AGENDA

Public Participation Task Force

October 3, 2013
11 am to 1 pm
Madison Avenue Meeting Room
500 SW Madison Avenue (across from City Hall)

1. Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules review - Kent (5 Minutes)

2. Agenda Review, Changes, Additions - Kent (5 Minutes)

3. PPTF budget support/minute taking for this meeting - Kent (10 Minutes)

4. City Manager/Dept. Head/other staff attendance at future meetings - Kent (10 Minutes)

5. Review PPTF outcomes documents from last meeting - All (10 Minutes)

6. Review and prioritize City Council charge ("what, when, how") - Penny & Richard (30 Minutes)

7. Visitors Propositions - 12:10 PM

8. Discuss/Review other documents noted below - All (15 Minutes)

9. Agenda for next meeting - Kent (5 minutes)

10. Check In: How did we do? - Richard (5 Minutes)

<u>Other Documents (Item #8 above)</u>

1. "The Process Is the Decision" (attached to first meeting agenda)
2. City of Ashland "Citizen Participation Guide" (available online)
3. "Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century" - David Booher and Judith Innes (available online)
4. Councilor Brown's documents (First document attached to first meeting agenda, second document handed out at first meeting)

CITY OF CORVALLIS
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION TASK FORCE
MINUTES
September 19, 2013 – 11am-1pm

PRESENT: Kent Daniels, Chair; Emily Bowling; George Brown; Becki Goslow; Richard Hervey; Annette Mills; Rocio Munoz; Brenda VanDevelder; Penny York; Mary Beth Altmann Hughes; Claire Pate, Recorder

ABSENT: Lee Eckroth

VISITORS: Jim Day, Joe Raia

KEYPOINTS OF DISCUSSION

Agenda Item	Info Only	Key Discussion Points	Recommendations/Actions
I. Introductions & Background Info		• Introductions made with each member sharing some information about their background and interests.	
II. Role of the Chair, Ground Rules, Expectations, Parking Lot		Role of Chair: • Keep the meeting on agenda and rolling. • Make sure everyone is heard. Ground Rules: • Be nice. • Everyone should be heard. • Operate on a consensus basis; however, motions can be used to clarify what has been agreed to. Parking Lot: • A list of items that do not seem to fit in to current scope, but will be saved for discussion at a later date. The list is updated each meeting and included at the end of the minutes.	
III. Regular Meeting Dates/Times		• Good time to meet. • Should meet twice a month for a while.	Meetings on 1st and 3rd Thursdays; 11am at MAMR

Agenda Item	Info Only	Key Discussion Points	Recommendations/Actions
IV. Budget Request to City Council for Staff Support		• No dollars were budgeted for support of the PPTF. • Using contract recorders can cost up to $250/meeting. • Options to be explored for taking minutes include: use volunteers or LBCC/OSU intern; rotate minutes taking through the TF members; use contract scribe for a limited time until minutes template is refined. • There is no uniformity in how the minutes are generated and formatted for the various Boards and Commissions (B&Cs). • If volunteers are used, training will be needed to ensure consistency and accuracy. • A format for the PPTF minutes should be used as a model for how other non-quasi-judicial B &Cs might format their minutes. • No more "he said-she said" or verbatim transcriptions. This could save resources and dollars for the City, plus they can be daunting for the reader. • Minutes should be a step above "action-only" minutes, but should be limited to key points for each agenda item. • Other support needs include translation services for translating key public documents and/or announcements into Spanish; and possibly a need for translators at key public meetings. • Interpreters can cost from $40-$50/hour. This is actually a City-wide issue and should be discussed as part of the larger picture. • Some $$ might be needed to cover costs of printing & holding a couple of larger public meetings. • It is assumed that City will still provide support services necessary to post and distribute the minutes and meeting packets. • Daniels will take responsibility for setup/takedown of	Daniels will finalize a Budget Request to take to October 7, 2013 City Council meeting, to include 3 months (6 meetings) of support for taking minutes, and some resources for other potential needs such as one/two public meetings to discuss findings. Budget request will be emailed first to other TF members for review and comment.

Agenda Item	Info Only	Key Discussion Points	Recommendations/Actions
		meeting room, and other miscellaneous items such as chartpaks if necessary.	
V. Change/Additions to Agenda		• Add Visitor Comments/Propositions on each agenda to be scheduled for 12 p.m. • Last agenda item should be a “check in” on how the meeting went.	
VI. Charge for the PTTF from the City Council		• The document handed out as part of the packet was approved by City Council. • Item 2.c of the Charge uses the term “neutral advisors.” It is not intended to preclude members from having a passion for a certain point of view, but the intent is for the various members to be able to look beyond a narrow advocacy position to understand the complexity of other constituencies and potential impacts decisions can make on City resources. • Recommendations made to City Council will consist of a range of options; this might be an approach that could be used by other B&Cs.	
VII. Process to follow over next 6-8 months		• There will likely be a need for a large meeting to present to the public sometime after January. • A large public meeting should take into consideration the non-traditional means of reaching non-traditional participants; perhaps providing childcare, transportation, translation services. • As the TF delves into specific interest areas, it will likely be more efficient to break into subcommittees, or study groups, to do the detail work then bring results back to the whole TF. • Suggestion: one of the two monthly meetings could be used for subcommittees, or study groups, to meet. • It will be important to update City Council at intervals. • Three department heads (Public Works, Parks and Recreation, and Community Development) have been	

Agenda Item	Info Only	Key Discussion Points	Recommendations/Actions
		invited to attend one of the meetings. This will be scheduled after the TF discusses what information they would like to have shared. • It would be good to have City Recorder Kathy Louie attend a meeting as well.	
VIII. Background Documents and Information Sources		• A packet of background documents was handed out, and included a listing of existing B&Cs by Department providing support; and other various documents that relate to citizen involvement opportunities. • Councilor Brown submitted a revised document entitled "Public Process and Participation Goal" for the TF to take into consideration (**Attachment A)**	
IX. Nominal group technique		Question: What 4 – 5 outcomes would you like to see from the PPTF work? • The TF took turns giving their responses, in a roundtable fashion. The responses are noted below.	
X. Additional Questions/comments. Agenda and homework for the next meeting.		Agenda items for next meeting (11am, October 3, 2013): • Approve budget request for City Council • Review the Charge and prioritize what to do, how to do it, and set a timeline for the work. • Determine expectations for the Department Head Q and A's/presentations. Some suggested points of discussion: How is the system working now; what would the impact of changes be; how are they now working with citizens. • Review and talk about the outside documents and processes of decision-making. • Visitor Propositions at noon. Homework: • Read suggested resources provided by Councilor Brown, including City of Ashland's "Citizen Participation Guide;" Judith I. Innes and David E.	

Agenda Item	Info Only	Key Discussion Points	Recommendations/Actions
		Booher's "Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century." Additional Question/comments: • Can we get parking passes next time? • VanDevelder offered to do nametags.	
XI. Check-In: How did we do?		• The meeting was well run, with everyone participating.	

The meeting adjourned at 1:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kent Daniels, Chair

Next Meeting(s):

- October 3rd & 17th;
- November 7th & 21st
- December 5th & 19th

Parking Lot:

- Multi-Jurisdictional Committees
  City/County (Example: Library Board)
  OSU
  Non-profits

Responses to "Desired Outcomes from the PPTF work"

- Highlight TF work as we go along

- Clear direction to provide to City Council
- Clear guidelines and outcomes for B&Cs.
- All B&Cs to receive equal respect and appreciation.
- Easy flow of info from City to citizens.
- Non-traditional strategies to engage non-traditional populations (languages)
- Citizens empowered to participate before decisions are reached.
- B&Cs should have measurable goals to garner respect.
- Explore ways and create environment to give input in public forum
- Open advertising of B&C vacancies.
- Survey other cities as role models for our public participation
- End up with fewer B&Cs, with greater focus and scope.
- Commonality re: staff support for B&Cs.
- Positive, collaborative relationships between B&Cs.
- Increased interdependence between neighbors.
- Vacancies on B&Cs should be filled by diverse populations.
- Like to see things/outcomes happen faster.
- Want citizens to be more interested in City government, and empowered through task forces.
- More diversity. Identify barriers to public participation.
- Templates for B&Cs and staff to use regarding role and responsibilities, goal setting, structure, recruiting and sunsetting.
- Go to the people and ask for input at non-conventional and diverse settings.
- Understand tangible and intangible costs.
- See City resources used well. Fewest meetings necessary to get things done.
- B&Cs producing work products as opposed to depending on staff to write them.
- Renewed faith in City government
- Staff should be seen as more of a resource, with citizens in charge (different dynamic and relationship)
- Greater visibility of neighborhood associations
- Process for City Council and B&Cs to use when creating task forces or major planning efforts to ensure citizen involvement from the beginning.
- The TF needs to get things done and have impact, accomplishments.
- Training/orientation for chairs of B&Cs.
- Want the TF to feel that they have significantly improved the system of B&Cs.

- Resources dedicated to ensure all people can participate, such as translation services, etc.
- Neighborhood associations need to be more proactive and less reactive.
- Identify/remove socioeconomic barriers to participation
- A CCI that advocates for all City activities; promotes diversity and citizen involvement.
- Is it necessary to engage those who don't want to be engaged?
- Task force needs to recognize there are different levels of citizen involvement.
- Elected officials and staff see citizens as a positive force.
- City budget process that is transparent and involves citizens.
- Provide trainings for citizen involvement so they know how to approach government

Attachment A

To: Public Participation Task Force **September 16, 2013**
From: Dan Brown, Ward 4 Councilor

Subject: Public Process and Participation Goal

Most Americans support the ideal of citizen participation. But do we all agree about what "citizen participation" means? One interpretation is that it is a process for running a government so that citizens will have a voice and government decision makers will listen to them. Starting historically in the 1960s the original context involved the "voice of the citizens" in project decisions made by the executive branch of the government.

Through the structure of City government, citizens can "participate" in a number of ways. Traditionally, they have been able to: vote in elections, speak to their elected representatives and run for elected office. In the last fifty years, new forms of continuing participation have become popular: volunteering in City organizations, getting appointed to a board/commission/task force, providing testimony at public meetings, filling out surveys, expressing opinions through "new media," reading official publications, etc. Some advocates consider lobbying, organizing, demonstrating, and even litigating through special interest groups to be citizen participation.

Various Goals of Citizen Participation:

Before the Public Participation Task Force sets about their advisory work, I would like all of us to think about what the PP&P goal is all about.

> **The Goal:** Why does the City Council want citizen participation in the first place?
>
> **The Problem(s):** Why do we want to change our current processes & structures?

I confess that I voted for the PP&P goal without understanding what it means. (I expect that Staff doesn't really understand it either.) From Sociology, I know definitions for "processes and structures," and from Economics, I know definitions of "effective and efficient." Although these goal variables sound great, I am very uncertain about how to measure: *develop diverse future leaders . . . enhance communication between citizens and the Council . . . help connect citizens to each other to strengthen community and neighborhoods . . . and utilize the expertise of citizen-volunteers in solving community problems.* I hope to learn more from the Task Force.

Figure I lists specific statements in *Vision 2020* about participation with some of my commentary. In addition, the City's annual *Citizen Attitude Survey* looked at representative data about how much the general population is involved in City government through a couple of avenues.

	2011	2010	2009	2008
Watched a meeting of local elected officials or other public meeting on cable television, the Internet or other media	18%	21%	25%	26%
Attended a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting	24%	20%	25%	29%

People can form their own opinions about how well we are getting people to participate.

After decades of personally "participating" in 509J, OSU, Benton County, and City processes, I observe that there are real costs (and even pitfalls) in poorly-designed or poorly-run processes. Sometimes, these include lack of transparency, obvious bias, lack of community consensus, loss of trust in government processes, continual pressure to increase in City services in spite of decreasing City budgets, and creation of an overwhelming workload for the City Council.

Participants' Roles in City Processes:

Over time, rules have been prescribed for both sides. "The citizens" should vote, should be proactive, should be informed, and should be willing to compromise. The government (City) should listen and should be: objective, transparent, and balanced. The City should also educate citizens about how participation processes work and should provide adequate notice about upcoming meetings.

The City Charter describes the roles of Mayor, Councilor, and City Manager. The Council has the responsibility for making policy (and quasi-judicial) decisions, and through the City Manager, staff has the duty to implement policy. Often the public's concerns and suggestions are aroused by the details of Staff's implementation, and sometimes by the Council's policies.

Regardless of the specific process, citizens can participate at different levels of influence. They can always receive information passively from the City and spontaneously provide ideas. A few processes are designed to capture certain citizens' expertise based on technical qualifications or based on specific experience, but not all are. Finally, I would hope that the Council would be very selective in choosing which citizen decisions to rubber stamp.

POWER GRANTED TO PARTICIPANTS

Less . . . . . More

Citizens Receive Information → From City	Citizens Brainstorm Ideas →	Some Citizens Can Provide Expertise →	Council Rubber Stamps Citizen Decisions

In any process, the authority granted to participants should be made explicitly clear on every occasion. Further, the amount of City resources allocated to the process should be known to them ahead of time. Failing to do these things creates incorrect expectations and hard feelings afterward.

Suggestions for Evaluating Effectiveness and Efficiencies of Structures and Processes

I've done some research on the internet and summarized my findings in the lists which appear in **Figure I** and **Figure II**. (The Task Force or the Council could use the resulting matrices to thoughtfully evaluate what we intend to accomplish). Horizontally, the "Structures and Processes" include the list of things the City does to engage citizens. To clarify the matrix, "Appointed Advisory Groups" includes a very long list.

A lot of new advisory groups have been created in just the last three years:

- Economic Development Commission
- Arts and Culture Commission
- Collaboration Steering Committee
- Collaboration Work Group: Neighborhood Liability
- Collaboration Work Group: Neighborhood Planning
- Collaboration Work Group: Parking and Traffic
- Property Maintenance Code Advisory Group
- Public Participation Task Force

The bottom line question is: In terms of efficiency (or redundancy), how many structures and processes does the City need to be effective and efficient? The "Effectiveness and Efficiency" goals are shown as vertical lists in two tables. I assume that the wording of the PP&P goal means we want to expand Benefits [**Figure I**] and/or reduce Costs [**Figure II**]. Although I have frequently heard "Better Decisions" cited as a benefit of participation, I don't know what that means. If the PPTF uses this term, I will need to know what that means.

Possible Reading

There are some examples and critiques concerning citizen/public participation on the internet. I recommend that the Task Force members look at a few. Here are some I found to be interesting:

City of Eugene, *Public Participation Guidelines*, July 2011, 79 pages.

City of Ashland, *Citizen Participation Plan*, February 2000, on City of Ashland website. http://www.ashland.or.us/Page.asp?NavID=116

Judith E Innes and David E. Booher, "Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century," *Planning Theory and practice*, 2004, pp. 419-436. http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4gr9b2v5

Figure II

POTENTIAL <u>BENEFITS</u> OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

← Structures and Processes →

	Ballot	Representa-tive Surveys	Appointed Advisory Groups	Testimony	Volunteering	Running for Election	Publicity	New Media	Special Interest Groups	Neighbor-Hood Assns.	Advisory Referendum*
Minimum State Requirement (e.g. Goal 1)			☺								
Democracy: i.e. Will of the governed	☺										
"Better" Decisions											
Greater Citizen Acceptance											
Avoid Litigation											
Free Labor					☺						
Reduce Citizen Surprise											
Train Future Electeds					☺						
Inform Public											
Public Trust, Credibility											

* I don't remember seeing this before, but it is mentioned in *Vision 2020.*

Figure III

POTENTIAL COSTS OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

← Structures and Processes →

	Ballot	Representa-tive Surveys	Appointed Advisory Groups	Testimony	Volunteering	Running for Election	Publicity	New Media	Special Interest Groups	Neighbor-Hood Assns.	Advisory Referendum*
Administra-tive Costs											
Time Delay											
Lack of Transparency											
Bias: non-inclusion and advocacy											
Conflict: Lack of Community Consensus											
Loss of Trust in City											

* I don’t remember seeing this before, but it is mentioned in *Vision 2020.*

Figure I

QUOTATIONS FROM *VISION 2020*

Neighborhood organizations are ***vigorous***

> Look at history over last 20 years. Many come to life to support or oppose specific issues (often opposing OSU related projects) and then wane or die. For example, once visible, North College Hill, lost the battle and evaporated. Now the Harding group is active because of livability issues associated with nearby college student housing. How many general interest neighborhood associations are "vigorous" today?

Most [>.50%] *citizens vote*

> Review of last 4 years: True for national elections / not true for local issues.

A broadly-based Committee for Citizen Involvement informs and ***assists*** *citizens on how to become involved . . .*

> Limited to land use processes. First group to take City budget cuts.

Citizens *. . . work proactively, directly, and positively to find common ground among their interests and those of other people in the community.*

Each board and commission is balanced in terms of members' ages, economic status, gender, race, philosophical concerns and professional experience.

Citizens are confident that their elected representatives will carefully consider their ideas and opinions.