

Citywide Public Involvement Standards Taskforce Summary of comments from March 2003 questionnaire

Brian Hoop

Office of Neighborhood Involvement

These are public comments from a questionnaire meant to help a taskforce developing citywide standards for City of Portland public involvement. The comments will assist in defining the scope of their work and help indentify case studies PSU students will complete to learn what worked and didn't work. 47 responses were received. Only questions #1, #3, and #4 are included here.

If this task force could accomplish one thing, what should it be?

Summary of key themes:

New suggestions not repeated from Feb. 25 workshop

1. Refer issues with strong opposition back to neighborhoods for a vote.
2. Create standard evaluation and feedback process.
3. Each bureau needs a written public involvement policy document.
4. Provide multiple involvement opportunities to meet public's busy schedules.
5. Involve public in problem-solving efforts.

Ideas repeated from Feb. 25 workshop

6. Create minimum citywide public involvement standards.
7. Improve transparency, access to information, how decisions made.
8. Improve City respect for public and City staff opinions, PI process.
9. Utilize electronic technologies to improve citizen participation.
10. Improve communication strategies for public involvement notifications.
11. Engage public at earliest point in planning processes.
12. Clear expectation and description of role of citizens, staff, consultants.
13. Increase neighborhood association role; crime prevention, land use, etc.
14. Improve outreach efforts for minority constituencies.
15. Expand outreach efforts beyond Citizen Advisory Groups, Neigh Assocs.
16. ONI coordinate City public involvement efforts.
17. Expand skills training on public involvement for staff and public.
18. Ensure flexibility of standards to fit unique circumstances of projects.
19. All capital improvement projects should have public involvement process.
20. Improve inter-governmental dialogue/partnership on public involvement.
21. Reinststate the neighborhood needs assessment program.
22. Create Citizen Advisory Committees for bureau, capital & planning projects
23. Improve accessibility for people with special needs at PI events.
24. Hold City Council meetings in the evenings.
25. Create special public involvement process for issues with citywide impact.
26. Provide more time for public comment periods.

Raw data of comments given by common categories:

Create minimum citywide public involvement standards

- ❑ Differentiate "what" Public Involvement is (giving the public a meaningful role in the city's decision-making process) from "how" it is done (CACs, Task Forces) so that public involvement is integrated into the city's decision-making process instead of its being independent of the decision-making and functioning more like a public information campaign.
- ❑ To establish standards which are legally binding and cannot be sidestepped or minimized by commissioners or bureaus. To create the energy that would make the standards something that bureaus would be expected to follow. To create a culture of expectation in the bureaus that this is the best practice for citizen involvement and that they will get the best from citizens if they use these standards. Also that the standards be seen as a working document and that bureaus would create a culture of social learning to incorporate and improve on these standards, rather than seeing these as compliance minimums.
- ❑ Universally agreed upon and measurable standards of public involvement among city bureaus.
- ❑ Create logical standards and codes of conduct for outreach to the public that will apply to all city bureaus and agencies.

Improve transparency, access to information, how decisions made

- ❑ Open channels between City Employees and the public.
- ❑ The CITY BUREAUS and their contractors/subcontractors should build PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT into their project time-lines rather than as an after-thought.

Improve City respect for public and City staff opinions, PI process

- ❑ Increase the level of trust between advocates, the public, and staff.
- ❑ Gain recognition and respect for citizen involvement in City Bureaus and at Council Level. Currently they are manipulated, treated with contempt.
- ❑ To assure the public's input is listened to and implemented and that the public is just not being paid lip service to. To often citizens feel that the time and effort they have contributed to is not taken seriously and the City will do what it wants to do regardless of citizen input.

Utilize electronic technologies to improve citizen participation

- ❑ Include incorporation of email feedback.
- ❑ Create a central clearinghouse via the web, that would list all the opportunities for citizen input. This list should be broken down by area and, should include LUR's and web links were needed.

Improve communication strategies for public involvement notifications

- ❑ Develop a centralized public notification system; that is used by ALL city bureaus. Include neighborhood association newsletters, list-servs, all newspapers in Portland area, and TV.

Engage public at earliest point in planning processes

- ❑ Develop a process that Informs communities at first hint of project.
- ❑ If the task force could accomplish only one thing it would be for all city decision makers to realize that the public must be involved before the decision is made. Once a decision is made it is too late to attempt a public process. If the decision precedes the process the process will always be deemed a sham unless you reach a different decision. Do you want to be in this no win situation? You either have to change your decision or you will alienate all the people who participated in the process who will believe that their participation was for nothing.
- ❑ Require citizen input EARLY on all major projects - CIP, ops budget, and "any project of more than \$xx.
- ❑ Affected neighbors, neighborhood and business district associations need advance notification of a forthcoming process or project so there is time to identify members for taskforces, citizen advisory committees, liaisons, and/or other contacts to keep all stakeholders in the loop and involved in necessary decision-making, collaborative problem-solving, and adjustments in travel patterns and other daily life issues.

Clear expectation and description of role of citizens, staff, consultants

- ❑ Streamlining - perhaps by defining a process (guidelines? worksheets?), skills/knowledge of resources required (whether someone in the neighborhood understands Land Use regulations, or the City provides).

Increase neighborhood association role; crime prevention, land use, etc.

- ❑ To get more people and our neighbors to be involved in crime prevention and getting to know your neighbors better.
- ❑ Treat the citizens and citizen groups as equal partners in all aspects of city administration.
- ❑ Get the city bureaus to uniformly recognize neighborhoods as the official voice of the public, and that they are a stakeholder by right in every public process. This concept needs to infiltrate through to the mayor and commissioners as well.

Improve outreach efforts for minority constituencies

- ❑ Setting policies and procedures regarding citizen participation that ensures broad representation of communities - there should be representation of people of color, low-income residents, renters, representatives of groups providing assisted living and transitional housing, people with disabilities, the elderly, and youth. Community organizations and neighborhood associations should be involved.

Expand outreach efforts beyond Citizen Advisory Groups, Neigh Assocs

- ❑ Strategies and steps need to be taken to encourage and welcome neighbors of all backgrounds into decision-making procedures.
- ❑ Discover barriers for involvement in non-participating populations
- ❑ Determine a method to engage citizens not already engaged with neighborhood associations, employed by the city, working on city-supported bond or levy campaigns, or community-based organizations funded in part by city dollars.

ONI coordinate City public involvement efforts

- ❑ Require use of ONI unless council authorization is given to avoid it.

Expand skills training/awareness on public involvement for staff and public

- ❑ Raise awareness in each neighborhood about ways to be involved as a city resident, especially helping residents understand how best to channel their input (ideas and concerns) for effect in the "system," beginning with their involvement in the neighborhood. Better contact needed when new residents move to neighborhood.

Ensure flexibility of standards to fit unique circumstances of projects

- ❑ Articulate in terms that citizens, city staff, and elected officials can grasp, what the standards (levels) for involvement should be for various types of activities. Some activities would require none, some a small amount, some a moderate amount, and some an extensive amount. Various individuals and organizations interpret what's appropriate very differently.

All capital improvement projects should have public involvement process

- ❑ Establish a fair and equitable public involvement process that all CIP are required to follow.

Improve inter-governmental dialogue/partnership on public involvement

- ❑ How do we continue to build for positive outcomes on the momentum generated in this community by the PPS funding issues, furlough, possible teachers' strike; complete new way the county will be delivering services based on the School Aged Policy Framework, etc.? There is a lot of energy in the community right now, and we should find a way to capture that and build on it.

Reinstate the neighborhood needs assessment program

- ❑ Expand/or increase the scope of the public involvement process to include time for prioritization. This prioritization step emphasizes those projects/tasks that are most critical. Current policy of the Planning and Transportation Departments only itemize a list of neighborhood concerns. There is very little emphasis placed on the most critical of outputs from a public agency to citizen partnership which is; "what are the next steps?"

and” how do we prioritize the itemized list to greater impact the overriding goal or mission of the public involvement gathering?”

Create Citizen Advisory Committees for bureau, capital & planning projects

- ❑ To establish that citizen participation is VITAL for a successful project 1. A Citizen Advisory Committee is vital for a successful project. 2. DO NOT WASTE CITIZEN'S TIME AND EFFORT Plan to use the ideas and suggestions of the CAC. If not - forget it. 3. Determine the Mission or the Need for a CAC What are you trying to accomplish? 4. Who should be involved? List the stakeholders. Those involved should be selected by their group. 5. Set up meeting dates and places. 6. Elect a citizen chair and vice chair. 7. The bureau people need to organize the education and allow plenty of time for discussion. 8. The group needs to put it all together and staff can go ahead with a draft. There should be open public meetings, opportunities for people to ask questions and make suggestions. 9. Revise the draft, how does the committee feel about the revised draft. Work from there.

Improve accessibility for people with special needs at PI events

- ❑ Include provision of child care.
- ❑ Include prioritized list of days for meetings to be held.
- ❑ Include meeting locations on transit lines.

Hold City Council meetings in the evenings

- ❑ Evening council meetings on significant topics.

Provide more time for public comment periods

- ❑ Improve notification (e.g. two weeks in advance).

Refer issues with strong opposition back to neighborhood for a vote

- ❑ There have been a number of council decisions that were opposed by a vast majority of those giving public input during the process. There is a general impression among citizens that I know that the council generally discounts public input and is just going through the motions but believes that it knows best. It convinced me that providing input is a waste of my time. If the task force took actions that convinced me that input has substantial and real power - that would be valuable. Anything short of that is not valuable. For example, perhaps there should be a policy that decisions that receive strong public opposition should be referred to interested neighborhoods or voters or the like for a fair vote. Or they should be referred back in a way that doesn't just allow a perfunctory re-affirmation that the council knows better than the citizens.
- ❑ Establishing protocols for each bureau/division to have a format for public involvement in an ongoing basis in which citizens have challenge/veto power, not just PI on a project-by-project basis.

Create standard evaluation and feedback process

- ❑ Develop and implement a 360-degree feedback/ appraisal process for all mid-level and senior level City staff. The survey should include feedback from a sampling of citizens, whom might have had contact with the City employee. PepsiCo made this a core component of their human resource planning process in the 1990s. First, the company identified the key attributes shared by the most successful leaders in the organization. Next, PepsiCo worked with Novations to develop a survey form that would be used to collect feedback to assess how an employee might be demonstrating each of these leadership qualities. Surveys were distributed to peers, direct reports and superiors both inside and outside the organization. The employee, in turn, had to assess himself/herself, too. This was a great tool for identifying gaps between (self) perception and reality. It was also a great tool for identifying individuals at all levels of the organization who exhibited great leadership potential.

Each bureau needs a written public involvement policy document

- ❑ Have clearly defined formats that identify the public process for major and minor projects or issues that affect our neighborhoods and the City as a whole. At a minimum each bureau should have clearly defined formats that speak to their specialty. These formats should be published and be available to the public.

Provide multiple involvement opportunities to meet public's busy schedule

- ❑ Work hard to find ways to create different amounts of time commitments to provide input in each and every project or request for input. Not everyone can be on a CAC for every issue. Conversely, not all good input can be delivered with a 14-day timeframe in a letter.

Involve public in problem-solving efforts

- ❑ Develop a process that involves communities in problem identification, scoping and solutions.
- ❑ Develop a process that enables communities to influence problem solving.

Other values/principles ideas for City public involvement efforts

- ❑ Off leash rights in all parks.
- ❑ To actually create a city that works instead of one that meets...to simplify the way citizens can participate in government and to respond to actual citizens' needs and not what the city perceives our needs to be based on the politicians priorities.
- ❑ The single most important task would be to find a solution that allows both pet owners and non-pet owners an opportunity to use the city services without having to be prepared for conflict of use. As a dog owner, I recognize that there are people that do not like, or are afraid of dogs. The to-date lack of appropriate planning by the city does not allow a coherent solution to this problem.

Name a project you were involved with in which participation went well. Why?

Neighborhood Planning Program, Piedmont NA– Bureau of Planning

- ❑ The neighborhood planning process for the Piedmont Neighborhood as part of the Albina Community Plan. We were assigned a planner as support staff, but were allowed to conduct our own process to determine overall goals and objectives for our neighborhood plan. Funding was available for outreach which we were also responsible for conducting. The PNA used this opportunity to engage the community, build leadership and an agenda for the association, as well as educate ourselves on city policies and programs that could effect our revitalization. It was a very transformative process for us.

South Corridor Transportation Project – Metro and Tri-Met

- ❑ Enabled citizen involvement early and ongoing. Lots of access to Metro staff. Flexibility from Metro. Light Rail was put back on the table because of citizen involvement.

2020 Vision Plan – Parks and Recreation

- ❑ Parks & Recreation 2020 Plan and subsequent bond issues. Development of plan, public meetings & focus groups.
- ❑ Park Master Plan. The Parks Bureau wanted and accepted citizen input.

Central NE Neighbors

- ❑ Projects involving Central NE Neighbors facilitation and outreach.

Mt. Tabor Park Master Plan – Parks and Recreation

- ❑ I have been told that the Mt Tabor Master Park plan was a good process but I did not participate. I have read the document and while the process seemed fair enough it left a gapping hole in planning. The water bureau was invited to participate but did not send a representative. The sixty acres of park and water reservoirs were excluded from the master planning process. A good process would have required their inclusion since this infrastructure is so critical to park development. It was a major oversight.

Emergency Response Classification Study – Bureau of Emergency Communication ???

- ❑ The Emergency Response Classification Study went especially well because the stakeholders worked hard to establish and maintain trust and goodwill. Project had limited public involvement since it was more an internal City issue, however, the principles that were used successfully transcend the particular process.

Waterfront Park Master Plan – Parks and Recreation

- ❑ The Westmoreland Park Master Plan process. 2020 Vision Team process.

SW Trails Urban Trails Plan/SW Barbur Streetscape –Transportation

- ❑ Leader was Bill Hoffman who truly tried to understand everyone's position and find solutions that were acceptable to all and still accomplished the job. The Barbur Streetscape Study was done in record time and low cost as well. In addition, the community choose the representatives to the task force. It was not stuffed with skills from downtown.

Neighborhood Cleanup, Sumner Neigh Assoc. – Central NE Neighbors

- ❑ The neighborhood clean-up went very well. Good turn out, good planning, and distribution of fliers.

Target Areas – Bureau of Housing and Community Development

- ❑ Certain target areas of BHCD (maybe not technically “public involvement”), illustrate the power and effectiveness that can be generated through community-directed development. N. Interstate Urban Renewal is also a good case study.
- ❑ Mississippi Avenue Street Fair 2002. The project was truly a team effort and the whole neighborhood was invited to participate.

National Night Out, Pearl District/Old Town China-Town NA's- NWNW & ONI

- ❑ Terrific support from Office of Neighborhood Involvement (Preston Wong), and partners in the community: Zimmerman Community Center, Portland Business Alliance.

Sports Work Group – Parks and Recreation

- ❑ Lisa Turpel and the Portland Parks leadership were wide open to input and all of the major parks sports users were represented. Many parks usage issues were not City problems but needed to be discussed by the users themselves who had no forum to get together prior to the SWG.

Parks bond measure planning – Parks and Recreation

- ❑ Washington Park Bond work went quite well because the city wisely appointed Richard Bosch, who was extremely sensitive to all stakeholder concerns, to manage the project.
- ❑ All Parks bond and levy measures have been great because city staff give time after hours, and when citizens see that kind of commitment it instills trust and belief in the city at large.
- ❑ Bond improvements in Washington Park. If the task force could accomplish only one thing it would be for all city decision makers to realize that the public must be involved before the decision is made. Once a decision is made it is too late to attempt a public process. If the decision precedes the process the process will always be deemed a sham unless you reach a different decision. Do you want to be in this no win situation? You either have to change your decision or you will alienate all the people who participated in the process who will believe that their participation was for nothing.

Land Use Reviews – Bureau of Development Services

- In general, the notification process for most LUR's goes very well. The reasons for this are, clearly defined stakeholders, repeated practice, clearly defined goals and outcomes, and legal ramifications if the process is not followed.

Tree Plantings and SOLV cleanups – Friends of Trees and SOLV

- Tree plantings, SOLV IT cleanups, many other environmentally oriented projects. They went well because the outcome was in the best interests of everyone - neighborhoods, businesses, and government - and because no one had to yield on anything.

Lewis and Clark College parking plan – Office of Transportation

- I chaired a task force on behalf of the Collins View Neighborhood Association that was charged with developing a plan for reducing off-campus parking in the neighborhood. The task force included staff from the College and neighborhood volunteers. From time-to-time, we also elicited advice/ ideas from City staff (e.g. City Attorney's office and PDOT). The College implemented the recommendations this past fall resulting in a substantial reduction in off-campus parking. Why was the task force successful? Because we developed a plan and we followed through. We solicited ideas from city staff as needed, but we owned the problem and the solution.

Urban Renewal District, housing committee – Pdx Development Comm.

- I was a committee member of an urban renewal housing committee. I thought that the committee was heard and that the final report was a good reflection of what the committee discussed and decided. The staff worked hard to get consensus and did a great job leading the process without leading the decisions being made.

Independent Police Review Board

- While it's sometimes cumbersome, the Citizen Review Committee in our organization "audits" our agency's work on an ongoing basis, and can vote to change what we do/how we do it - has some real authority to approve things, or appeal to city council.

Police Activities League – Police Bureau

- Supported by the City as well as police jurisdictions around the area, local businesses and community members is a great example. It works well because we engaged many different city departments (from Water Bureau to Parks to Police to BCHD), and every day citizens.

BLAZ study - ????

- All stakeholders were at the table as soon as the problem was identified, i.e. planning bureau, two neighborhood associations, 1 business association,

residential and commercial owners, renters, real estate professionals, and developers.

Surplus lands disposition - Portland Public Schools

- The selling of School lands issue continues to be an emotional issue with Portlanders and is a good example of both what to do and what not to do! The School Board actually defined a reasonable process for identifying portions of school sites that might be sold to public entities or developers. (There could be some quibbling about the previous statement as it has been revised after City input.) It appears the defined process would have been somewhat low key, but would have met a reasonable process criteria. The difficulty occurred when the consultant the School Board had hired to quantify and describe the properties to be sold met with the television media early in the process. The result was news clips which identified sites and included airborne shots of acreage that could be converted to apartments or condominiums....and the shots included playing fields. This exposure resulted in immediate neighborhood meetings where school officials and their consultants were invited to appear and were roasted by the groups for trying to put a fast one by the citizens. The issue became a firebrand and has delayed the School Board process. In fact, the School Board had put in place a reasonable but it had been co-opted by their consultant. And, in fact, the neighborhood associations call to arms delivered up to 300 people to neighborhood meetings to voice their opinion. This also was a positive result.

County Budget Hearing Forums - Multnomah County Board

- County Budget Forum last Fall where 200 folks showed up for the Westside evening.

Fire Station Siting – Fire and Rescue Bureau

- Likewise the siting of Fire Station 16 is the poster child for public process because the Fire Department and Commissioner Francesconi were willing to listen to concerned citizens who eventually persuaded them that Sylvan was the better location - a fact that all stakeholders now accept.
- The Station Advisory Committee for Stations 12 and 28. It went well because all of the members of the committee were after the same goal, did not have personal agendas and respected each other's opinions. Also the citizens felt their input was given the same weight and consideration as that of the City's bureau members.
- Siting of Fire Station 16 at Sylvan. If the task force could accomplish only one thing it would be for all city decision makers to realize that the public must be involved before the decision is made. Once a decision is made it is too late to attempt a public process. If the decision precedes the process the process will always be deemed a sham unless you reach a different decision. Do you want to be in this no win situation? You either have to change your decision or you will alienate all the people who participated in the process who will believe that their participation was for nothing.

Neighborhood Transportation Safety Initiative - PDOT

- Early involvement of key citizens. Honesty about what was “on-the-table”. Clarity of suggested actions to support. Opportunity for citizens to select how much time they would spend on their involvement without having to choose to be “in or out”. Upfront “roadmap” of project goals. Consistency in themes, but (at least some) demonstrable responses to input.

Hollywood Sandy Plan – Bureau of Planning

- All stakeholders were involved, many points for people to get involved with the project (lots of open houses), people could see in the reports where there input went and what became of it.

Capitol Highway Plan – Office of Transportation

- I participated in the Capitol Highway Plan. It was very successful because the stakeholders were identified and 1- Each N/A the Highway involved was invited to name a representative to the CAC. 2- Two days were devoted to walking the Hiway from one end to the other looking at what many of thought needed to be done. 3- Elected a citizen chair and vice chair. 4- each meeting was well planned and much good discussion was had. All participants felt it was their Plan and were thrilled when it passed the CC. Matt Brown and bill Hoffman from PDOT were responsible and could be very helpful and showing how it is done successfully.

Others

- I have been at several affordable housing, urban renewal, and neighborhood meetings. Good facilitation is key, as is the flow of information regarding the nature of the process and how feedback will be used.
- I have not been directly involved with a project in the past, but in those I have seen the highlights of success were communication and strong leadership.
- I have been involved in a couple of processes, but I can't name one in which participation went well if you look at it from the perspective of the most vulnerable members of our communities.

Name a project you were involved with in which participation did not go well. Why?

Portland International Airport expansion - Port of Portland

- Citizens group Airport Issues Rountable and CNAC are groups of dedicated citizen advisory groups who have clear ideas expressed by neighbors, and the Port listens but does not hear. Public involvement is a rubber stamp.

North PDX Needs Assessment for Parks/Open Spaces – Parks and Rec.

- *(Comments shortened due to length.)* PI process controlled by Bureau's PI Standards, but the standards have never been disclosed to the CAC. This

was a major source of confusion and frustration for Chair of committee. PI Standards do not allow the Chair to help develop meeting agendas, contribute as process guides, or lead decision-making at meetings. Outreach was weak due to funding constraints. More importantly the public outreach techniques (web sites and survey forms) not effective in North PDX. There is also a clear bias against working with NA's to meet public involvement goals despite the fact that the citizen advisory group are representatives from the NAs and that the bureau seems to have no "interested persons" contact lists for North PDX.

Johnson Creek Boulevard reconstruction – Office of Transportation

- ❑ Agencies were willing to bend rules to suit community needs.

Interstate Ave. Urban Renewal District – Pdx Development Commission

- ❑ A PDC employee commented directly to me that he could not wait for the “process” to be over so PDC could get on with its work. He was completely clear that the process was a hindrance to his agency’s ideas for how to proceed and gave no value to the importance of citizen participation in determining the future of the city.

Off-Leash Dog committee - Parks & Recreation

- ❑ Recruitment of non-dog owners for this study group.
- ❑ I have been involved in two projects both related to the off leash parks issue. Both went badly. Keeping an off leash park in Mount Tabor park, and the Parks improvement project. *(Statement too long to include. Summary is that City ignored overwhelming voice of dog owners and bent over backwards to accomodate small number of nearby neighbors.)*
- ❑ A few years ago, there was a considerable amount of energy expended on this same subject, and at the end of the project, the task force findings were ignored. This was very frustrating.
- ❑ The off-leash issue is a prime example...the city was told in '92 that adding off-leash areas was a good idea and virtually nothing has happened. This has increased animosity on both sides of the issue. They waited until they could use the current financial crisis as a reason why they won't add any, all the while wasting our time getting neighborhood input on where to put them. Another was the rezoning issue in Sellwood when they felt they had to shove infill down our throats. Now I face having 37 townhouses built down the street from me, considerably decreasing the livability you pride yourself on...and I bet 40% of those town house owners will have dogs...

Fire Station Siting - Portland Fire Bureau

- ❑ SE 39th design process, It would appear that the public meeting phase of this was just to meet requirements with little impact made by public comments.
- ❑ Sylvan fire station *(Summary of comment. Council discounts public input. Should refer topics with strong opposition back to neighborhood.)*
- ❑ Siting of Fire Station 16 at Sylvan. All city decision makers need to realize that the public must be involved before the decision is made. Once a decision

is made it is too late to attempt a public process. If the decision precedes the process the process will always be deemed a sham unless you reach a different decision. Do you want to be in this no win situation? You either have to change your decision or you will alienate all the people who participated in the process who will believe that their participation was for nothing.

Open reservoir replacement project – Bureau of Water Works

- ❑ Open reservoir replacement project has been a disaster. *(Comments very long. Summary is feeling City staff see public involvement as adversarial, public not included early on, bureau controlled who participated and agenda, too many staff and professionals on committees, technical reports too complicated for public to respond to, not happy with PI contractor hired.)*
- ❑ Open Reservoirs. Rehab and Water Bureau did not want citizen input. Did not allow anything except "what goes on top."
- ❑ The city claims that the public had notice of the reservoir burial project even though it never held a public hearing. It just attempted an after the fact hearing and when it decided to ratify its original decision generated an appeal to LUBA. Since I initiated the appeal I can assure you that this is worst way to resolve disputes. It will be a long and expensive nightmare for all concerned. However, this is the only alternative open to opponents who sincerely believe that the city is making an enormous mistake.

Lewis & Clark/ Riverdale High School master plans – Planning ???

- ❑ Process did not require institutions to submit information to public to allow enough time for thoughtful review and response.

Willamette Boulevard Traffic Calming Project - Transportation

- ❑ The Willamette Blvd. Traffic Calming project was an utter disaster! A small, vocal group dominated and disrupted the entire process by refusing to adhere to the group established ground rules (that they help develop) or to basic civility (project supporters and staff were harassed and physically threatened by project opponents).

South Portland Circulation Study - Transportation

- ❑ Leadership of committee and (apparent) interference from the commissioners or bureau directors office. Agreements were reached, then incorrectly recorded by the leader, bias on the part of the leader, a real mess. Worse, the leader proposed and we adopted decision criteria at the beginning of the project which made no sense when we really understood the options at the end of the study. The study was manipulated from the start. That really rubs me the wrong way. The leader was Laurel Wentworth, now head of PDOT planning.

Holocaust memorial siting, Zoo parking – Parks and Recreation/PDOT ???

- ❑ *(Summary of comment. Council discounts public input. Should refer topics with strong opposition back to neighborhood.)*

- Holocaust went quite badly because the decision preceded the process. *(Comments cut short due to length)* It is obvious that none of the Council members had a clue about its location within the Park; their entire focus was on the propriety of having a memorial at all. Once Council made this initial decision the coalition designed a memorial to fit that site and became emotionally attached to it. Commissioner Francesconi's attempt to resolve this controversy with a subsequent process was doomed from the start.
- With the zoo parking case the Court of Appeals determined that the city failed to provide adequate notice of its decision so concerned citizens never had the opportunity to object. Upon remand to LUBA it found that the city never demonstrated the need for additional parking. The result is a new zoo master that excludes this lot leaving it with open space designation that cannot be used for parking without conditional use approval.

Southwest Community Center – Parks and Recreation

- From the outside, the controversy around Gabriel Park's Center and the SW Plan seems unproductive.
- SW Community center. *(Summary of comment. Council discounts public input. Should refer topics with strong opposition back to neighborhood.)*
- The worst was the committee to choose the location of the SW Community Center. The CAC was appointed by the City Commissioner. Many of them did not represent their N/A. This group was a disgrace and created all kinds of problems. The Park Bureau had no conception of how to run a successful CAC. They have improved over the years

North Macadam Urban Renewal Advisory Committee – Planning Bureau

- After two years of occasional meetings, the members are still debating what their role and responsibilities are. They have wasted hours of time and contributed nothing of value. C-TAG -- used by City Planner working as Project Manager for Marquam Hill Project to try to manipulate public opinion.

The Russell Street Improvement Project - Transportation

- There were individuals who were not especially qualified facilitators, and background information to be used for decision-making was suspect and lacked clarity causing participants difficulty in making informed choices. There were also a lack of choices and no real direction for the project, in terms of what the goals were and how we might prioritize and initiate catalyst projects.

Portland Arts Foundation - ???

- Failed to observe neighborhood process for park planning in relation to sculptural works.

Code re-write project ?? – Planning Bureau or Bureau Develop. Services

- From my perspective, most large code re-write projects have a poor citizen participation process. The reasons for this are that the projects are way too

large, usually hundreds of pages, the real outcomes and impacts are difficult to assess and the stakeholder group is poorly defined.

Land Use Appeals – Bureau of Development Services

- Any land use appeal where the planning bureau treats neighborhoods as adversarial rather than a stakeholder. Too many to enumerate.

Traffic Calming Citizens Advisory Committee – Office of Transportation

- I served on PDOT's Traffic Calming Citizens Advisory Committee for over two years between 2000 and 2002. This was a case study on how a city agency managed to alienate the citizen activists who were poised to be its most ardent champions in the trenches. The Traffic Calming CAC was created in 2000 to review/update PDOT's traffic calming master plan. The project is still not done. Why did it fail: 1) PDOT leadership did not lead the charge and support either the project or the citizen participation process; and 2) PDOT staff were not held accountable for getting the project done in a timely and effective manner. After this experience, I will not volunteer to serve on another CAC. It was dreadful.

Mississippi Ave. Street Fair – Mississippi Target Area, BHCD/NECN

- I am relatively new to the NA and do not have many complaints. However, last year when working on the Mississippi Avenue Street Fair, particularly the "Rib Off Contest," there were definitely some cultural conflicts of interests which made the process a little difficult, but we worked it out.

Urban Renewal District advisory committee – Pdx Development Comm.

- I am currently a member of an urban renewal advisory committee. When I asked at a meeting two days ago for some additional information for our next meeting, I was told by the staff that I should request the information from their legal department under the freedom of information act. I asked for budget to actuals for the first 6 months of fiscal year '02/03 so the committee can compare spending to the allotted budget. I believed this request was reasonable and that the item was something the agency should have. The rest of the committee was in agreement that this item would be helpful in our discussion of next year's budget. I am putting it in writing to the legal department. As a citizen volunteer, this attitude by staff amazes me.

Brownfield Showcase – Bureau of Housing and Community Development

- The brownfield showcase effort was an example of a process that did not go well because the city acted too late to involve community members and leaders in a meaningful way and the city was insensitive to the particular needs of Portland's most affected and most racially diverse neighborhoods. I would characterize the city's leadership in this instance insensitive at best. However, the city did make an attempt late in the game to involve the community more meaningfully, but did not reach far or deep enough nor provide adequate follow-up.

City Budget Hearing – Office of Management and Finance

- Budget meetings! What is important for the community, I.e. public safety issues, roads and infrastructure does not get the resources necessary for a city the size of Portland. City Council "pet" projects always seem to have funding while the citizens of Portland have to deal with Police precincts that are closed for more than half the time.

Metro RTP

- *(Cut short due to length. Felt committee was waste of time over 3 years.)*
They followed the proper pattern. 1- Need for a CAC, Develop the Metro RTP
2- Identify the stakeholders 3- Meeting schedule organized and elected a citizen chairman 4- Staff directed education A great deal of time was spent wordsmithing. Staff failed to tell the group that it would all be rewritten. The group needed to work on the big picture and basically create the outline of ideas, etc. When public meetings finally held they were poorly attended and the way the meetings were organized by Cogan & Cogan they were skewed to come out with the answers they were looking for and the committee who attended those meetings were incensed and refused to approve of the material written by staff. Metro staff went ahead and finished the project without true citizen involvement.

Washington Park bond improvements – Parks and Recreation

- All city decision makers need to realize that the public must be involved before the decision is made. Once a decision is made it is too late to attempt a public process. If the decision precedes the process the process will always be deemed a sham unless you reach a different decision. Do you want to be in this no win situation? You either have to change your decision or you will alienate all the people who participated in the process who will believe that their participation was for nothing.

Others

- Those I have heard of that did not go well resulted from lack of inclusion of community stakeholders at the planning stages.
- Efforts to involve the whole community only seem to attract the small hard core of regulars that do not reflect the real diversity of the community. Working with the city on transportation issues. How the city evaluates transportation improvements (currently no outreach or input option).