

Community Involvement Committee

Meeting Minutes

October 20, 2010

Committee Members Present: Paula Amato, Jason Barnstead-Long, Judy Bluehorse Skelton, Liz Gatti, Judith Gonzalez Plascencia, Brian Heron, Linda Nettekoven, Stanley Penkin, Howard Shapiro, Peter Stark, Alison Stoll

Absent: Anyeley Hallova, Shirley Nacoste, Lai-Lani Ovalles, Rahul Rastogi, Ryan Schera

Staff (BPS): Raihana Ansary (Mayor's Office), Eden Dabbs, Eric Engstrom, Alex Howard, Deborah Stein, Marty Stockton, Mark Walhood

Visitors: Laura Moss, Hilary Olivos, Jason Rood, Kayla Slovick, Chris Tackett-Nelson

Welcome and Announcements – Howard Shapiro

Howard welcomed everybody and expressed appreciation for the good turnout.

Marty announced the following upcoming events. Marty and Howard emphasized the significance of the two PPAG meetings, and expressed a hope that CIC members attend and participate in these work sessions.

1. Central City 2035 Symposium Series event on Housing and Community Development 1 – Friday, Oct. 22, 9:00am-12:00pm; 1900 Building, Room 2500 A
2. Portland Plan Advisory Group (PPAG) – Thursday, Oct. 28, 9:00 am-12:00 pm; 1900 Building, Room 2500 A
3. Portland Plan Advisory Group (PPAG) – Tuesday, Nov. 9, 2:00-5:00 pm; Portland Building, Room C (Paula pointed out that the date in the agenda was incorrectly listed as a Thursday)
4. Central City 2035 Symposium Series event on Housing and Community Development 2 – Friday, Nov. 12, 9:00am-12:00pm; 1900 Building, Room 2500 A
5. 24th Annual Fix-It Fair at Ron Russell Middle School – Saturday, November 20th, 8:30am-2:00pm

Howard also mentioned that the Central City 2035 events are important, since this effort is a subset of the larger Portland Plan and upcoming Comprehensive Plan update processes. Liz asked what the role of the CIC is with respect to Central City 2035, given this relationship. Eric replied that the Central City process is adhering to the public involvement principles and approaches developed for the Portland Plan, and that they will be continuing to monitor and learn from Portland Plan public involvement successes and areas for improvement. Howard added that the CIC will indeed have influence over this process.

Introduction of Visitors – Judy BlueHorse Skelton

Judy introduced a group of her students from PSU who are participating in two classes: Leadership in Sustainability, and Environmental Education through a Native American Lens (a Capstone class). Howard welcomed the group and said he'd love to hear more about their work at the end of the meeting.



CIC Coordination and Communication – Howard Shapiro

Howard talked about reinvigorating the group, now that the group is entering its second year. When Marty sent out Howard's letter, she received a positive response from 13 CIC members reaffirming their commitment to the charge of the committee. Howard noted that we haven't implemented the bylaws, which spell out the process for members who repeatedly miss meetings, but we need to get a better feel about who is willing and able to fully commit from this point forward, because not achieving a quorum repeatedly hampers the ability of the group to be fully effective.

Howard posed several questions for the group to discuss:

- Are we being effective?
- Are we interacting well with staff?
- Are we fulfilling our charter?
- Are you feeling personally energized?
- Do the meeting times work, or do we need to find an alternative? (in the email poll, the vote among CIC members was split between retaining the current morning schedule and alternating morning and evening meetings.)

Peter expressed that he was impressed by the way the business survey occurred. He cited this as a good example of the CIC initiating something and staff running with it. It took awhile to produce/conduct the survey and analyze/post the results, but he found the results of the survey candid and very useful. Peter noted that members of the business community have said "thank you for asking" – demonstration that this was a worthwhile effort.

Jason said that he's been impressed from the beginning with CIC's involvement and staff's efforts. He keeps hearing that we are doing better than we've done in the past, but there is still a disconnect between the CIC's input and staff's follow through, even when staff is on board with the CIC's perspective and suggestions. He recognizes that often the barrier to follow through is a lack of staff capacity. It would be better if staff could say so quickly, so that there is an opportunity for CIC volunteers to help fill the gap when possible.

Howard noted that when the group comes to a conclusion or provides direction to staff, the CIC needs to hear a report back about follow up. To improve accountability, Eden suggested that the CIC minutes call out follow up actions and identify who is responsible and when. These items would then fall into an "Old Business" section on the next meeting agenda, so staff (or other responsible party) can report on the status of these actions.

Jason reiterated that prompt follow through is particularly important, given the relatively short timeframe of this process.

Stan suggested that more CIC participation in staff meetings would be productive to help advance the work. Alex noted that the TAGs (Technical Action Groups) would benefit from more inclusion as well.

Howard asked for nods around the table that "this is worthy work."

Linda, putting on her Public Involvement Advisory Group (PIAC) hat, expressed that the CIC's work is so important to observe and learn from, on a citywide basis, and guide the work of other efforts in the future. Howard noted that many people around the table wear several hats, and it would be beneficial to all if everyone could share with the group what they are hearing through connections with other groups/organizations.

Eden mentioned the Metro audit of their public involvement processes. She posed the question about how the City would stack up if evaluated against the same criteria. The findings about Metro were that Metro spent too much money on *informing* the public, but not enough on *engaging* the public.

Liz said that we are moving into a new phase in which information is processed through many people over time; when newcomers arrive on the scene mid-process, it is challenging to engage them and not let them feel lost. It is a critical time because people provide input and want to feel heard and validated as an individual. Judy agreed, and reflected on the people who haven't been in the room during the process – including people who haven't even been born yet. She expressed a desire for a leadership style that values inclusion and we need a new paradigm. How do we keep this going in the face of deadlines? Inclusion is a big investment and there is no end... this is just the beginning of the hard work.

Howard, taking the 30,000 foot view, pointed out that we are looking at a million new folks coming to the region. This is vague – some will be high tech workers; some will reflect our changing demographics. This is exciting: a new melting pot.

Linda asked about how the CIC can stay informed about the work of the Diversity and Civic Leadership (CIC) as it progresses. Deborah replied that she was hoping to provide an update at this meeting, but wasn't prepared; but will follow up by email. Linda suggested that we add DCL Update as a standing agenda item on future agendas. Jason added that he encourages more interaction between the CIC and DCL organizations; the CIC could ask DCL organizations what they each need from the CIC to help. Brian suggested that there could be a similar structure to the East Portland Action Plan committee, in which there is a designated liaison to each of the five DCL organizations.

Paula stated that she has felt like staff has been very responsive and that she particularly appreciates Marty's informative emails. Paula also expressed continued frustration about fulfilling the CIC's charge to increase the diversity of participants in the public process.

Howard pointed out that there are vacancies on the CIC, and that in filling these vacancies Commissioner Fritz is hoping to increase the diversity of the committee membership. Mary clarified that the CIC's bylaws specify 18 seats. In addition to two vacancies (Planning and Sustainability Commissioner and a community-at-large representative), two of the CIC's current members (Peter and Allison) were added to the group without having gone through the formal appointment process, so this situation will need to be taken care of through a housekeeping item (consent calendar approval by the City Council). The CIC recommends that the Mayor looks broadly in the community to identify a new community-at-large representative. Judith added that the CIC should be clear about the criteria for recruitment; Marty suggested that the original recruitment criteria are very good.

Liz asked whether we should expand the committee beyond 18 members to increase the potential for good attendance at meetings. This would require an amendment to the bylaws. Paula asked how many members reaffirmed their commitment to the CIC when polled. The response is 13, with no response from the others. (No one has replied negatively at this point.) Jason asked whether "recommitment" means "yes, I commit to attending meetings," or "yes, I'm interested – but will only attend intermittently." The response was "we'll see!"

Howard asked the group about preferences for meeting times. In the pre-meeting poll, the vote was split between retaining the current schedule and alternative morning meetings with evening meetings. Howard posed a new proposal: one meeting per quarter in the evening; a light meal and mingling at 5:00 and the meeting starting at 6:00. Jason and Allison expressed concern about evening meetings



conflicting with other community meetings scheduled for the evening; their calendars are already very full. Paula pointed out that it's clear that a morning meeting time works *for those in the room*; it's the people *who aren't in the room* who have the conflicts with the current schedule, and for whom an evening time would work better.

Linda proposed we try an evening meeting and see how it goes; she also pointed out that an evening meeting time opens up the opportunity for more members of the public to attend and observe. Peter and Jason agreed. Brian liked the idea of a meal and social interaction. It was agreed that scheduling consistency is important, and Marty proposed keeping the once-per-quarter evening meeting on the third Wednesday of the month.

Marty asked whether there is interest and availability in a December meeting. It was pointed out that there will be a lot to cover and a December meeting will be productive.

The group decided to keep the November and December meetings in their current time slot, and will have a January meeting in the evening to try it out.

Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI) – Eric Engstrom

Eric presented an overview of the Buildable Lands Inventory (see attached PowerPoint presentation). He posed this to the group: How do we want to involve the public in reviewing land use alternatives based on this inventory? He described that there will be some sort of participatory design exercise in spring 2011 to explore how the city will be able to absorb approximately 136,000 new households.

Judy asked whether we can assume that new housing units will all be LEED certified and net-zero energy use. Eric replied that these are targets, but we would be looking at recent trends to make informed assumptions about what we can expect.

Howard asked “What do you need from the CIC and when?” Eric replied that for now, Phase 3 of public involvement should be the primary focus of the CIC. The Buildable Lands Inventory is just a preview for now of what happens after Phase 3, and the CIC can start to think in earnest about public involvement for the BLI in January/February.

Paula asked whether there is a relationship between the BLI and the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Eric replied yes – there is a close tie. Metro's growth assumptions are based on the UGB.

Allison noted the mention of ADUs (accessory dwelling units or “granny flats”) and said that there is support for ADUs at the grassroots level, but permit costs are a strong deterrent, and we cannot highlight ADUs as a model for accommodating increased density of people are deterred from building them.

Paula asked how accurate Metro forecasts have been historically. Eric replied that there is high confidence in the *range*, but it's prudent to aim for the high end of the range. Mark Walhood added that Metro has been more accurate in the past in forecasting household numbers than job growth.

Judy asked who the audience is for the presentation about the BLI so that the CIC can be most helpful in making suggestions. Liz felt like this presentation and discussion offers an opportunity for the public to get engaged in a kinesthetic way by drawing or marking up a map at a workshop or open house. She suggested that the Round 3 workshops include a kiosk for this information to be previewed by the public.

Communications Update – Eden and Deborah

Eden announced the Inspiring Communities Series and the upcoming Planning and Sustainability Commission public hearings on the Portland Plan Factual Basis and Buildable Lands Inventory.

Deborah updated the group on a proposal shared with the CIC at the last meeting. This proposal was to conduct focus groups to test whether we are describing draft strategies in ways that are understandable, clear, relevant and meaningful to a variety of audiences. Staff recognizes that we often use terms, phrases and images that make sense to us as planners, but which don't relate well for many community members, so we need assistance with our communication.

The update is that rather than contract with a professional communications firm to conduct these focus groups, we will work directly with our Diversity and Civic Leadership Program partners. They have invited staff to join their November 16th DCL Partners' meeting in which the organization leads and invited guests will review and critique the ways we are communicating about the different draft strategies. Staff will provide lunch for all participants, and we will arrange for an outside facilitator. We also plan to contract with the Center for Intercultural Organizing (one of the DCL partners) to videotape the discussion. The CIC's reaction to this shift was very positive. Allison and Brian both offered their assistance to advance this effort. It was proposed that the CIC serve as a second focus group to do the same exercise at the next CIC meeting on November 17. It was further proposed that this meeting be extended by one hour to accommodate this.

Phase III Workshop Design Update – Alex

Alex described the most recent thinking of the Workshop Design Subcommittee (see handout). Howard noted positively that the idea of a "fair" is like a farmer's market: you could wander through and "taste" the different offerings in a lively, engaging setting. Several CIC members expressed support for turning these events into genuine community events by inviting local food vendors. Liz added that having an opportunity for a kinesthetic experience – like creating a wall graphic and/or opportunities to draw pictures – would be fun, engaging and creative ways for people to express themselves. Paula asked if these workshops would provide an opportunity to prioritize and make hard choices among alternatives. Alex replied yes – participants could pull from a list of actions and identify which would be most strategic. Peter noted that at the Transportation Summit, the participants were divided up by neighborhood and each cohort moved around the room together to meet with staff of various bureaus. He liked this model because it promoted interaction among neighbors and between neighbors and City staff about place-specific issues.

Approval of Minutes from September 15, 2010 Meeting

Before adjourning, the CIC unanimously voted to approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

Next Steps:

The next CIC meeting is as follows:

- **Wednesday, November 17, 8:00-11:00 a.m., Rm. 7A (7th Floor, 1900 Bldg.) NOTE extended time.**



CIC Decisions and Follow up Actions

Follow up items:

- 1. Future CIC minutes will call out follow up actions and identify who is responsible and when.*
- 2. More CIC participation in staff meetings would be productive to help advance the work.*
- 3. Add DCL Update as a standing agenda item on future agendas.*
- 4. The CIC recommends that the Mayor looks broadly in the community to identify a new community-at-large representative.*
- 5. The group decided to keep the November and December meetings in their current time slot, and will have a January meeting in the evening to try it out.*
- 6. It was proposed that the CIC serve as a second focus group to do the same exercise at the next CIC meeting on November 17. It was further proposed that this meeting be extended by one hour to accommodate this.*

Meeting adjourned.

Attachments

The following documents should be considered part of the minutes for this meeting:

Central City 2035 Advisory Group Memorandum, dated September 17 2010



City of Portland
Bureau of
**Planning and
Sustainability**

Sam Adams, Mayor
Susan Anderson, Director

Planning

1900 S.W. 4th Ave., Ste. 7100
Portland, OR 97201-5350

Phone 503-823-7700
FAX 503-823-7800
TTY 503-823-6868

Sustainability

721 N.W. 9th Ave., Ste. 350
Portland, OR 97209-3447

Phone 503-823-7222
FAX 503-823-5311
TTY 503-823-6868

www.portlandonline.com/bps

An equal opportunity employer



Printed on recycled paper

M E M O

September 17, 2010

To: Portland Plan Community Involvement Committee

From: Steve Iwata, Central City Project Manager

Cc: Commissioner Amanda Fritz

Subject: Central City 2035 Advisory Group

The Central City 2035 team is pleased to announce the addition of Amy Lewin to the Central City 2035 Advisory Group. Amy represents the Hosford-Abernethy Neighborhood Development. She has already received project materials and a briefing from the team. She will be formally welcomed by the group on October 5th, at the next Advisory Group meeting. This appointment was in direct response to concerns from the Community Involvement Committee.

On Wednesday, July 21, 2010 the staff from the Central City team attended the Portland Plan Community Involvement Committee. Staff presented on the Central City 2035 project, timing, and initial steps of the projects, including the formation of the Central City 2035 Advisory Group. During the discussion with the CIC, there were concerns about representation on the Advisory Group. Members of that group had been selected based on representation of various interests, familiarity with issues in the Central City, and the ability to discuss long-range Central City-wide topics. However, the CIC felt the group was lacking adequate neighborhood representation, especially from someone on the east side. I appreciated the comments from the CIC and will continue to keep you informed on our process.

As work continues to move forward with Central City 2035, I hope the CIC will continue to stay informed about the project by viewing our website at www.portlandonline.com/bps/cc2035. If you have any questions about the project or this memo, please contact me at (503)823-9904 or Steve.Iwata@portlandoregon.gov.