



# Community Involvement Committee

## Meeting Minutes

November 16, 2011

**Committee Members Present:** Paula Amato, Jason Barnstead-Long, Judy BlueHorse Skelton, Lois Cohen, Liz Gatti, Brian Heron, Shirley Nacoste, Linda Nettekoven, Stanley Penkin, Kevin Pozzi, Peter Stark, Alison Stoll

**Absent:** Judith Gonzalez Plascencia, Anyeley Hallova, Lai-Lani Ovalles, Ryan Schera, Howard Shapiro

**Staff:** Raihana Ansary, Eden Dabbs, Chris Dornan, Eric Engstrom, Joan Frederiksen, Paul Leistner, Barry Manning, Deborah Stein

**Visitors:** Allison Moe, Tony Vi

---

### Welcome

Stan Penkin began the meeting in Howard Shapiro's absence. The CIC achieved quorum, and approved the CIC minutes from 10/19. Stan gave a brief overview of the day's agenda, and then turned it over to Marty Stockton for announcements.

### Announcements

Marty brought the CIC up to speed on upcoming events:

#### Outreach in November

- Landmarks Commission, Monday, November 14
- Hosford-Abernethy Neighborhood Development, Tuesday, November 15
- Design Commission, Thursday, November 17
- Fix-It Fair at Ron Russell Middle School, Saturday, November 19

#### Planning and Sustainability Commission Hearing Dates

- Tuesday, November 15, 5:30-9pm at Parkrose High School
- Tuesday, November 29, 5:30-9pm at 1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

#### PSC Work Session and Recommendation

- Tuesday, December 13, 12:30pm at 1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

### CIC Decisions and Follow up Actions

CIC role at the November 29<sup>th</sup> PSC public hearing

### Update on PSC hearings

Stan asked for an update on testimony received at the PSC hearings so far, and for a guess on how many people attended and testified.

Jason Barnstead-Long responded that some responses were neighborhood-centric, though others were concerned with overall equity or citywide issues. Still others had specific language and format suggestions. As for attendance, there were many observers, and roughly 20 testifiers between the two hearings.



Deborah Stein expressed her appreciation for the two-part structure of the hearings, which allowed for public testimony followed by the Commissioners' summary so the public can see how the PSC processes public feedback.

Peter Stark asked if any of the testimony focused on Appendix B of the Draft. Deborah said none yet, but the level of specificity has greatly increased from the first hearing.

Eric Engstrom added that two big messages came out of testimony so far. One was focusing on youth and the aging population, including increased participation and empowerment of youth and enhancing multi-generational neighborhoods. The other was about increasing Portland's resiliency, including better emergency planning, dealing with climate change and peak oil, etc.

Jason stated that the Appendix B-related questions came at the community and coalition meetings.

Stan asked if there has there been much oral testimony, and if the testifiers were the usual suspects, or new faces.

Eric responded that there were few at the first hearing, but more at the 2<sup>nd</sup>, and they expect many more at the final hearing.

Deborah added that seeing youth testify in groups is a new phenomenon, advocating for youth involvement. Youth mentioned in testimony that graduation rate should not be the prime indicator, that success should reflect the entire student experience.

Eric added that the East Portland School Districts crafted a joint letter, with oral testimony from the superintendents.

Brian Heron estimated that roughly three-fourths of the attendees and testifiers were usual suspects. Brian mentioned his son's story in which he struggled to graduate on time, but graduated from PCC later. This situation would not be counted using current graduation metrics.

Peter said that while the business reaction has been limited so far, businesses tend to react to policy, so they will likely speak up more as the Comp Plan becomes more real.

Eric mentioned that as a strategic plan, the Portland Plan asserts the need for business development. Portland can't hang its hat on livability alone.

Judy BlueHorse Skelton informed the group that the mayoral candidates agreed to come to an event hosted on 11/28 at the Native American Center at PSU. The intent is to have a conversation in a "talking circle" format. The candidates are excited about speaking in a non-debate format about sustainability and social justice. They currently hope for a max of 200 people, though the event is open to all. The event notice will show up on the PSU website next week. The Portland Plan is not mentioned specifically. Students will facilitate. The main focus will be on equity. Judy thanked the CIC members, as the PSU organizers told her they were inspired from their experience with the CIC before.



### **Process for Tracking Testimony**

Deborah said that they are taking in all the written testimony, and are working to be very responsive to testifiers. Chris Dornan is entering testimony into the database and Alex Howard is referring various Portland Plan staff to respond. Processed comments will be incorporated into the next draft.

Eric stated that oral testimony will conclude on 11/29, but written testimony is extended to 12/28.

Marty said that the hearing on 11/29 will be big. It will happen at 5:30pm, at the 1900 Bldg, on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor. Alan Lazlo is holding a special meeting on Monday to go over the whole Plan. He is using the United Nations Human Rights analysis model to look at the Plan and generate comments to share with the PSC. Alan has testified at the hearings, which will be followed up with a written letter on behalf of the Human Rights Commission.

Stan asked if there has been an effort to respond to individuals who testified. Marty said that Chris and she respond in kind to email and phone responses as necessary, but they haven't crafted response letters yet. Brian mentioned that the PSC did do follow up on the spot to some testimony at hearings.

### **Comp Plan Design Subcommittee Update**

Marty introduced Paul Leistner from the Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI). Paul will check in with the main CIC occasionally to update about public involvement. They met on 11/4; they will determine how long the group will meet, but for now it is necessary as they needed a group that was able to meet in force more often than the standard CIC. She mentioned the draft subcommittee minutes, and the 3 documents that staff put together. The first is "What is Comp Plan?" The Portland Plan is a set of 5 year actions, but also setting the 25-year policy framework, including the 9 action areas, which could manifest as chapters in the Comp Plan. The Portland Plan is the strategic plan, while the Comp Plan is one of the ways to implement it.

Eric said the Comp Plan is already about a quarter done, specifically the work that this is the background reports and data. They need to be careful to point out that Portland Plan is feeding into the Comp Plan, and make sure not to create a false perception that the Comp Plan is starting from scratch. The Comp Plan will be one channel to implement the Portland Plan.

Deborah said that the most impactful testimony regarded supporting a multi-generational city, with support for youth and the aging community. This would manifest as housing policy.

Marty stated that the Comp Plan will be adopted by ordinance. All other projects will be adopted by resolution. Brian asked what the difference was between an ordinance and a resolution. Marty clarified that a resolution is simply a declaration, while an ordinance is legally binding. Peter said this is why the business side is more interested in the Comp Plan. Jason pointed out that resolutions are more volatile as they are more dependent on the makeup of City Hall, while the Comp Plan has more staying power. Eric said that work is going on to improve the staying power of certain parts of the Portland Plan.

Marty said that 2013 is the deadline for City Council to adopt the Comp Plan into ordinance per the Periodic Review Work Program. Eric mentioned that they already used a one-year extension to get the deadline moved to 2013. Of the five tasks they are responsible to the State, the first is to establish the Committee Involvement Committee, the second is to complete the background reports, the third involves scenarios, the fourth is the analysis of alternatives and the fifth is implementation.



Eric said that Central City is a focused specific area plan. The State's requirements are not driving it. CC2035 will not propose things that are in conflict with overall Comp Plan. Both will need to work together.

Peter said that geography will come into play eventually, and will need to be looked at in the policy phase.

Brian asked how the EPAP affects the Comp Plan, or vice versa. Eric said there is a question as to how past area plans will interact with the Comp Plan. The current Comp Plan has a list of local plans adopted by reference. The area plans used to have more weight, based on state laws. The question is if it is meaningful to have local plans incorporated into the Comp Plan, or if they should be stand-alones. East Hayden Island isn't going to be dropped, but there are some old neighborhood plans that need to be addressed.

Stan asked if this group could have a presentation about the NE Quadrant. Marty will follow up.

Peter said that the subcommittee should get folded back into the CIC eventually.

Kevin Pozzi said there was conflict about how the public is involved in the committees. He asked what the expectations were for public involvement with the Comp Plan. Eric mentioned that since the Comp Plan is more about geography, more geographic-specific groups/approach might be looked at for public involvement. Deborah stated that there has been pushback on geography, because they might raise expectations too high on the level of detail and zoning. They are leaning towards a topic-based focus to start, and dive into geography slowly.

Alison Stoll mentioned that there are high expectations already in the community, and they better make it clear up front what will and won't happen. There are areas in central NE that haven't had planning in 30 years, including 82<sup>nd</sup> and Cully. Jason mentioned that if this were approached geographically, some underrepresented non-geographic communities might be excluded. Involvement will be needed at a high level to keep them involved.

Deborah said that the deadline is not a cliff, but more of a process, and some things will take longer to achieve. Eric pointed out that they must accomplish significant things in those 18 months so the public will see this process as valuable.

Marty handed out the product diagram, showing the relationship between the Portland Plan, Comp Plan and other projects, as well as the Comp Plan framework handout.

## **Follow up on Communications Recommendations by the CIC**

### Update to the Portland Plan brochure

Eden handed out the People's Summary, which is a small four-page booklet. The Summary is a high level overview of the Draft Plan. They would like to start printing and distributing it soon.

Lois Cohen said that the office is at the OAME building in North Portland. It would be a good place for distribution. Furthermore, OAME might be a good place to have a future CIC meeting. OAME meets every other Friday from 7:00am-9:00am. The CIC could have a meeting right after that, with Sam Brooks mentioning it before they finish. A lot of people represent businesses, as well as organizational people. This is a good place to say you've been to. OAME is politically powerful.



Jason said the People's Summary booklet describes the Plan, but doesn't say what the City is going to do with it. Paul opined that adding questions like "how will the Plan change Portland?" or "how can I remain engaged?" would help. Linda Nettekoven suggested having a place to comment, even after the testimony deadline. Including a web address for email comments and a phone number might help. Liz Gatti suggested putting in a line like "this will be implemented many ways, including the Comp Plan," and/or "Read the Plan, here's some community organizations to get involved with."

Marty noted that they need a piece that they can translate for DCL partners. The CIC agreed that this would be a good piece to translate. After CIO reviews it, it might look different. Liz said it might be good to look at after Council approval. Eden mentioned that content might be tweaked after approval, and might be packaged differently to reach different audiences at the state, national and international level.

Kevin noted that the origin is not shown clearly, and it would be good to clarify the high level of long-time community involvement that contributed to the document's creation.

Paul said that ONI has suggested strategic translation from other groups. Refugee groups and others are most concerned with "how will this affect me?" Linda expressed concern about having something translated before council. Eden said a call to action has been suggested.

Peter commented that it was a nice document. Granny Franny collected attention. Even a short document garners a quick glance at best. He recommended that they add the website URL large and early. The goal should be to get people to the site. Perhaps the site, or multiple sites, one per translated language, are better places to show translation. Eden replied that this piece is meant for people who don't necessarily have a computer.

Stan suggested that they distribute materials through schools, art centers etc. Eden, Marty and Chris agreed that they were definitely willing and able to distribute materials to suggested places to help with distribution.

Paula Amato wondered if they could cut down on the text on the last page, that there was some overlap. Lois asked to keep arts in the document, and to have economic and cultural integrity as we grow. Deborah stated that the type is as small as it can get, and some content will need to be trimmed if any new content is to be added.

### Video

The CIC was shown the new videos, one with Alex Howard and Pam Phan and the other with Andre Baugh. Jason mentioned that the video with Alex and Pam, the transitions should be slower.

Paul said that with the Andre video, it would be helpful to give instructions and show dates still available. It would be good to have less talking heads and more slides with info.

Jason noted that any date-specific info will need to be updated. Brian commented that the content in the videos was good.

Liz asked if the CIC is still going to gather comments and provide a unified written testimony to the PSC. Stan replied no. Liz said that individual members should submit testimony, but it's better to show a unified front if possible. Stan asked Jason to email the group again to gather comments.



Eden told the group that they will send out an email blast with Alex's video soon. Julia Thompson and Eden are meeting with Coates Cokes (who did Granny Franny and marketing for the first two phases) to help close the loop. The messaging concept will get used for print, advertising and video. The contract is to create an ongoing public awareness campaign to start before the City Council vote. Paul cautioned the group to be careful of creating a too-polished look, which can give the appearance to the public that money was wasted on style over substance.

Eric noted that less people are using paper to communicate; they tune in more to video now. Eden responded that video is one thing, print is another.

### **Update on grants to Diversity and Civic Leadership (DCL) Partners for culturally-appropriate Portland Plan involvement**

Marty informed the CIC that they are moving forward on a new DCL grant. The ordinance is with staff; they are already working with the City Clerk on the start date and getting the ordinance to go to Council, hopefully by the end of the year. The Portland Plan Phase 3 Public Participation Report showed the DCL partner involvement. There was errata, such as the only group showed prior to web release was the CIC, not the DCL partners. The DCL partners actually wanted to write part of the document. Marty emailed some people, and offered that they could add an appendix with their writing. Periodic Review is January 24-25; they'll need to give public notice in advance. Marty asked that if changes are to be made to the document, to make those changes by the end of the calendar year.

Paula asked if there were any issues with content. Marty said she thought the issues were mainly about process. They wanted to see the Draft before it was published, and did not get to do so. She said she was open to their input moving forward. Paul mentioned that it would be good to have genuine interaction. It would be powerful to include people's own words at the next level.

Brian stated that the majority of people are not system-oriented, and learn more visually. He suggested marketing a "4 hour plan," which asked individual Portlanders to spend 4 hours a month making it better locally, to help show that the Portland Plan will be really carried out by the people, not just the City. The mentality of too many right now is that the City is supposed to do things for the people. There needs to be a call to action that it is time for individuals to act. He mentioned something with a similar message to the Blazers' "Rise With Us" campaign.

### **Comments from the public**

Alison introduced herself. She is in the Masters of Urban Planning program at Portland State University, attending the meeting to fulfill a public involvement requirement for her studies. She didn't know the CIC existed before seeing it for herself.

Tony introduced himself. He is also a MURP at PSU. He said he was glad to see public involvement included in city planning, especially to this extent.

### **Next steps**

Next CIC meeting will be Wednesday, December 21, from 8:00 to 10:00 AM.



**Attachments**

Portland Plan brochure