



Community Involvement Committee

July 29, 2009

Committee Members Present: Paula Amato, Liz Gatti, Anyeley Hallova, Brian Heron, Jason Long, Linda Nettekoven, Lai-Lani Ovalles, Stanley Penkin, Rahul Rastogi, Howard Shapiro, Angie Thompson, Jon Turino

Absent: Judy BlueHorse Skelton, Amy Cortese, Judith Gonzalez Plascencia, Shirley Nacoste, Ryan Schera, Alison Stoll

Staff (BPS): Tom Armstrong, Eric Engstrom, Deborah Stein, Kim White, Matt Wickstrom, Joe Zehnder

Guests (on agenda): Mayor Sam Adams

Visitors: Emerald Bogue (Mayor's Ofc./BPS), David Brandt, Megan Ponder (Mayor's Ofc.), Barry Joe Stull

Agenda

- Welcome
- Remarks from the Mayor
- Announcements & updates
- Subcommittee report: charter
- The Portland Plan overview
- Desired outcomes exercise
- Subcommittees needed
- Public comments
- Next steps

Welcome – Howard Shapiro

Howard opened the meeting with a brief welcome. In his introduction of Mayor Adams he mentioned that the Community Involvement Committee's best work will come about by addressing both the substance and the process of the Portland Plan. His hope is that this committee's outreach work will serve as a best practice for future public engagement processes.

Remarks from the Mayor

Mayor Adams began his remarks by asking how many in the room use Facebook and Twitter (fewer than half). He noted that 87% of 16-24-year-olds have cell phones. Communication tools are changing, and the challenge for Portland Plan outreach is to try new things; use these new tools. He wants the committee to consider all the ways that we can spark interest with everyone who lives in, works in, or visits Portland. This means that our outreach efforts need to make getting involved seem easy, worthwhile, and fun. People need to see what's in it for them, and we need to meet them where they are at.

Howard wanted to take this opportunity to publicly voice the Committee's desire, and his promise to the members, that they be heard by the Planning Commission and City Council. The Mayor concurred and went on to suggest that City staff will be presenting ideas/concepts that are different than they might be expecting at this point, and he encouraged the group to begin to think differently. He mentioned that with the last citywide planning process (1980), neighborhood associations were developed and were seen as cutting edge. He challenged the committee to think about what this group

could come up with that would be seen as cutting edge by the next generation. He wants future Portlanders to look back at this process and say, “Wow.”

Q: Will expectation management be part of the process given that, realistically, (1) not every Portlander will be able to or willing to participate, and (2) City staff, BPS in particular, is working with reduced resources given current City budget constraints.

A: Sam acknowledged the constraints and said that we would need to be strategic about efficient and inexpensive ways to communicate. He went on to say that there’s no more important project in the City right now than planning for the next 25 years, and that we should work to find at least 3 cost-effective ways that every person can be involved.

Q: Can Mayor Adam’s office help the Committee make sure that families and schools are involved in the outreach process? Can his office provide contacts, if needed?

A: Yes. He said that previous best practices point to the effectiveness of reaching out to schools. He specifically cited Portland’s recycling rates, and pointed out that the initial outreach for this effort was through elementary schools. Students then educated and prodded their parents to recycle at home, making the program a success.

Mayor Adams closed by explaining that the Portland Plan is intended to involve all layers of government and agencies throughout Portland. He wants the Strategic Plan to serve the entire City, not just City Government. He explained that our current Comprehensive Plan addresses only City government, and does not involve the County, Schools, the Port, etc. He believes that the way forward for the City is through better alignment with and efficient use of all City services and agencies. Outreach efforts by the Committee should not be limited to issues of City government, but should instead address all of the City’s issues. Make the process meaningful for all of Portland.

Announcements & updates – All

- Howard asked that all in the room introduce themselves, noting that our newest member, Alison Stoll, was not able to make the meeting. *[kw – she had a conflict for this meeting, but there was also a concern raised at the meeting that we had an incorrect email for her. We now have her correct contact info.]*

One member expressed concern that there was no one on the committee who seemed to represent Portland’s art community. Howard mentioned that he believes his résumé allows him to provide that representation and offered to meet with any members to discuss his background. There was also an assumption that others on the committee may have similar background and experiences and may be able to collectively represent the art community’s interests.

A suggestion was also made that we consider adding a young person to the committee. Deborah Stein (BPS) responded that the bureau has a youth planning program and staff will be actively working with them throughout the Portland Plan process during outreach and other activities.

- Deborah reviewed the agenda.
- The group approved the minutes from the July 8, 2009, meeting.
- Howard used the City’s *Streetcar System Concept Plan* to point out how City projects can and will inform the Portland Plan and stressed how important he believes it is for the CIC to know of the various plans, concepts, and activities being proposed by various City agencies.

He also noted that at last night's Planning Commission meeting there was a presentation about the connection between School and Park properties. These two examples led to a general discussion about how the committee could learn of these projects and plans in a timely manner. A suggestion was made that rather than take up CIC meeting time with presentations, that BPS staff organize brownbags or similar sessions on a consistent basis to allow non-BPS City staff to provide one or more updates about their project. It was also stressed that these updates should focus on the outreach/communication part of their process. Suggestions for updates included: streetcar, schools/parks, and lightrail.

Staff will look into creating a brownbag schedule, and Kim White (BPS) will start building a list of agencies and projects to provide to the CIC so that they can track projects and/or sign up for email updates and announcements. BPS staff plans to soon make available a calendar/timeline of various City projects that may inform or affect the Portland Plan, as well as a chart or graphic display of the connections between them – a project “family tree” of sorts.

Subcommittee report: Charter – All

- The group's discussion of the Charter primarily focused on whether there should be more or less specificity in the Purpose section, particularly in the second paragraph. Several members believed that since ONI was mentioned maybe others should also receive mention, such as amending the first sentence of the 2nd paragraph to read “...Office of Neighborhood Involvement, business associations, and others.” Other members were comfortable with the language as it is, explaining that it seemed better to keep this section broad and leave specificity to the Committee Responsibility section. The point was also made that the reference to ONI implies that they will be advising and interacting with the committee, whereas other organizations or agencies won't have that explicit role. ONI staff includes experts that can provide advice on best practices to reach not only neighborhood associations but the community at large. It was decided that Deborah Stein would draft some language, amending and further defining ONI's role to clarify that we would be tapping their expertise. Deborah will send the new language to the committee for their review before the Sept 2 meeting.
- There was a short discussion on whether it would be helpful to mention “best use of funds” or somehow document that the committee wants to work to make the most efficient use of the resources available through BPS. Howard commented that this particular charge is important but is more implicit than explicit and, for that reason, he recommended leaving this type of language out of the document.
- Finally there was a request for BPS staff to look into whether the committee needs to adhere to the words or the spirit of the Public Involvement Plan that was adopted last year as the Portland Plan was being introduced.

There was group support of the charter once the ONI reference has been modified and accepted by the group.

The Portland Plan Overview – Joe Zehnder (Chief Planner, BPS)

Joe provided an overview of the Committee's work over the next 6-12 months. He explained that the Portland Plan is a 3-year project with a number of phases, and that we will be introducing it in a public way this fall. He added that it will be a challenge to come up with best practices that quickly.

He described the Portland Plan as a 25-year, long-range plan that looks at City policies, investments and actions to ensure that Portland stays a thriving and sustainable city, one that is: prosperous for residents and businesses; healthy for people and natural systems; and rich in opportunity. Metro

predicts that we will grow by 110,000 – 140,000 households by 2035. We have the capacity to accommodate them, but the details of how we do that is the challenge. Joe sees the Portland Plan being composed of 2 primary components:

First, the State mandates that we update the following sections of the City’s Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan):

1. growth – where, what kind, how
2. transportation
3. economic development
4. housing
5. public facilities

City staff is proposing that we also update these Comp Plan sections:

7. environment
8. public involvement

The second component is to create a set of indicators – a set of objective measures to track our progress over the life of the plan. Constructing and selecting these indicators will be part of the process.

Both of these components start with a Concept Plan – high-level planning direction that has input and shaping from the community. It provides a general sense of how all 7 elements of the Comp Plan listed above are connected (e.g., the notion of a 20-minute neighborhood encompasses schools, parks, etc.)

One year from now BPS wants to present a draft of the Concept Plan to the Planning Commission for their consideration. Between now and then, we anticipate two rounds of public engagement and a final round for presenting the draft Concept Plan.

1. Setting goals & objectives of Concept Plan – ground community in conditions and trends and then get input on direction we should go; what we want to accomplish. Also talk about concepts like 20-minute neighborhoods. In this phase education takes place and information flows out. [October/November 2009]

2. Scenario-building – take info from 1st round and use maps and other tools to let the community begin to see the impact of their choices on the City. In this phase, we take information in. [Jan-Feb, 2010]

[Between phases 2 and 3 we will synthesize and summarize what we’ve learned and then report back to the public to get their input. This will be accomplished through open houses, presentations to neighborhood associations and others, as well as outreach to those people and groups that are not geographically based.]

3. Present the draft Concept Plan in public briefings/hearings to the Planning Commission. In this phase, we focus on presentation of the draft. [June-July 2010]

The Concept Plan will then be used to inform the more detailed work we must do to update the Comp Plan.

Joe hopes that the CIC will help us in learning how to communicate with “everyone” in a way that they can understand and engage with the work. The CIC should ensure that staff is keeping our

promise with outreach. Howard added that the CIC needs to put a face and a voice on the project that speaks to the community in a way that planners cannot always do.

One member stressed how important it is for the CIC to get a timeline very soon. Also needed as soon as possible is the “family tree” of connections between various City projects would be important to inform the committee’s work.

Joe mentioned that staff is working on a calendar of projects and timelines and that we would be able to get this out in the next few weeks. He cautioned the group that the first outreach event will seem like it’s coming too soon. It always does.

Q: Is the first phase all about policy? What communication approach will it take – maps or other?

A: Phase 1 is not just about physical development but includes concepts, too. Maps can be used in some cases, but not all. And some read and understand maps, but others don’t. A variety of approaches will have to be taken.

Q: Will the Concept Plan or later steps highlight areas/places of disagreement? We will need room for detailed conversations about these issues.

A: Absolutely. The Concept Plan will list areas of consensus and will also point to areas needing detailed discussion.

One member conveyed to staff and members two lessons learned from last summer’s leadership summit:

1. A lot of momentum was lost by having the Portland Plan stall after the summit. Even at the summit there were missed opportunities to engage City leaders in more dialogue.
2. She expressed concern about messaging, using the “20-minute neighborhood” as an example. She hears community members saying that they don’t define their neighborhood geographically, so if that’s the first message or concept that we present, it may discourage some people from getting involved in the process.

Joe responded that staff will be looking to and relying on the CIC to help us with our messaging.

Q: Is there money in BPS budget for outreach consultants?

A: Money we were hoping to have has been subsumed by demands on the budget for other projects and staff, so we have a much smaller pot of money than originally hoped.

Desired outcomes exercise – Deborah Stein

Deborah led a discussion on the Desired Outcomes for the public rollout of the Portland Plan. Staff’s list of desired outcomes are on pg. 1 of the handout; this discussion was to have the CIC consider their desired outcomes (pg. 2 of the handout). Several members had already contributed ideas and those were incorporated into the draft that was discussed.

The following points/topics were raised during the discussion:

- The first bullet – evaluation/tracking – represents the desire to get feedback regarding comments. The CIC wants to know that their info and input is valued; that “we are being heard.”
- Momentum builds throughout the process; need tangible reminders of inspiration – through arts, multicultural events, etc.

- Need to create a multi-sensory connection by the community with the plan.
- Need mechanisms in place w/press & media to encourage public involvement; to keep it on everyone's mind. We can't afford to lose momentum like we did last year after the summit. We need consistent media coverage.
- Define priorities for neighborhoods and groups so that expectations are clear.
- Although one bullet reads "Key areas of controversy are identified and addressed through the process" some will want consensus before the process ends, not just to identify areas of controversy.
- An additional bullet item was suggested for pg 2:
All parties involved acknowledge that different groups, communities, and individuals communicate in different ways and customs, and frequently have available different times and methods in which they can meet. Following that, parties involved accommodate the different styles of, and abilities for, interaction, and work with the public to adapt outreach and workshops accordingly.

A modifying statement was suggested for the last bullet on pg 1 – the "staff side" of the document: *Participants (including political leadership and bureau colleagues) have realistic expectations about process and outcomes, given budget and other constraints.* It was suggested that language be added to this bullet item to imply that this should not limit brainstorming or valuable input.

Howard suggested adding a few bullets referencing the following:

- That the CIC is being heard, especially at Planning Commission
- Indicate that there is a shared hope that committee members will grow individually through the collaborative process.

Subcommittees – Howard and Deborah

Howard and Deborah have identified four subcommittees that are currently needed to work on CIC projects:

- **Executive** – provide general support to chair as needed
- **Communications** – serve as advisors to staff to develop and tell the Portland Plan story
- **Workshop** – assist staff team in designing fall/winter public workshops
- **Outreach** – work with CIC & staff to ensure comprehensive outreach; brainstorm techniques

Here's a list of CIC members that have volunteered to serve on the committees, either at the meeting or soon after:

- **Executive** – Liz Gatti, Brian Heron, Stan Penkin, Rahul Rastogi, Howard Shapiro
- **Communications** – Anyeley Hallova, Linda Nettekoven, Howard Shapiro, Jon Turino
- **Workshop** – Paula Amato, Liz Gatti, Linda Nettekoven, Rahul Rastogi, Stan Penkin (interested in secondary role: Brian Heron, Jason Long, Angie Thompson)
- **Outreach** - Liz Gatti, Jason Long, Linda Nettekoven, Lai-Lani Ovalles, Angie Thompson

Q. How often is it likely that the full CIC and subcommittees will meet?

A. The CIC was originally envisioned as meeting at least quarterly, but members could decide that the Committee should meet more often; or the CIC could decide that subcommittees should do much of the work and the full CIC could serve to approve that work.

Highlights of the discussion concerning the CIC and subcommittees:

- The CIC schedule could adjust their schedule to be able to provide timely and relevant feedback to the Planning Commission. Projects such as the Streetcar System Concept Plan will inform the Portland Plan, and the CIC may want to provide feedback on the public involvement process of those projects.
- Subcommittees could do more ad hoc/nimble work.
- Subcommittees could set up Google or Yahoo groups to create opportunities for on-line meetings.
- Let's think about meeting frequency and discuss at our next meeting.
- Anyeley will send the CIC a form designed to let members indicate outreach networks/contacts. This can be compiled to show capacity and gaps.
- Q. Where do subcommittees fall under the public meeting law? A. Staff will check into this and report back at our Sept 2 meeting.

The conversation then broadened to one about outreach efforts in general:

Q. Is there any money for outside facilitators?

A. A little, but not very much.

Several CIC members were involved with the East Portland Action Plan (EPAP) process and want to incorporate some of the effective approaches from that planning process into staff's work on the Portland Plan. It was pointed out that although there were a lot of ideas brought forward throughout the EPAP process, "nothing was lost" and in the end the group was still able to establish priorities. It was suggested that staff share more about work on the EPAP so that committee members could learn from that process.

Public Comments – David Brandt; Barry Joe Stull

Two members of the public joined our meeting and provided comments:

- David Brandt expressed a desire for the Committee to ensure that input from the community is always reflected back; "close that loop." He also pointed out that the Committee has a unique scope – an opportunity to build a public engagement process that will carry into the future.
- Barry Joe Stull conveyed to the committee that he attended the meeting to present the "interests of the poor." He shared his desire that medical marijuana laws be protected and expanded; reminded the committee that MAX runs 50% on coal, so be careful about our energy-efficiency assumptions; and conveyed his concern to the group that "nature cannot advocate for itself" so we must be remember this in the face of pressure by special interests.

Next Steps

- Staff liaisons will be assigned to each of the 4 subcommittees. *[Now done: Kim White, Executive; Eden Dabbs, Communications; Tom Armstrong, Workshop Design; Debbie Bischoff, Outreach.]*
- Meet as full committee on Wednesday, Sept 2, 8:30-10:30 a.m., Rm. **2500B**.

Desired outcomes for the public “rollout” of the Portland Plan

In June 2009, staff involved with public involvement for the Portland Plan brainstormed what a successful rollout phase would look like – from the particular perspective of staff. The results of this brainstorm are listed below. On the following page, we also listed the results of a brainstorm with a community member to respond to the question *from the perspective of the community*.

The CIC has an opportunity to add to this list. The resulting list can then be used as a benchmark for gauging success as we collaboratively proceed with public involvement for the plan as it develops.

Desired outcomes from the perspective of staff:

- The public understands that the planning process continues, building on a strong body of public feedback and research accomplished in earlier phases
- Interested stakeholders understand *why we plan, why it matters to get involved, and what the Portland Plan will be*
- District Liaisons build on their relationships in the community to engage the public in a trustful and positive way in the next phases of the planning process
- Participants understand the general roadmap and what opportunities there are (and when) to shape the process and content
- Community members feel inspired and motivated to become/remain engaged
- Participants have the background they need from staff to be informed participants throughout the process
- Participants help inform and enlist neighbors, friends, family and co-workers to broaden the reach of public involvement
- Participants (including political leadership and bureau colleagues) have realistic expectations about process and outcomes, given budget and other constraints

We will discuss this at the July 29th CIC meeting; please be prepared to add to this list!

From the perspective of community members:

In addition to outcomes listed above:

- An evaluation/tracking process captures responses to the rollout information and approaches, allowing outcomes to be measured and adjustments to be made for the next round
- Neighborhoods build or strengthen relationships over common concerns (e.g., historic neighborhoods, streetcar neighborhoods, environmentally sensitive neighborhoods)
- Neighborhoods and business groups have an opportunity to develop a shared vision for commercial areas
- Groups and organizations grow stronger and more cohesive through participation in the process
- Staff recognizes the public's ability to make meaningful contributions to community efforts
- The community increases their understanding of and level of trust in their City government
- Key areas of controversy are identified and addressed through the process
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Portland Plan Community Involvement Committee Charter

Purpose

The Portland Plan Community Involvement Committee (CIC) is charged with serving as the “eyes and ears” of Portland’s many and diverse communities, ensuring that the perspectives of ALL Portlanders are reflected in the Portland Plan as it evolves.

CIC will interact with Bureau of Planning and Sustainability staff – particularly District Liaisons – as well as the Office of Neighborhood Involvement. It will continue the community’s participation in the Portland Plan, a process that began with visionPDX, which captured and fleshed out our shared values of sustainability, equity, accessibility, community connectedness and distinctiveness.

CIC will receive information and be a checkpoint for a wide representation of community members to review, comment and advise the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability on the Portland Plan as it is developed. It will help guide the Planning Commission and City Council as they consider approval of the plan.

CIC will meet quarterly, or as needed. Sub committees will be established to work on specific tasks as may be determined and will hold meetings as necessary. CIC will provide regular reports and updates to the Planning Commission.

Committee Responsibilities:

1. Define criteria and principles for engaging Portlanders in a public involvement process for the Portland Plan, identify benchmarks and timelines to measure success, and serve as “guardians” of the process to make sure that criteria and principals continue to be adhered to throughout the development of the Plan.
2. Advise the Planning Commission on Portlanders’ understanding, awareness and reaction to the Plan as it progresses. Recommend changes for outreach and public support for the plan as appropriate to stay flexible, responsive and transparent.
3. Provide guidance to and a sounding board for staff to test ideas, messages, informational materials and exercises – with special attention to clarity, accessibility, and relevance to issues of concern to the public.
4. Utilize the member’s connection to their respective networks as ambassadors for the involvement process in the community.
5. Document key discussion points and decisions, post notes on the Portland Plan website, and appear before the Planning Commission for interaction and to provide reports.

Portland Plan Community Involvement Committee

Portland Plan Community Involvement Committee

Proposed Subcommittees – Summer/Fall 2009

1. Executive Subcommittee

- 3-4 members
- Work with chair to flesh out committee charter to incorporate operating agreements, decision-making protocols, roles and responsibilities, etc.
- Provide general support to chair as needed (e.g., help develop agendas, help facilitate meetings, fill in if chair is absent, etc.)
- This subcommittee could rotate every 6 months (or other interval - TBD) so that several CIC members could fill this role over the life of the CIC

2. Outreach Subcommittee

- Work with CIC members and staff to help ensure that a wide range of organizations and networks are being effectively reached through formal and informal means
- Help staff brainstorm and pursue specific outreach techniques, with an emphasis on reaching traditionally underrepresented communities

3. Communications Subcommittee

- Serve as advisors to staff to develop and tell the Portland Plan story in a compelling and relevant way to multiple audiences
- Immediate task: assist staff to select a consultant to develop strategic communication program; assist with refining consultant's scope of work
- Serve as a sounding board for testing written and graphic materials, to ensure that they speak to a variety of interests and audiences and that materials are clear, understandable and compelling

4. Workshop Design Subcommittee

- Assist staff team to design participatory public workshops in the fall and winter

Portland Plan Community Involvement Committee