

# Community Involvement Committee Outreach Subcommittee & Communications Subcommittee

September 8, 2010 8:30-10am, 1900 Building CR 7A **Meeting Minutes** 

Committee Members Present: Jason Long, Linda Nettekoven, Howard Shapiro, Peter

Stark, Anyeley Hallova

**Absent**: Liz Gatti, Shirley Nacoste, and Lai-Lani Ovalles

BPS Staff: Deborah Stein, Eden Dabbs, Alex Howard, Kate McQuillan

**Visitors**: Alicia Crain (public)

# Agenda

• 8:35am Welcome

- 8:40am Review and Comments on Draft 2 Public Participation Progress Report
- 9:05am Review and Comment on Phase 2 Marketing and Communications Recap
- 9:20am Review and Comment on Market Research and Strategic Marketing Communications Request for Proposals (RFP)
- 9:45am Different Plans and Project's Relationship to Portland Plan (Alex Howard)
- 9:55am Next Steps
- 10:00am Adjourn

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Deborah began meeting at 8:40am. Before addressing the meeting agenda items, members and staff began a discussion about how to best convey the whole Portland Plan process and how it relates to other current City initiatives. Eden Dabbs mentioned that to try to convey this relationship may be premature for Phase 3 as the Portland Plan strategies will be still in draft form; however Phase 4 may be appropriate. Peter Stark reiterated the process of describing the Portland Plan as a broad and all-encompassing initiative, instead of focusing on too narrow of strategies. His example was Portlanders interested in the Portland System Streetcar Plan being unable to relate to the broad reach of the Portland Plan.

#### **General Discussion of Phase 2 Outreach**

CIC members inquired about the success of the new Portland Plan "What's your big idea?" game. Staff reported the game to be very successful, with over 400 recorded responses as well as video clips of Portlanders discussing the game. CIC members expressed interest in making both the video clips and the analyzed results of the game responses available as soon as possible. There are concerns about the demographics of the people playing the game. Anecdotally, staff described the game participants as more diverse than other participants.

CIC members asked staff about the depth of partnerships with fellow bureaus, agencies, and Portland Plan partners during Phase 2 compared to Phase 1. In particular, Howard Shapiro was interested to hear how Portland Plan staff is working with the Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI).

Peter Stark reminded fellow CIC members and Portland Plan staff that in addition to the successful targeted outreach completed in Phase 2 that we need to continue simply "getting the word out" as there are thousands of Portlanders who have yet to even hear

of the Portland Plan. Howard mentioned that social media is a tool that may greatly help with this notion. Eden noted staff's successful use of social media in both Phases 1 and 2, but also cautioned that social media might not be the most successful tool for reaching underrepresented groups.

# **Reviewing the Draft Phase 2 Public Participation Progress Report**

Upon introducing the report, Staff commented that in general the report is still too thick. The purpose of the report is to supplement the Phase 1 report and not to repeat any information already covered. There ought to be a balance between cutting out any information already covered in the Phase 1 report and leaving enough information so that the document can stand on its own if needed. Additionally, there needs to be either a smaller handout to accompany the report or an executive summary. Staff agreed that an executive summary would be best and could be written in a timely manner.

Staff pointed out that two of the goals for public engagement have either already been modified or need edits. Peter suggested language for renaming Goal 5; however, the wording was just too vague. A discussion followed where it was expressed that the goals need to stand apart from one another, and that Goal 5 is about acknowledging that community members are being heard and staff is able to show how feedback is being utilized. Anyeley provided the following language that fellow CIC members and staff both approved of: "Acknowledge that Portlanders are being heard, and show how their comments are being incorporated into the Portland Plan".

Overall, pages 8-12 discussing the approaches used in Phase 2 public involvement need to be updated to reflect new information. CIC members suggested making changes to the format to separate "Lessons Learned" in Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Several suggestions were made about document formatting that would make the report easier to read. For example:

- The evaluation of each goal should begin on a new page, and unnecessary narrative should be cut so that the reader's eye is immediately directed towards the subsections "Successes" and "Areas for Improvement"
- More photographs in white spaces
- In the tables on page 8-12 about approaches used, cut information that was provided in the previous report and add relevant details about incorporating lessons learned such as "budget does not allow or completed in Phase 2"

## **Reviewing the Communications RFP**

One CIC member was confused why such a technical Request for Proposals (RFP) would be included in meeting materials for members to review. Jason suggested that there be clear but concise language in emails sent prior to the meeting that describes what the meeting materials are and what is expected of the members in reviewing the documents. Other members spoke up to say they thought the RFP and other technical materials are interesting... and they felt well-informed about what was expected of them when the meeting materials were sent out.

Linda mentioned that on page 4 of the RFP that the final sentence stating the goal ought to be brought toward the beginning of the document.

CIC members asked for clarification about the focus groups mentioned in the RFP: How would the representatives of various organizations or agencies be chosen? Will public involvement staff from partner agencies such as ONI or the County be involved, as they historically have done a better job at engaging underrepresented communities? While

Eden agreed that these aspects of choosing focus group participants will be a challenge: the details simply have not been worked out yet.

CIC members also wanted to know whether or not the RFP states that the consultant will provide a quantifiable report at the end of the process stating how the communications strategy has improved. Staff pointed out that the RFP is to help Portland Plan staff craft a message to underrepresented communities and not to administer various outreach strategies.

CIC members asked staff to clarify the timeline of the RFP process: When was the RFP being sent out; when the group/consultant will be selected; and when participants for the focus groups will be solicited. Eden clarified that it will take an additional 1-2 weeks before the RFP is sent to ONI and other City agencies to review. Then there will be a required 2-week period while the RFP is posted. Eden estimated an additional 6-8 weeks before contracts are signed. The timing of the contract signing must be aligned with the release of Portland Plan strategies being developed by Portland Plan content staff, which will hopefully be available in mid- to late-October. Ideally, the focus groups will be underway in mid-November with data and results available by mid-December.

# **Reviewing the Communications Report and Strategy**

There are many measurable successes with earned media detailed in the report. CIC members mentioned that they appreciate how the Portland Plan facebook page shares other items and articles related to the Portland Plan. CIC members recognize that social media is already a big part of the outreach strategy.

Peter praised the quantifiable aspects included in the Communications Report and thought it may be useful to highlight them more in the report as a means to show our successes. Other members echoed that new means to determine quantifiable numbers would be helpful such as the actual numbers for website views. Helpful statistics include the average number of visitors per day as well as the number of absolute visitors (the number of visitors who are new to the website). Portland Plan staff will ask technical staff if it is possible to collect this information. It was suggested that a program called Google Analytics be used to find such data.

Overall, CIC members felt that the communications report was very good.

## Discussing other Plans and the Portland Plan with Alex Howard

Alex Howard was introduced to the CIC members whose role will be demonstrating how existing plans and other policies are being reflected in current strategies, policies and processes.

CIC members explained that a graphic is still needed to describe the entire Portland Plan process and how it relates to other City of Portland initiatives. Alex explained that a graphic was created by staff earlier this year but that nobody liked it. A graphic that will describe such a complicated process will inherently be very messy.

CIC members wanted to know if a graphic describing the Portland Plan were to be comparable to a road map what would the "end point" be for the Portland Plan process? Is the end point the Portland Plan itself? No, because the Portland Plan is meant to be a a living document to inform other planning processes and the Comprehensive Plan. So is the Comp Plan the "end point"? No. It is difficult to use analogies to describe the Portland Plan process because none are perfect. A static diagram is not helpful either.

Staff mentioned a possibility of creating a video of a staff person describing the Portland Plan process which could later be uploaded onto the Portland Plan website.

Alex made the distinction that the Comprehensive Plan is not the only action coming out of the Portland Plan. In other words: The Portland Plan is not being developed for the sole purpose of creating the Comp Plan. Rather, the Comp Plan is one of many actions and strategies that the City and its agency partners will implement over the next 20 years.

Howard Shapiro mentioned checking out the Stanford School of Design (the d.school) that is tackling large social issues through design. Perhaps this school and its work can provide valuable insight into how we might better explain the role of the Portland Plan.