

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- These are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- This are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- These are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- These are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- These are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- ❑ Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- ❑ Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- ❑ Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- ❑ Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- ❑ Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- ❑ Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- ❑ Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- ❑ Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- ❑ Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- ❑ Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- ❑ Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- This are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- These are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- This are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- This are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- These are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- These are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- These are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- This are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- These are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

November 19, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Bryan Aptekar, Parks; Laurel Butman, OMF; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Doug Zenn, Zenn & Associates.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; Marjorie Brown, ESA; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Emile Combe, Latino Network (rep for Rey Espana.)

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for Sept. 24, 2003 mtg. Minutes approved for Oct. 22, 2003 mtg. with correction that JoAnn Bowman was at meeting.

## **Process Design Workgroup**

- Carlotta Collette outlines Process Design recommendations. Group did not come to agreement on a final step by step product. But found strong agreement on broad outline of key concepts.

### **Section One:**

- This are guidelines by which to direct a project into a public involvement process.
- Carlotta proposes changes in section 1. Need to mention "provide early notification". That has been a key citizen concern.
- Look to staff proposal, David Nemo/Jean Senechal proposal, to determine which types of projects would have to have written public involvement plans.
- Look to Warringah Council matrix as a model for determining level of resources to go into public involvement effort.

### **Section Two:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
  - Look to Metro as a model for developing plans for public involvement.

### **Section Three:**

- These are the guidelines by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- Workgroup did not find agreement on minimum notice before final action by Council or the City. This is an issue raised in the GREAT committee proposing updating of Code Chapter 3.96, ONI and neighborhood system. Will need to organize further dialogue between citizens and staff in winter. Just haven't had time this fall.

**Motion:**

- Tim moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Paul seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Concern this doesn't address services or administrative issues such as off-leash policy, liquor licenses, police exclusion zones, etc.
- Suggestion that any major policy, capital, or planning proposal would have to have support of a neighborhood association before being approved. City of Milwaukie, OR requires this.
- Notice before final action is meaningless if there hasn't been public involvement at early stages of a project.
- Discussion about how would we engage public in service issues that include stakeholder groups -i.e. low-income peoples or small businesses - that don't fit into neighborhood association framework.
- Staff have been clear including all administrative issues will not work.
- Concern staff proposal not as comprehensive as Warringah matrix which has clear outline of criteria for deciding which projects have citywide impact, are controversial, etc.
- Concern that we have not defined what is the continuation group. Suggestion that steering committee figure out PI Advisory Group, staff network, and GREAT/PI Taskforce are those groups.

**Amendments:**

- Emphasize the matrix model can be applied to issues that are not necessarily bricks and mortar. Follow outline of recommended language from Principles suggesting we need to include public works, public services, etc.
- Proposed language on page 2: "Process by which to provide early notification and to determine when and how to direct public polices, public works, public services, and other government actions into a public involvement or public information process. "

**Motion:**

- Approved Process Design recommendations with amendments recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. 14 in favor, no oppose.

## **Accountability and Transparency Workgroup**

- Jim Gladson provides overview of Accountability Workgroup recommendations. There were four topical areas: Codification, structural issues, corrective action, and evaluation.

### **Accountability Recommendations**

#### **1.) Codification**

- Ordinance: Recommendation to adopt by ordinance the principles, requirement for written public involvement policies, and written public involvement plans on major projects following guidelines.

## **2.) Structural**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Process design model (the Metro model), 2.) Creation of internal public involvement committee, 3.) Position descriptions for public involvement staff, 4.) Personnel reviews, 5.) Uniform backing for ordinances addressing public involvement, 6.) Discussion about review and role of ONI.

## **3.) Corrective Action**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Personnel actions following existing city HR rules, 2.) Role of Ombudsman, 3.) Campaign finance reform, 4.) long-term exploration to change Portland's form of government.

## **Transparency Recommendations**

- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Access to Public records, 2.) Advance notice of Council agendas and explanation of consent agenda items, 3.) Use of web technology, 4.) Customer service improvements, 5.) Project specific, 6.) City budget process education and training.

### **Motion:**

- Carlotta moves to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Sy seconds.

### **Discussion:**

- Discussion regarding who would be responsible for holding staff accountable and following through on corrective actions. Internal bureau management structure and existing personnel policies. The proposals are referring more to the typical role of an ombuds and/or advisory committee to shine the light and advocate for corrective action.
- Concern that 10 days advance notice for making Council agendas is not realistic for the many small contract issues council approve. Limit 10-day requirement to the big projects identified in the process design workgroups.
- Concern that web technology ideas miss out on all the people who do not have access to the internet. Communications Workgroup recommended need for creating digital divide policy. Group felt we need to capitalize on new technology. Over 70% of Portlanders already wired.
- Take out "complex" under Access to Public Records.
- Note that final note that bureaus should be expected to "alert" District Coalitions of potential actions affecting the neighborhoods...
- Steering committee needs to clarify which committees are responsible to continue working on these issues.

**Motion:**

- Motion approved to move recommendations forward for further review including friendly amendment to incorporate Brian's notes with minor revisions into the document. Doug Zenn seconds. 15 approves. No opposition.

**Diversity Workgroup**

- Brian Hoop provides overview of Diversity Workgroup recommendations.
- Recommendations include addressing: 1.) Establish stable funding mechanism, 2.) Leadership education and training for diverse constituency groups, 3.) Eliminate barriers for MWESB in contracting for PI/PI work with City, 4.) Standing public involvement advisory group, 5.) Staff training on culturally appropriate public involvement skills, 6.) Expand language interpretation and translation services, 7.) Make PI efforts accessible to people with disabilities and families with children, 8.) Coordinate relationship building and contact lists of diverse constituency groups, 9.) Coordinate efforts with Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee.

**Motion:**

- Jim motions to approve recommendations recognizing there is opportunity for review and input. Carlotta seconds.

**Discussion:**

- Discussion that many of these ideas call for the need of centralized support services. Bureaus might be more willing to provide childcare and provide interpretation services if there was a structure that made it easier to contract for these services.
- Small firms struggle to respond to City contracting opportunities. There is a need for simplifying and eliminating barriers for MWSEB to have access to City public involvement and information contracts.

**Motion:**

Motion approved. 11 approves. No opposition.

**Other items:**

- Update on meetings with commissioner's liaisons. Four completed. Brendan Finn (Saltzman's Office) broke his foot so had to postpone that meeting.
- Update on how the report will be put together. Have executive summary and show how ideas are mergers from different workgroups.
- Julie suggests proposal for how to continue conversation on how to restructure ONI. Proposal for PI taskforce, GREAT, and summit participants to work together to address this issue. Group feels Julie should pursue the topic but that the taskforce needs to focus on their tasks at hand.