Public Involvement Task Force
Process Design recommendations
April 28, 2004 Meeting Minutes

Attendance:
Bryan Aptekar, Parks and Recreation; Laurel Butman, Office of Management and Finance; Christine Egan, Portland Development Commission; Jim Gladson, Bureau of Environmental Services; Brian Hoop, ONI; Steve Hoyt, Southeast Uplift; Arlene Kimura, East Portland Neighborhood Office; Julie Odell, PSU Center for Public Participation; Corinne Weber, Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc.

Discussion on Process Design issues

➢ Suggestion that some of the inter-bureau recommendations should be in a separate section.
➢ Laurel updated group on Mayor's Public Outreach Efficiency Group and reviewed any of their recommendations that might be related. Council is primarily interested in more coordination between bureaus on major projects. Public Information coordination role would need to be limited to a support role coordinating cross bureau projects.

Recommendation #21: Staff networking group

➢ Intent of having a regularly meeting network of city PI staff is its a useful tool for staff to communicate, share ideas, coordinate, and be more effective.
➢ Group agrees to take out the concept that it is informal.

Recommendation #22: Public information specialist

➢ Concern expressed if a PIO position should even be in a public involvement report.
➢ Discussion about role of the position. Needs to focus on coordination of cross-bureau public information activities, not developing message or being the spokesperson for specific bureau projects.
➢ Change title to Public Information Officer, not specialist. Include "city-wide" inter-bureau development…. Change "strategy" to "relations" in title.

Recommendation #23: Web-based contact management system

➢ Simplify title to "Create internal citywide web-based contact management system" instead of long title.
➢ Concern that many people/interested stakeholders do not want to end up on multiple lists and receive unwanted spam. Bureaus will be proprietary/ resistant to sharing their data. There need to be safeguards for privacy. We believe the technology is available so that all staff can view key contact information while blocking lists the individual is tagged to that might be unique to that bureau.

- This concept seems to make sense to everyone as its an inter-bureau project taking into the account of needs of all bureaus to better manage their lists and reduce printing and mailing costs.
- Talk to BTS about further details and possible fiscal impact.

Recommendation #24: Staff training on best practices and diversity

- Strong support for this.
- Discussion about what it would mean to partner with diverse community-based organizations. This means grassroots community leaders helping develop and/or provide the trainings.

Recommendation #25: Role of ONI and location in City organizational structure

- Group recognizes this has been a politically charged issue currently.
- Historical role of ONA/ONI has provided both internal and external support, serving both neighborhood groups and city bureaus.
- Neighbors concerned focus of ONI moving too much in the direction of service provision. Seems ONI and Council are losing commitment to supporting neighborhood system and citizen involvement and leadership training and support.
- Some recognize that moving the office to the Auditor's Office would still place it under an elected official's oversight whose leadership will change with future elections. So this proposal does not resolve immediate concerns of neighbors.

Recommendation #26: Coordinate efforts with City diversity committee.

- Group agrees to drop this recommendation since most have seen it as a low priority. Most agree that we don't need to mandate committees cooperating with each other. This will likely already happen since several public involvement staff are already involved.
- Suggestion that some of these action steps can be incorporated into one of the other Community/diversity section recommendations.

Discussion on 3 key Process Design Steps: #18, 19, and 20.

- Brian proposes merging these steps into one that would be incorporated into the top five "Governance/Culture" recommendations.
- Proposal is to directly link these action steps to City Code, chapter 3.96 – Responsibilities of City Agencies. Basically incorporate recommendation from last September of an ad-hoc group of PI Task Force members, staff, and GREAT/ONI Guidelines Committee members who addressed this language in code.
- Outlines that a committee will continue the inquiry of this effort and answer the following:
  - What types of activities shall require public involvement plans and outreach;

- ➢ Extent of resource allocation for public involvement based on "type" of project;
- ➢ Description of process components to be addressed in public involvement plans;
- ➢ Description of how public involvement policies and plans will be made accessible to the public and how you will evaluate their effectiveness.

- ➢ Current Code language has been contentious because it includes requirement that notice be given to neighborhood groups and public 30 days in advance of final action on any issues dealing with neighborhood livability. Citizens want it to be 45 days. Many staff do not think it is a realistic requirement. No criteria on how to define "neighborhood livability:"
- ➢ Other participants agree the current recommendations #18, 19, and 20 are vague and concerned Council will not understand our intent.
- ➢ Concern expressed about balance between how staff and citizens work together. Goes back to trust.
- ➢ PDC and BES are already making plans to move ahead on modeling our proposals and developing their own policies and best practices handbooks. Need to identify how we can work together.
- ➢ Concern that recommendation #19 doesn't acknowledge that staff do not control budgets and may not be able to implement Cadillac version of outreach if the annual budget does not provide enough funding.
- ➢ Group agrees to add concept that we need to allow adequate time to assess public involvement needs.