

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

January 7, 2014

Members Present: Claire Adamsick, Kelly Ball, Mike Crebs, Donita Fry, Bill Gentile, Greg Greenway, Tim Hall, Brian Hoop, Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, Paul Leistner, Linda Nettekoven, Shoshanah Oppenheim, Marty Stockton, Mike Vander Veen.

Members Absent: Mohamed Abdiasis, Bill Beamer, Glenn Bridger, Muna Idow, Denver Igarta, Carri Munn, Colleen Poole, Amy Spring, Christine White

Guests: Steve Pixley (Parks & Rec)

Staff: Greg Greenway

Agenda

- A. Announcements & Business
 - 1. Announcements & Public Comment
 - 2. Approve December Meeting Notes
 - 3. Update on Hiring Process
 - 4. Update on Comprehensive Plan
- B. Discussion Items
 - 5. PIAC Annual Report
 - 6. PIAC Membership
 - 7. PIAC Work Plan 2014
- C. Adjourn

Notes

A. Announcements & Business

1. Announcements & Public Comment

Parks & Recreation is hiring for an outreach position, focusing particularly on communities of color and immigrant and refugee communities. They have over 350 resumes. Elizabeth asked if anyone could help review resumes or serve on an interview panel; Tim and Shoshanah volunteered.

Shoshanah announced that the Office of Management & Finance is hiring an ADA process specialist.

Tim announced that the Water Bureau sold the Water House.

Shoshanah announced two trainings: a session on public involvement and the Williams Bikeway project on January 17, and a public involvement training on February 6. Shoshanah said she would distribute details by email after the meeting.

Bill announced that Elders in Action Commission is looking for volunteers. Bill can put interested people in touch with the volunteer coordinator.

Elizabeth announced a Parks & Rec budget discussion scheduled for January 8. She shared with the group that she will transition off PIAC and be replaced by Steve Pixley. She expressed her satisfaction with having served on PIAC and will still be available to engage with PIAC's work as appropriate, although not as a member of PIAC.

There was no public comment.

2. Approve December Meeting Notes

The meeting notes for December were approved with one abstention (Bill).

3. Update on Hiring Process

Brian said that the job announcement for Public Involvement Best Practices Program Specialist will be posted on January 13. He expects the hiring process to continue through March, with a new person on board in April.

4. Update on Comprehensive Plan

Marty reviewed the process for the Comprehensive Plan. She incorporated PIAC member comments from the last two meetings into the draft. She still intends to review Shoshanah's comments related to Title VI. Marty will send her draft to management in February and will come back to PIAC in 2-3 months after receiving their comments (those comments may come from bureaus beyond Planning & Sustainability). She praised the extensive involvement in developing the draft so far. The proposed draft will be available for public review in the May-July timeframe. There will be at least six weeks for the public to review the draft before the public hearing.

B. Discussion Items

5. PIAC Annual Report

Greg presented the draft Annual Report and explained that he appended the Baseline Assessment report to the document. He said he separated most of the recommendations from the summary and analysis of the survey data, following PIAC direction from previous meetings to carry the recommendations forward in a new workgroup for 2014 but not in PIAC's Annual Report.

Brian pointed out that the full PIAC had not adopted the recommendations in the ASPIRE report, leaving open the question of which recommendations, if any, to include in the Annual Report.

Elizabeth: The intent of ASPIRE was to use its report to indicate where the City is now. The baseline of where we should be is represented by the 20 foundational practices identified in the report. The recommendation was that bureaus should display at least some of these practices within two years, by order of the mayor.

Mike V.: The larger group conversation had moved to thinking about a pilot project with one or more bureaus, but that if we lost something from the ASPIRE report we should honor it.

Elizabeth: The ASPIRE group's work was originally intended as advocacy for a manual, which didn't come together within the group but which has returned by a different path.

Mike V.: The manual can't be "one size fits all."

Linda: We started with the bureau pilot idea originally.

Paul: The appended ASPIRE report is confusing because it's not a report from the full PIAC; it is an ASPIRE report to PIAC. Both the ASPIRE report and the Comp Plan group point to two lines of work: bureau policies (ongoing public involvement) and a practices manual (project based implementation of public involvement). Any recommendations in the Annual Report should come from all groups.

Elizabeth: Does this come across as the recommendation of the full PIAC even though the ASPIRE report is appended?

Paul: We need to put forth a coherent vision.

Kelly: When we provide the analysis of the baseline survey, it would be natural for City Council to ask about our recommendations. If we don't state those recommendations in the Annual Report, we should share our next steps with Council.

Elizabeth answered a question about bureau participation in the survey, saying all bureaus filled them out. She reiterated that that ASPIRE's recommendations are minimum qualitative expectations of bureaus. She said the baseline that has been established in practice is pretty low, and that we need to move the bar to a level that is both higher and achievable.

Brian: One option is to list ASPIRE's 20 recommendations in the appendix and say PIAC did not adopt them. He supported the approach suggested by Kelly and Paul (talk about next steps) and said ONI can serve as a model.

Shoshanah: We want bureaus to apply any model in a way that fits their purpose and practice, and she pointed out that we have existing City principles around public involvement. Do we need a new policy?

Marty: Differences across bureaus exist because some are required by State law to have public involvement policies. She also said PIAC has given reports and described next steps to Council in the past. She said we should check to see if we have done what we said we would do in the past. In 2010, for example, Council adopted the Principles and gave direction to do the baseline assessment and have some bureaus pilot public involvement policies. Some bureaus (like Planning & Sustainability) were responsive to this Council direction even though those policies might not have been daylighted.

Mike V. asked if the BPS policy was an outcome of the Principles. Marty said yes, and that the policy is legally defensible through “findings.”

Shoshanah: It is already the policy of the City to follow the Principles.

Elizabeth: ASPIRE’s recommended 20 practices came from the Principles. She said you can’t just tell bureaus to implement the Principles based on their wide range of current practices. We need to take steps to get there.

Marty: It can be a matter of semantics. At BPS there is an internal guidebook and a manual.

Paul: This is the difference between ongoing and project specific involvement.

Marty: There needs to be a “strategy” or “plan” to implement City policy.

Paul: Agree that we will not use the term “policy.” There appeared to be general agreement around use of the term “strategy” (so PIAC’s workgroup would focus on bureau public involvement strategies, using one or more pilot bureau).

Kelly: I’ve been hearing about a manual since I’ve been on PIAC. Let’s make one or get one.

Marty: That’s what BPS did internally. Parks had something like one. Let’s pull together what’s good citywide and use what’s appropriate.

Elizabeth asked if this was the final version of the ASPIRE report and she suggested that there was another version along with the survey results themselves. She said the ASPIRE group had lost momentum at some point and suggested that the full PIAC might like to look at the longer version of the ASPIRE report.

Paul: Because it was the work of a committee rather than the full PIAC, the ASPIRE report should remain in the Annual Report as an attachment.

Kelly: Any recommendations in the Annual Report should be adopted by the full PIAC through normal processes. We need to be clear with City Council about what PIAC has adopted and is recommending. Rather than alluding to recommendations that are not stated in the Annual Report, it would be better to describe the next steps we are taking toward making recommendations.

Shoshanah: There was a lot of work that went into Title VI that should be included in the report. Should we wait to complete this until the new staff person starts?

Paul: That would be too long. We should present our goals for the next 12 months.

Marty: It has been a long time since our last report and we can spend some more time on it. We should add some information about the questions asked in the baseline assessment.

6. PIAC Membership

Greg reported on recruitment efforts and asked for suggestions from PIAC members.

Marty said her bureau had 150 applications for the Comprehensive Plan Community Involvement Committee (CIC). She asked Greg for some boilerplate language to encourage those applicants who weren't selected for the CIC to apply for PIAC.

Brian: We reached out to the Diversity and Civic Leadership partners.

Shoshanah: Portland African American Leadership Forum.

Mike V.: It would be good for PIAC to require interpretation at our meetings.

Tim: There is an International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) board meeting this week.

Linda: What about small business? Venture Portland.

Marty: Tony Fuentes is the Milagros owner in northeast. He is the coordinator of VOIS – Voice for Oregon Innovations & Sustainability.

Kelly: We need a selection committee.

Marty: We could do a big email blast with links to PIAC info and application.

7. PIAC Work Plan 2014

Greg summarized the discussion at the December PIAC meeting, suggesting that two work groups seemed to emerge (bureau public involvement strategies and a public involvement manual focused initially on bureaus governed by the Comprehensive Plan) along with several candidates for other work groups.

Mike V.: The Comp Plan group is a new and discrete step, not a continuation of the same group as before.

Paul: I like the two groups and new effort like Mike says. The baseline assessment relates to the bureau strategy work. Energy is the key.

Brian summarized the major topic areas that came out of PIAC's last strategic planning process and group discussions over the past year:

- Bureau public involvement strategies

- Public involvement practices manual
- Digital engagement
- Boards and Commissions (standardized process, guidelines and practices)
- Budget (evaluate use of BAC guidelines and tools to support staff)
- FIPIS (evaluate effectiveness and issues, suggest changes as needed)
- Notification (existing and recommended policies and practices)

Members of PIAC took turns talking about their level of interest in various topics.

Mike V.: FIPIS and BAC's (staff self evaluation and PIAC support of staff).

Kelly: Manual and evaluation of BAC's (if we evaluate the functioning of the BAC guidelines, we need to give support to staff in carrying them out).

Shoshanah: All the topics.

Marty: Manual. This list is heavy on recommendations.

Linda: Manual and support for BAC's. I can follow up with participants she recruited. Regarding the DCL partners, is there a more strategic way to recruit BAC members?

Tim: BAC's and FIPIS. Bureau evaluation of their BAC's to see how the guidelines work. One person we recruited from an "underrepresented" community has dropped out. FIPIS – how is City Council using it? Do they use it? Do they find value in it? Can we quantify its effectiveness?

Paul: Manual, bureau strategies, FIPIS and Notification. Manual – there have been so many over the years; we could pull them together. FIPIS – it is responsible to follow up. The form should evolve and incorporate Title VI. Notification is my pet issue.

Mike C.: Engaging PIAC's help in the Police Bureau's work and BAC's. Mike explained the Police Bureau's work with the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) to create a community oversight board and develop an outreach and engagement plan to implement an agreement between DOJ and the City. There are multiple stakeholders and strict deadlines. He asked how a bureau can reach out to get PIAC's help with this kind of project. Can PIAC help develop a product for a single bureau? Regarding BAC's, he asked whether City Council is listening when BAC's speak to them. Is the time of volunteers valued?

Paul: That would be a great test case with PIAC as sort of a consultant. This could help PIAC work on issues related to the manual. It would be good for PIAC to track this process and have regular updates from Mike. More controversy means the process needs to be that much better.

Brian: BAC's and Boards & Commissions. We have been planning to convene bureau staff who work with these.

Mike V.: Like the Comp Plan/manual group, any budget group should be a new, discrete group.

Claire: FIPIS, notification and digital engagement. FIPIS – what kind of access do community members have? Notification and digital engagement could be related topics. I have lots of questions about how bureaus function. For the strategy group, it's good to follow up on what has already been done.

Bill: BAC's, bureau case study (like Mike C. suggested), manual, notification. BAC's – we need to wrap up that process. Notification is always a big issue.

Steve: Consulting role applied to a bureau (like Mike C. suggested), digital engagement, bureau strategies.

Elizabeth offered some advice and reflections upon leaving PIAC: Be strategic. Show how we are building a body of knowledge and practice, not just doing disparate things. Once we've made something, determine if it is working. Play the role of a consultant – how can you use a given tool or resource? The manual would do help do this. With an assessment we know where we're at, so now where do we go?

Kelly: Budget priorities are a big issue now. What is the nexus with our group?

C. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:00.