

**Agenda for BIP #9: Public Involvement**  
**September 28<sup>th</sup>, 2005**  
**6:30-8:30 PM**  
**Location: Central NE Neighbors (CNN), 4415 NE 87th Ave**

**NOTE: [Meeting packet is available on the BIP #9 website, under "Background Materials"](#)**

- 1. Greetings/Introductions (10 min)**
- 2. Review/Approve Revised Goal Statement (10 min)**
- 3. Discuss/Approve Committee Ground Rules (10 min)**
- 4. Principles of Citizen Involvement (20 min)**
  1. Review and discuss Citizen Involvement Principles (BCP-ADM-4.02) adopted by Council in 1996
  2. Review and discuss Updated Principles proposed by Public Involvement Task Force in 2004
  3. Discuss provisional use of proposed principles to guide committee work and product development
- 5. Classification of Projects/Programs (50 min)**
  1. Discussion of classification framework
  2. Review examples of classification approaches
  3. Use case studies from recent experience?
  4. Brainstorm classification tool for Portland
- 6. Discuss Public Involvement for our process (15 min)**
  1. How Much?
  2. When?
  3. How?
- 7. Confirm Next Meeting (5 min)**

**BIP #9 – Public Involvement**  
**Draft Meeting Notes, September 28, 2005**

**Team Members Present:** Eileen Argentina, JoAnn Bowman, Brian Hoop, Lynne Coward, Gay Greger, Christine Egan, Romeo Sosa, Karen Withrow, Art Alexander, Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, Sandra LeFrancois, Gretchen Hollands, Rick Williams.

**Team Members Not Present:** Barbara Hart, Laurel Butman, Mary Jo Markle, Sue Dicile, Linda Hunter, Beth Kaye, Joan Saroka

**Staff:** Majja Spencer

**Guests:** Paul Leistner

**1. Introductions**

**2. Review of Goal Statement:** The team discussed the goal statement that was part of the meeting packet materials. The Team’s suggestions included:

Add	Delete	Change	Consider/Confirm
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agencies</li> <li>▪ We will create consistent standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bureaus – use City</li> <li>▪ “lacks consistent expectations”</li> <li>▪ first sentence entirely</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “public involvement project” &gt; “project where public involvement will be needed”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Adding broad definition of public involvement</li> <li>▪ Involving AND informing</li> <li>▪ “we lack” is the problem statement</li> <li>▪ Including “expectations” possibly “publicly shared expectations” - if measurable</li> <li>▪ Consistent wording (pick public involvement, community involvement, public engagement)</li> </ul>

**Based on feedback, co-chairs will complete a final goal statement.**

**3. Working Agreements:** The Team reviewed the handout for working agreements.

**The following changes were discussed and adopted:**

- Decision making: Maintain the stated goal of consensus but, if agreement of all members present is not possible, a 70% majority is required for a decision. To vote, one must be present and be a member of the committee. If a majority is reached, those in the minority opinion may submit a minority report.
- Housekeeping items to include:
  - The Team will appoint any sub-committees
  - Agendas should state when there will be key votes

**4. Principles of Citizen Involvement**

The Team discussed the adopted and proposed principles of citizen involvement. Adopted principles are those which were adopted by the Portland City Council in 1996. The proposed principles are a product developed by past public involvement task force, but never formally adopted. The goal of presenting both sets of principles to the group was to provide a guide to keep the group focused. As we move forward, we can ask “do our decisions reflect these principles?”

Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, Mayor’s office, stressed that the past work of the public involvement task force IS being used. BIP #9 came out of that body of work – the sense was that scope of the previous task force was too big to accomplish. We need to start with a defined, concise mission. This group may end up making a recommendation for a new project to be worked on next year. The Mayor’s Office felt it was not manageable or doable to take on all 30 recommendations from the past task force. BIP #9 is doable, meaning that this group can be successful and form a foundation for future work. Brian Hoop volunteered to communicate to the email/ mailing list from past task force that only part of their work will be considered now but other portions may be included in future work.

It was noted that the Team would come back to a discussion of the principles. In general, people like the proposed document but would like to consider additional changes which may become clearer as the work of this team proceeds.

**There was consensus that the Team can live with these principles documents as they stand for the present and come back to them later to make needed changes.**

## **5. Classification of projects**

Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong led off a discussion of how to classify projects. She noted there are different ways to classify projects and how much public involvement occurs. Example: The City doesn't consult on changing light bulbs, but would if a major change to Waterfront Park was being considered.

It would be useful to determine criteria that is quantifiable – how do we classify projects? Some suggestions might be:

- What can the public expect from each decision made?
- What is the accountability mechanism?
- Who needs to be engaged and for how long?
- How do we make sure the right folks are being included in a diverse way?

The Team started with a discussion of what types of projects should be classified. The question was posed of if there is an example of public expectations not being met. The example of the Mt. Tabor reservoirs was raised. In that case, the public expected to have been involved at a greater level.

An example from Metro to note differences in projects was shared. They use an annual process to allocate federal transportation money. It is the same process every year – different amounts/different communities, but overall fairly predictable. This is a significantly different process than a discussion about whether or not to expand the urban growth boundary. The first case is a repeating process where the public involved is familiar with a predictable process. The second case involves a process that has a huge impact and is very unusual – very different scope, affects entire community, rather unusual process. Public participation associated with both would be different. Some processes need longer public processes than others.

It was noted also that projects that cost a lot of money, have a big impact, or affect values can be big issues to the public even though staff may think they are routine (example: leaf pick-up, pesticide spraying in parks.)

The Portland Development Commission classifies projects into three major areas in their adopted policy:

1. Major policy decision (has be adopted by board)
2. Project plan, such as a development study focused on a particular area
3. Strategies and Programs (storefront grants, home repair)

This classification system is not perfect and they still found there were loopholes where they had to add in optional areas for things that fell through the cracks.

Some noted that there are judgment calls that enter into this – different people might classify projects different ways. Team leads suggested the Team assume there are many projects that can be easily classified to help ensure that, across-the-board, bureaus provide a similar experience for the public.

The PDC matrix was explained further. It borrowed from Warringah & IAP2. The Warringah matrix was also reviewed. It was noted that the matrices seem capable of addressing the consistent standards part of the Team's goal. For the City, the Team may need to create different thresholds. Examples raised which might would require significant public involvement included: budget issues; issues that generate a lot of public phone calls/emails; and hot button issues.

**For the next meeting that team members bring suggestions of what categories different criteria would fit into.**

**Full versions of the Warringah and PDC reports (and any other examples available) will be posted on the website and sent out to Team members.**

**6. Discuss public involvement for our process:** The Team brainstormed the following methods for involving more people in this process:

- "Road show" presenting draft documents to different interest groups
- Use a survey on the Team's website
- Develop a work plan for ourselves
- Utilize Community Visioning process being done by Mayor's Office (BIP #1)
- Information table soliciting feedback at events we host
- Talk to the Metro citizen involvement committee
- Try to coordinate with other processes
- Use the email/ mailing list from past public involvement task force
- Remember to provide context to public before asking questions
- Take into account different expectations for different levels of involvement depending on the stakeholders
- Need to tie into BIP Teams 1 & 8 which are working on similar issues
- Brainstorm other stakeholder groups beyond who we reach
- Communicate in other languages

**Co-chairs will develop a draft work plan for review at the next meeting.**

**7. Next Meeting:**

**October 26, 2005  
6:30-8:30 PM  
Oregon Action  
Alberta Simmons Plaza  
6601 NE MLK (cross street–Dekum)**