

City of Portland
Public Involvement Advisory Council (PIAC)
Agenda & Meeting Notes
May 7, 2013

Members Present: Teresa Baldwin, Glenn Bridger, Liam Frost, Bill Gentile, Greg Greenway, Tim Hall, Brian Hoop, Muna Idow, Denver Igarta, Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, Paul Leistner, Carri Munn, Linda Nettekoven, Khalid Osman, Amy Spring, Marty Stockton, Mike Vander Veen

Members Absent: Mohamed Abdiasis, Kelly Ball, Robert Boy, Kyle Brown, Donita Fry, Inger McDowell, Colleen Poole, Goldann Salazar, Christine White, Desiree Williams-Rajee, Keith Witcosky

Staff: Afifa Ahmed-Shafi

Guests: Mike Crebs (Portland Police), Jaymee Cuti (PHB)

Agenda

- A. PIAC Annual Report Development for Fall 2014
- B. Civil Rights Title VI Draft Report
- C. Vote to approve April large group meeting notes
- D. Small group updates
- E. Reminder: Take small group notes
- F. FIPIS Evaluation

Notes

A. PIAC Annual Report Development for Fall 2014

The Annual State of Public Involvement Report and Evaluation (ASPIRE) group described their DRAFT strategy for the report to be presented to City Council later this year. The group requested further feedback to be sent via email to Afifa and Liam after the meeting. All PIAC member feedback will be considered before finalizing the report later this year, and adopted as a large group, since the final product will be sent forward from the PIAC as a whole.

DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT STRATEGY as of 5/7/13:

In September/October – we will present PIAC’s Annual Report to City Council that includes:

- *Here’s what we heard:* Results from the baseline assessment
- *Here’s what we recommend:* Paint the “road map” for the next three to five years – what we would like to see accomplished in the City on public involvement – and the role we see PIAC, City Council and bureaus playing to achieve that.

The report will also be accompanied by a series of stand alone Public Involvement Appendices/Products (and/or as a series of separate resolutions) that may include the following:

- *Glossary of public involvement terms – to help City staff begin to use common language*
- *Project specific implementation version of public involvement principles with a new framework with “stages of execution”, (e.g. Scoping, Designing, Implementing, Evaluating)*
- *Best Practices for public involvement in bureaus, based on PI Principles*
- *Re-fashioned version of the BIP #9 Toolkit –with a potential new title, such as “Public Involvement Assessment”*
- *FIPIS 2.0 – this potential task will not be shepherded by ASPIRE, but by the small group that volunteered to take this on, (Afifa, Paul, Mike and Linda) and overseen by PIAC large group as a whole. This task would most probably be presented as a separate resolution asking City Council to adopt a new version of the FIPIS and reporting back initial results).*

How did we get here?

- The formerly known as “Policy Group” (now known as Comp Plan group) shepherded the creation of the City’s first “public involvement baseline assessment”, which was adopted as an initiative by City Council in 2010
- The PIAC conducted this citywide assessment in 2012
- Former Intern Jennifer McGuirk processed all of the raw data into a 60 page report with visuals and the raw data in 2012.
- The group now known as ASPIRE (formerly known as the Best Practice group) offered to pick up the ball in regards to evaluating all the data that bureaus submitted as a foundation upon which to recommend future best practices.
- ASPIRE has been working for many months on extensive analysis of the data and recruited intern Victoria Demchak to assist with writing a draft report.

Liam provided an outline of ASPIRE’s progress to date, and future work. Last year, the group sent a baseline assessment to all the bureaus to evaluate current public involvement practices. This past fall the group sorted through the data gathered through this assessment. The group picked out the key elements of the data, and then decided what message they wanted to send to bureaus and how this data can be used to better define public involvement practices throughout the city. The group has decided to also provide a strategy, beyond the report. The report is one element of a public involvement four-part packet, which will describe what PIAC is, what was learned from the assessment, and how they would like viewers to respond. PIAC will act in an advisory role in helping bureau’s develop strategies and provide support to implement public involvement plans or strategies. The goal is that every bureau will have a public involvement strategy by 2015. The other elements of the packet are: Bureau Innovation Project (BIP) #9, PIAC principles, and a glossary of public involvement terms. The report will be completed in the next month or so. The group will then meet with various

bureau representatives and present to City Council in the fall. Carri added that the group discussed making the full results of the survey and the data available for anyone who is interested in digging deeper into them.

Liam continued in saying that the group is responding to the main issue that came out of the report and the request from bureaus for support in developing public involvement practices. In 2015, after every bureau has a public involvement strategy in place, they will send out another assessment to consider the state of public involvement practices, and every 2-3 years beyond that. Paul asked if the packet will include examples of what a public involvement strategy might include. Liam said that they will include some core recommendations, but they will also emphasize that each bureau performs very different services and will therefore have different public involvement goals and strategies. It will be up to some sort of group or subcommittee to provide support for each bureau in establishing their baselines and guide them through where they need to be and perhaps what practices they should adopt. The group would like to meet with a few PIAC members individually and also send out a document to the entire PAIC for review in early summer. Shoshanah mentioned that the Citywide Equity Committee (CEC) is developing a racial equity guide or template for each bureau, and there is also the public involvement component of Title VI. She asked how these other efforts and requests of bureaus work alongside ASPIRE's report. Liam said that the report will help provide some backing to the public involvement principles. Shoshanah suggested that she meet with Liam and the ASPIRE group outside of PIAC. She said that the end product will be better if the work is complementary and coordinated. Muna said that the CEC will be putting out a racial equity template at the end of this summer. The committee recently broke into work groups to work on this. They will incorporate existing tools, including the Urban League of Portland's Racial Equity Strategy Guide. The CEC is writing a letter in support of Title VI and hope that this will be the beginning of a collaboration, moving forward together.

Marty said that it might be helpful for someone in the City to map out all of these different efforts. She asked how the CEC's racial equity template ties in with current bureaus' requirements of completing affirmative action reporting and diversity strategy/plan reporting. She said that even just a flow chart would help show how these efforts work together or overlap. Shoshanah said that each of these efforts touch on engaging the community, but perhaps have different ways of how the community is engaged and their end goals. Mike encouraged unity around the Principles of PI that have already been adopted by the City and the language that was used; however, this does not help with the problem of what they are asking bureaus to do. He also noted the importance of creating a culture that considers public involvement a "core service" and in which all bureaus are comfortable with public involvement. Paul said that the strategy of ASPIRE's report can weave all of these ideas together. Linda said that it would also be important to include a consolidated system of reporting, so that there can be meaningful tracking and evaluation of the progress that is being made. Brian said that either the ASPIRE group or the Coordinating Committee can discuss this further.

B. Civil Rights Title VI Draft Report

QUESTIONS FOR PIAC ON TITLE VI

- A. Shoshanah is open to feedback on what else we would like listed in the public involvement section (see below) **E.g. do we also want to ask bureaus to each have a bureau PI plan?**
- B. Draft letter from PIAC – last month we voted to write a letter in support of Title VI. Later in this packet is a draft version of that letter. Afifa will send it via email later this week, please send any edits you have to her via email.
- C. Translation Policy – any comments from PIAC members tonight? If you want to submit comments later, please email to Shoshanah.

This is an important opportunity to align the work of PIAC with the Civil Rights report and to list future initiatives of PIAC within the public involvement section of the Title VI plan.

Public involvement section in Title VI

e.g. currently under “Bureau Director Responsibilities” on Public Involvement, it reads: *“Ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to be engaged and involved in the decision-making of the bureau. Annually report the engagement of the protected classes in community outreach and involvement.”*

This is a great step forward for PI in the City of Portland.

Potential areas of collaboration between PIAC and Title VI –

- *Bureau PI Plans*
- *FIPIS questions – incorporating civil rights based questions as Novick requested*
- *Future PI Bureau Baseline Assessments*
- *Annual reporting to City Council on PI*

Shoshanah said that the translation policy is online and available for comment. She has met with or will be meeting with the Latino Network, IRCO, and others. She considered the translation policies of other cities and distilled them into what she saw as an applicable framework for Portland. She has to file her documents by next Wednesday (May 15th), so the final date for comment would be Friday, May 10th. She noted that the adopted PI principles are highlighted on the Title VI website and in the Title VI plan. She suggested that the first sentence of PIAC’s letter of support read: “The PIAC works to help develop the core public involvement principles within the City, which help us achieve the goals of public involvement.” Brian asked if we needed to adopt the letter of support. Afifa said that the letter is still in the draft stage, so she will not be asking the group to adopt it tonight. PIAC already voted to write the letter. She will incorporate Shoshanah’s suggestion, as well as any other suggestions received at the meeting or emailed to her that week. She will send PIAC a more final version in a week or so. Shoshanah asked PIAC members to attend the June 12th City Council meeting

where she will be presenting the Title VI plan at 2:00PM. She will email Afifa confirming the time of her presentation. Paul asked how we can make this policy relevant for the community. He also added that community groups might ask what opportunities this policy provides. Shoshanah referred to a document that describes how this Title VI plan advances equity and says that she hopes a lot of the “how to” questions are answered there. The community should be seeing a strengthened effort around public involvement, more transparent decision making that reflects environmental justice, and accountability that each bureau will know that this is part of an annual review that she will perform. She will have open houses throughout the summer and fall where she will provide information on what has been adopted, and how people can access the Title VI program, file a complaint, and document their concerns. She says she will need help in implementation from PIAC and interested community members.

Afifa discussed the question of whether the group wanted the public involvement section of the Title VI plan to ask bureaus to each have a bureau PI plan. She referred to Shoshanah’s point of not wanting to ask each bureau to create numerous and perhaps overlapping products. She noted that an emerging recommendation from PIAC, via the ASPIRE report, may be a request for bureaus to have a public involvement plan. In the Title VI plan, there is already a request for bureau directors to go to Council on an annual basis and report on their public involvement. Afifa asked the group if they wanted to ask Shoshanah to request in the Title VI plan that each bureau have their own public involvement plan, which PIAC can then support when they go to council later this year. She said it would be important to develop language to show that all of these pieces are working together. Glenn asked if we are talking about a plan or a strategy. He said that he believed a strategy might provide greater strength to elicit action. He hopes that public involvement can be blended in with the various operations of the bureaus. Greg stated his agreement with Glenn, and also added that within the Comprehensive Plan policy language was included within the community involvement chapter. The word “plan” was used in reference to specific projects. Carri also agreed and said that a strategy could detail when and how a plan is required for specific projects. Greg said that it would be great to have templates available for bureaus to understand what these strategies would look like.

Shoshanah said that it is because of the work that PIAC has done that the City is in such a good position to implement the Title VI plan, in regards to the PI principles and toolkit that they developed. She said that the request for bureaus to use these tools in developing stronger public involvement strategies is already written into the plan, but is perhaps in a different format or language than is being discussed here. However, she is nervous in adding an additional requirement that she has not yet discussed with stakeholders. Elizabeth said that the request stems from the work on the baseline assessment, and that the group shouldn’t insert the request into Shoshanah’s work. She said that the Title VI plan echoes the language used by PIAC, and ASPIRE’s report is working to echo the language in Title VI. She discussed the importance of streamlining the requirements, using an example of streamlining meetings for permitting requirements in her bureau that bring together all entities that might require a similar products. Something of this sort could be helpful in this situation, or if PIAC could

provide a package that describes all of the requirements when talking about public involvement. Mike said that this sounds like a bureau plan that refers to all of the practices that are woven into the workings of the bureau, therefore the actual strategies are more embedded within.

Muna said that adding the word “plan” at the end of proposed products often puts people off and is often seen as a document that just collects dust on a shelf. She noted that we need to work past the fatigue many have on these topics. She expressed support for Elizabeth’s ideas. Elizabeth said that she thinks the group might be talking about “policy”. Muna said that “policy” often has even worse connotations than “plan”. Brian reiterated that Elizabeth is suggested that there be a list of all the public involvement tasks that bureaus must do. Paul said that public involvement is just one of the things that is included within the Title VI plan. He said that a strategy might be a good place for PIAC to start as it expresses an interest to support and provide guidance to bureaus in putting all of these pieces into place. Afifa said that the intention is to help bureaus become actionable on the pieces that have already been created. She said that perhaps PIAC creates a template for an annual report on public involvement, as that is already listed in the Title VI plan as a requirement. PIAC can then support bureaus, but also encourage bureaus to work on all of these documents and requirements. Shoshanah said that by creating support heightens the value of PIAC. Liam said that the language in the Title VI plan complements that used in the ASPIRE report recommendations. He said that we shouldn’t shy away from the fact that there are multiple efforts that are working towards public involvement. However, he said that we do need to be concerned about our impact in terms of how these documents will be received and if they will be implemented. We must be aware of bureau capacity, as well as the capacity of PIAC members. Brian said that no decision on this topic would be made at the meeting, however the discussion should continue.

C. Vote to approve April large group meeting notes

Motion to approve April’s large group meeting notes, motion was seconded. No oppositions or abstentions.

D. Small group updates

Greg said that the Comprehensive Plan group is nearing the end of their formal work on the PEG. They have made great progress in taking the strong draft of goals and policies and reorganizing it, thinking about what represents broad values, what are appropriate goals, what are policies, and what should be tools for implementation. He said that the content did not change, it was simply reorganized. Marty said that most of the content was from the community involvement survey. Greg said that they also used the survey to see what content they should elevate according to what appeared to be important to the public. They also added the requirement by state law to adequately fund this public involvement work. Paul added that Marty is suggesting added these state requirements out of the public involvement section and into the administrative section, including adequate funding, as well as the requirement to have an oversight

body, doing evaluations, and creating a manual. The group broke the policies into those that need to be done on an ongoing basis, thus requiring more support, ongoing assessment, training, etc. He said that their process has helped the group see where the different kinds of requirements should be placed within the plan. Marty said that the community involvement PEG's work will be completed in June, and the other PEGs will be finishing in September. The next version of the proposed draft will be available in December, which will be available for public comment.

Liam said that the previous discussion adequately described the ASPIRE group's progress.

Brian said that the BAC group is continuing to provide feedback on the best practices handbook. Tonight, the group will be reviewing questions that will be used to survey the experiences of BAC administrators and members.

E. Reminder: Take small group notes

Responsibility of Small group leads to ensure: *Brian/Amy, Greg/Paul, Liam/Mohamed*. Project Coordinators are encouraged to help: *Marty, Liam and Bill*.

F. FIPIS Evaluation

The FIPIS small group will meet again before the next PIAC meeting. Rene, an intern, is entering the remaining FIPIS data. As of today, Rene only has six more weeks of data to input.

Linda, Paul, Mike, and Afifa will meet again next month to continue planning for the evaluation of FIPIS. Their goal is that by the Sept/Oct annual report that PIAC gives to City Council, we will have:

- a. Summary of the first year of FIPIS data
- b. Notice to the community re: FIPIS, how to use it, invite to comment on the second draft of questions
- c. FIPIS 2.0 – second version of proposed questions
- d. CPIN session for staff who frequently fill out FIPIS to share their experiences and comment on the 2nd draft of FIPIS questions.
- e. Strategize with Title VI and Office of Equity regarding introducing equity/impact related questions on the FIPIS (Novick's idea)
- f. Ask City Council members in person about their experiences with FIPIS and send an online survey to staff of elected's to ask about their experience.

APPENDICES

Coming up in 2013 for PIAC

- **Spring Evaluation of BAC process** – BAC group plans to hold a community debrief on the BAC process as well as conduct interviews with BAC staff to obtain feedback on implementation of the new BAC guidelines.
- **Summer of Advocacy** – meeting with bureau directors and City Council members to advocate for the recommendations we would like to put in our road map for the next 3-5 years.
- **PIAC's Five Year Anniversary – October 2013**
 - Report to City Council crafted by ASPIRE
 - *Here's what we heard:* Results from the baseline assessment
 - *Here's what we recommend:* Paint the “road map” for the next three or five years – what we would like to see accomplished in the City on public involvement – and the role we see PIAC, City Council and bureaus playing to achieve that.

Translation Policy (Accessible Version)

City of Portland Guide to Providing Translation

A. Policy: Provide timely and meaningful access to services for persons with limited English proficiency (LEP) in the language they are most comfortable communicating. LEP persons are persons that cannot speak, read, write or understand the English language at a level that permits

effective interaction with City staff. The policy and a definition of LEP persons should be distributed and posted widely, as should information about how to request translation services.

B. Analysis: An LEP program must be based on the needs of the community to be served and baseline of what languages are spoken by the LEP population. Each bureau should identify what documents are vital for the public to interact with the City. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) recommends the following “Four Factor” analysis to determine if translation of documents needs to be performed to ensure meaningful participation or understanding of the agencies programs.

1. The number or proportion of LEP persons served or encountered in the eligible service population (baseline);
2. The frequency with which LEP individuals come in contact with the program;
3. The nature and importance of the program, activity, or service provided by the program; and
4. The resources available to the recipient, and costs.

This baseline population analysis is a key step to determine what languages are most commonly used by LEP populations in the City and what translation services are necessary to ensure full access to City programs. and

C. Access: Each bureau should develop an assistance plan that provides meaningful access to services for LEP populations. The plan should include a description of how the bureau provides language assistance and notice, how it updates the plan, and how it trains staff to provide timely and reasonable language assistance.

The following recommendations should be considered minimum elements of a bureau’s program for translation services

1. Develop a list of vital documents that require translation as well as a set of criteria to determine what future documents will require translation. At a minimum, vital documents should include all documents that describe benefits, fees or penalties. Necessary pages on the bureau’s website should be identified for translation or use of Google Translate could be used as an interim step. (Note: Newly issued business cards could contain the City’s statement about access to translation.)

2. On all other web pages and publications, post a notice in the most common languages that translation services are available. For example: *The City of Portland is committed to providing meaningful access to the residents of Portland. **If you require translation services please contact XXXXX.***

3. **Develop a (bureau- or City-wide) database of City personnel with foreign language skills.** Post on the internal staff website and train staff how to use the reference. Provide instructions and billing numbers to staff who are asked to translate. Supplement with City-wide translation services provided by the translation contractor.

4. For in-person contact by LEP speakers, use a language chart (these should be located wherever the public has access to bureau staff) to help identify what languages an LEP person speaks. This tool can provide information to City staff when in-person translation is necessary.

5. For telephone calls, provide systematic translation services using staff, as available, or the City's translation service.

6. For meetings, establish a system for providing translation services using the City's translation contractor. Clearly notify the public about the availability of translation and plan for translation services for meetings that are expected to draw LEP speakers. Train staff on how to provide translation service. A minimum of two translators should be scheduled per language for meetings that exceed two hours.

7. Consider employing an email address that could be used by the public to gain information about services. Emails could be written in the native language of the sender and then translated once the email is received by the City of Portland, using the above methods or other translation options.

D. Safe Harbor Provisions: The DOJ has developed *safe harbor* provisions that can be used to demonstrate that an agency has met the translation obligations. Essentially, if an agency provides written translation of vital documents for each eligible LEP language group that constitutes 5 percent or 1000 persons, whichever is less, of the total population to be served, then such action will be considered strong evidence of compliance with the written translation obligations.

To use the *safe harbor* provisions, the bureaus would translate vital documents into the languages most commonly used in the City. The decision to use the *safe harbor* provisions should be documented and reviewed based on subsequent information about the LEP populations.

DRAFT LETTER FROM PIAC TO CITY COUNCIL, IN SUPPORT OF TITLE VI.

The City of Portland's Public Involvement Advisory Council (PIAC) serves as a key component of the City's public involvement team. Our members have expertise in public engagement and represent a wide variety of the communities in Portland. The PIAC works to improve the quality and consistency of public involvement across City government by creating clear guidelines for how Portland's City government engages the public on decisions and outcomes that impact their lives. Our efforts are critical to supporting the City in becoming a more truly representative, responsive, and accountable government. The Civil Rights Title VI program is vital in achieving these goals and we urge the City Council to adopt and implement the program.

The plan highlights how important public involvement is to providing services and programs equitably to the residents of Portland.

We strongly support the following tenants of the plan that support good public involvement and access to services:

- Ensuring that all persons are able to receive the benefits, services, and opportunities of City programs and investments without regard to their race, color, national origin, age, gender disability, economic status, or limited English proficiency, and working towards eliminating discrimination.
- Ensuring early and meaningful public involvement in City decision making processes.
- Requiring Bureau directors to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to be engaged and involved in the decision-making of the bureau and annually report the engagement of protected classes in community outreach and involvement.
- Developing a Citywide policy for outreach for persons with limited English proficiency (LEP).
- Providing annual reporting on the progress of the goals listed in the Title VI plan.

We are painfully aware that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed 49 years ago and the struggle for equity continues. The Title VI Plan alone cannot ensure equity, but together with the work of the PIAC, Human Rights Commission, Portland Commission on Disability, OEHR, and the Citywide Equity Committee (CEC), our commitment to improving the quality and consistency of public involvement is strengthened. The concept of equity and civil rights relies upon the ability for government to involve the communities that are affected by a proposal or decision. Therefore, public involvement is a critical ingredient in both equity and civil rights work. Civil rights is the union between equity and public involvement.

The members of the Public Involvement Advisory Council urge the Portland City Council to direct the Office of Management and Finance (OMF) to institute the Civil Rights Program and implement the Title VI plan and for all bureaus to work cooperatively with OMF in order for the City of Portland to fulfill its legal obligations

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Public Involvement Advisory Council