# Public Involvement Advisory Council (PIAC) Meeting Agenda & Notes

November 5, 2013

**Members Present:** Bill Beamer, Glenn Bridger, Mike Crebs, Donita Fry, Bill Gentile, Greg Greenway, Brian Hoop, Linda Nettekoven, Amy Spring, Marty Stockton, Mike Vander Veen, Christine White

**Members Absent:** Mohamed Abdiasis, Kelly Ball, Kyle Brown, Jaymee Cuti, Tim Hall, Muna Idow, Denver Igarta, Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, Paul Leistner, Carri Munn, Colleen Poole.

Guests: Shoshanah Oppenheim (Office of Management & Finance), Jonathan Fuentes

Staff: Greg Greenway

# Agenda

- A. Announcements & Business
  - 1. Announcements & Public Comment
  - 2. Approve June, September, October Meeting Notes
  - 3. Update on Budget Advisory Committee Group
- B. Discussion Items
  - 4. Integrating the Work of the Comprehensive Plan and ASPIRE Groups
  - 5. Review of Draft Comprehensive Plan
  - 6. PIAC Membership Recruitment and Selection
  - 7. Planning for the PIAC Annual Report
- C. Adjourn

#### **Notes**

#### A. Announcements & Business

#### 1. Announcements & Public Comment

Greg announced that he is honored to staff PIAC on an interim basis and is looking forward to helping ONI with the transition to a full time staff member for the Public Involvement Best Practices Program. There were no other announcements or public comment.

# 2. Approve June, September, October Meeting Notes

The meeting notes for June and September were approved unanimously. Members will review the October notes and approve them at the December meeting.

## 3. Update on Budget Advisory Committee Group

Brian reported that the budget group still has work to do. A scheduled meeting with BAC coordinators was postponed because of the Spirit of Portland Awards. That meeting will occur in the future to get feedback on implementation of the BAC guidelines. Brian also

had a meeting in the Budget Office. Andrew Scott, the bureau director, will come to PIAC in December to get the group's thoughts on public outreach for the City budget.

Following the update, the group discussed the challenge faced by staff across bureaus to implement requirements and recommendations related to public involvement and equity. Brian pointed out that staff members are often overwhelmed and that new requirements do not necessarily specify who is responsible for implementation. He expressed concern about PIAC's relevance if it continues to produce recommendations without also helping staff to meet new expectations. Glenn suggested, as someone who has served on BAC's for years, that there should be more uniform expectations of effectiveness across bureaus. Brian responded that the BAC guidelines are the first effort to try to standardize expectations and practices across bureaus. However, he said we need to think more about the differences in capacity across large and small bureaus. The Budget Office, for example, has very limited public involvement staff, and Andrew Scott is pushing back a bit on the requirements because it is a struggle to meet them. Mike V. said it is good that he is being honest about working within real constraints.

Brian said this raises the question of how to hold bureaus accountable? Shoshanah mentioned the Budget Equity Toll, which is in draft form and is supposed to help bureaus have more equitable outcomes. Brian asked whether the Office of Equity and Human Rights would welcome PIAC's feedback on the draft document. Shoshanah asked whether the Office should look at the BAC guidelines as they develop the draft.

Marty agreed that we should let the BAC guidelines play out this year, then start to evaluate their effectiveness. She seconded Andrew's concern about the tension between community expectations and staff capacity. She recommended a "tiered approach" based on bureau size and number of staff. Linda made a distinction between the behavior and capacity of individual bureaus, and the lack of experience with public involvement at the Budget Office itself (which we will discuss next month).

#### **B.** Discussion Items

# 4. Integrating the Work of the Comprehensive Plan and ASPIRE groups

Greg summarized common understandings that arose from the conversation at the October meeting:

- The analysis of the Baseline Assessment surveys can be presented separately from the ASPIRE recommendations, and published in the PIAC Annual Report;
- The ASPIRE recommendations are similar to the draft goals and policies recommended by the Comp Plan group;
- The time frame to wrap up the Comp Plan work (comments on the public draft in the January-March range) is similar to the time frame to release the Baseline Assessment analysis in the Annual Report;
- At that point, a new work group will be formed to focus on guidelines and tools to help bureaus implement public involvement best practices;

 Since a key recommendation of both ASPIRE and the Comp Plan groups is that all bureaus should have some sort of public involvement policy, the initial focus of that group will be the development of a template and/or guidelines for such a policy (or strategy/program/framework) that uses shared language and can be tailored to bureau size and capacity.

Brian indicated that ONI could be a test case for such a template. Marty reminded the group that in 2010 PIAC encouraged bureaus to develop public involvement pilot programs. Parks and BES had one, and Marty and her colleagues advocated for a public involvement manual at BPS. So, there are examples out there.

Glenn said that existing programs do not include bureaus that are driven by Capital Improvement Plans (CIP's). He suggested that this kind of organization is different from service oriented bureaus, and that we need a sample or template that works for each.

The group expressed general agreement with the idea that more regulations could be counterproductive, and that it is important to avoid "fatigue" among bureau directors over new public involvement and equity requirements. Shoshanah said that she is working with ONI staff to develop a training that links public involvement and Title VI requirements. Linda said we should have a toolkit or manual that helps bring all these requirements together if we are going to ask bureaus to have (or revisit) a public involvement policy or program. Marty said this resonates with her. It is fine to put pressure on bureaus but we also have to help them deliver. They need standard operating procedures, which is the approach taken by BPS. The key is to break the process into simple steps. Bill B. concurred, saying it is important to give guidance to managers in "accessible, bite size pieces" rather than just saying "do it."

Donita said this issue is complex because the City is complex, but that there is a different perspective from the community. From the community perspective (especially the Diversity and Civic Leadership perspective), there is one way to engage: by building relationships and having good channels for feedback. Sometimes "best practices" from the City standpoint may not be the best way to move forward with particular communities, and "best practices" that create new processes will not succeed without strong relationships. Title VI should improve staff capacity to move with the changing complexion of our city, and it is important to recognize that community organizations bring resources and ideas that could also be beneficial for the City. NAYA, for example, uses "practice-based evidence" that works for the community because it is grounded in cultural practices. The approach might be called "innovative" but it is really very old for native peoples.

Marty seconded the importance of relationships but said that it is a struggle for staff to spend the time necessary to develop them. Shoshanah said this is a question of how to make an institutional shift. Donita asked whether we have identified a goal for the City – the sweet spot of what is good community involvement. Mike said it is difficult because of all the differences across bureaus. Linda emphasized that solutions need to emerge from both directions – the role of the City is not just to bring things out to the community,

but also to create space for ideas to come from the community. She noted that the Parks bureau has a moratorium on community-generated parks programs.

Brian summarized some conclusions:

- We will not seek a requirement that all bureaus have a public involvement policy;
- There is a wealth of bureau examples of public involvement policies;
- There is a wealth of community-based resources related to best practices;
- Within the next few months we will start to organize a new committee to help bureaus understand and implement existing expectations around public involvement.

Final thoughts on the subjects of best practices, implementation and new requirements:

- Glenn: We should talk about how to "expand" (not "shift") ways to reach the public;
- Bill B.: Best practices are not static; we review them all the time;
- Chris: Implementation is the key; give individual advice to specific bureaus;
- Brian: Less focus next year on recommendations, more focus on evaluation of what we have learned and successful implementation;
- Mike: Agreed we should support City staff in meeting statutory requirements, not adding new requirements;
- Bill G.: This is a start. Bureaus will collapse if we give them a "mega program," so we need a beginning point to move forward;
- Amy: I like implementation, but in my role with this group it is hard to know what I
  can do to make a difference on implementation. How can PIAC have an impact?

Chris asked what will happen in the future with the Citizen Involvement Committee that the City established for the Comprehensive Plan. Marty said it is not determined and this is a good conversation to have.

# 5. Review of Draft Comprehensive Plan

The Comp Plan group continued to facilitate a conversation about the draft document. PIAC members reviewed and gave feedback on the draft goals and ongoing policies in chapter 1:

#### GOAL 1.A

Mike: Does "relationships and communication" constitute a partnership? Isn't "partnership" too strong to describe this relationship? A partnership is 50/50, meaning the community needs to be involved in the design of policies and process.

## GOAL 1.A and 1.B

Donita: Goals do not call out the reciprocal aspect of the relationship. What kind of relationship do we want? Goal 1.B says the City "seeks out" community input but not necessarily that it uses it. (Mike agreed – the City needs to do something.)

## GOAL 1.D

Mike: This goal helps to expand Goal 1.A

Glenn: This language has been changed. We dropped "satisfying."

Mike: Can people challenge the City on this? Marty: Yes, the Comp Plan can be appealed. There was some concern expressed that this draft language might not

survive initial review by attorneys.

#### GOAL 1.E

Amy: Delete "best practices" – it is superfluous.

#### GOAL 1.F

Donita: This should also recognize "treaty rights" as well.

Brian: Change "develop and support" to "develop and adequately fund."

## Policy 1.1

Chris: Why say "business associations" instead of "businesses"? It could read "businesses and neighborhood associations."

## Policy 1.2

Greg: Early involvement got the most attention in the Comp Plan Policy Expert Group's community survey.

## Policy 1.3.b

Mike: Is this enforceable? Will there be guidelines for how to give feedback?

#### Policy 1.3.c

Marty: The revised language includes the Community Involvement Committee.

#### Other comments:

Chris: There should be a place to address methodologies (how these goals and policies are achieved), to ensure that tools and methods stay modern and current.

Marty: You will see more of this in project specific policies.

Donita: How can we hold planners accountable on equity and antipoverty strategies? Marty: That might be found elsewhere in the Comp Plan.

The group agreed to discuss the last three ongoing policies (1.4, 1.5, 1.6) at the December meeting.

## 6. PIAC Membership Recruitment and Selection

Greg reviewed a handout that describes the current status of PIAC member terms. Sixteen members have terms that expire in 2014 or 2015. At the September meeting, the group voted to extend terms that expired in September 2013 by six months if the PIAC member is willing to serve for that time. Most members agreed to serve for at least six months. For the December meeting, Greg will put together a list of candidates to recommend for new, 3-year terms. That list will include current members who are

willing to serve another term, new members who are replacing representatives from their bureaus, and new applicants who are recommended by the Selection Committee. Amy and Mike V. agreed to serve as the Selection Committee for this round of recruitment and will review any applications received before the December meeting.

# 7. Planning for the PIAC Annual Report

The group agreed that staff would draft an Annual Report for PIAC members to review. It will include the Baseline Assessment report and will be scheduled for release sometime after the first of the year.

# C. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:05.