

City of Boulder
Public Participation Working Group

Monday, March 20, 2017

4:00 pm – 7: 00 pm

East Boulder Community Center, 5660 Sioux Dr., Flagstaff room

Agenda

Meeting Purpose: To discuss the Draft Report Framework(s) and agree upon a Framework for the final report. To establish whether to use additional subcommittees to synthesize concepts and draft Recommendations. To establish accountability measures and schedule milestones.

Time	Agenda Topic
4:00 pm – 4:10 pm	Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review
4:10 pm – 4:20 pm	Public Comment
4:20 pm – 4:40 pm	Debrief and Discussion: Review of Special Subcommittee Working Session Desired Outcome: PPWG is informed about the outcomes and action items from the 3/13/17 Special Subcommittee Meeting
4:40 – 5:50	Review and Discussion: Review of the PPWG Charter and DRAFT Report Framework Desired Outcome: PPWG agrees on a framework for the Recommendation Report based on the PPWG Charge. <i>Subcommittees may be formed for further exploration of topics, including: Values and Principles, Case Studies/Lessons Learned Integration, Problem Statements, Solutions and Recommendations, Decision Making, City Council Retreat topics.</i>
5:50 pm – 6:00 pm	Break
6:00 pm – 6:15 pm	Review and Discussion: Accountability and Recommendations Schedule Milestones Desired Outcome: PPWG reviews and agrees upon milestones and a timeline for action to develop the recommendations.
6:15 pm – 6:30 pm	Staff Review and Discussion: Development Notification Process Desired Outcome: Jean Gatza to present on the Development Notification Process. Possible subcommittee formation.
6:30 pm - 6:45 pm	Discussion: Checking in with City Council and Considering the Items from the Council Retreat The official CC Retreat notes are here: https://documents.bouldercolorado.gov/weblink8/0/doc/140235/Electronic.aspx . Community engagement items that the CC would like PPWG to address start on page 32. Desired Outcome: PPWG agrees on how to engage City Council in the Recommendation and Report process. PPWG considers the public participation topics from the Council Retreat.
6:45 pm – 6:50 pm	Next Steps and Action Items
6:50 pm – 7:00 pm	Public Comment

Attachment
PPWG Recommendations Framework – Final Report
(DeAnne and Darwin template)
DRAFT 3-18-17

1. What are the Values and Principles of Good Public Engagement?

(Kristie and CDR in red)

1. CLEARLY DEFINE THE PROJECT/PROGRAM VISION AND THE PURPOSE AND NEEDS.

Clearly state, for all, the vision for the project or program, why it is being examined and what problems it is attempting to solve; engage stakeholders, ensuring multiple opportunities for education and input.

2. PLAN PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT EARLY, PREPARE THOUGHTFULLY

As early as possible in the process, develop a Public Engagement Plan, that creates multiple opportunities for all stakeholders to engage. Implement and evaluate the effectiveness of the Plan, with the input of the public, and make adjustments and learn lessons.

Commented [JB1]: Stakeholders can be a term that limits participation – only those with standing?

Commented [JB2]: Best practice here is to engage the public in the development of the PI Plan.

3. INCLUSIVE INVOLVEMENT

Ensure all voices are represented and have broad access to a transparent decision making process that ensures equitable outcomes. Employ a 'go to them' strategy by reaching out to where people live, work and play, particularly with those not traditionally engaged in City processes. Provide support for community needs and aspirations.

4. CONNECT, COMBINE, COOPERATE

Come to the table with an open mind and without pre-conceived notions, assuming the best intent of all involved, remaining open to opposing opinions, exploring new ideas and considering new options, providing encouragement and support, ensuring all involved can participate and contribute in a meaningful manner and that regardless of the outcome, all can take pride.

5. PAY ATTENTION TO THE PROCESS

Throughout the planning and implementation process, remain transparent, with accurate record keeping, so that anyone may access information. Provide accessible

information on current public processes (e.g. on the web and in writing) to ensure that citizens can get involved.

6. EXPECTATIONS AND DECISION MAKING

Establish clear expectations for the public and educate them about the timeline for the decision making process. Provide meaningful and collaborative opportunities throughout the process - vision and purpose, criteria, alternatives and ways to mitigate impacts. "Close the loop" with the public about how input was used, or not, in the decision making, aligning the decision with the public input received.

7. CAPACITY BUILDING AND COMMUNICATION

Provide public participation capacity building opportunities for both the community and City staff (Council, Boards, and Commissions) to learn how to engage and participate effectively in decision-making processes. Establish an expectation and provide forums for effective, 2-way communication, among the community as well as between the community and City staff.

Address misunderstandings by proactively providing accurate, accessible information on projects, planning, and decision-making processes. Make information available using accessible format and means. Provide translation services and accommodate those who are visually or hearing impaired.

2. Identifying the Problem. What is the Process of Public Engagement in Boulder? What are the Current Issues and Problems with this Process? What Issues are We Trying to Solve and Why?

(Michael Caplan and Sandra)

3. Steps to Effective Engagement Planning/ Preparation

(DeAnne and Darwin)

- 1) Understand the context, issues, the people involved and impacted
- 2) Frame the decision/s that need to be made and the roles people have (citizens, council, city staff, boards, etc.)
- 3) Understanding results from the first two steps... determine the purpose for engagement and what level of engagement makes sense or is appropriate (see IAP2 Spectrum)
- 4) Build a participation plan that recognizes all the ways and levels of detail different people may want or may like to be involved. Go to where people live work and play
- 5) Align participation with the decision- making process. Help everyone understand how, when and where their input is used...make data and analysis transparent. **Create a decision-tree model.**

- 6) Evaluate the process over time and often--gather lessons learned and continue to improve process/es. **What happens when the process goes wrong?**

4. Recognize Complexity, Uncertainties, Interconnections, Root Causes and Long-term Consequences

(Excerpted and Summarized from Bill and Claire's document)

- How to start talking about wicked problems
- Understanding the scale of problems and how to tailor public engagement processes to the specific type of decision. Not all decisions will require the same level or type of engagement.
- The public engagement structure needs to match the complexity of the issue.
- For example, a process around determining Rec Center Hours will be different than the process to update the Comprehensive Plan for the next 5 years.
 - These processes have different levels of public engagement.

Key Themes

- **We won't solve all the problems.**
- **What changes or impact from this?** Content and process? Each intervention into a 'wicked problem' creates consequences.
- **Be more specific with the questioning.**
- **The work starts by hearing what the personal interest and wants are from two parties, the goal is to further define the need vs. the want.** This process should explicitly recognize that people are encouraged to *want* things from the city and that is why they get engaged.
- **We can attempt to include the people who are going to be most affected, but** there should be no assumptions that the city knows everyone who may be affected by policy, and by what measure.
- **Real life relationships - "How do you think about this?"** The engagement process should be predicated by people using their words to describe their thoughts and their livelihood.
- **Public Participation has different elements that will address different problems:** Values - Mission - Strategy - Tactics – Actions
 - **Values** are very abstract, and far from the individual, tangible impacts. A **mission** is a conception for how to put values into practice. **Strategies** are long-term conceptions for further operationalizing a mission. **Tactics** are short-term plans for operationalizing a strategy. **Actions** are the actual "doing", the implementation of a tactic.

- There are different frames of reference, different value constructions, different operational considerations at each of these levels, and they do not always translate 1:1 with another level.
- **The “complexity” of any given “problem” can be considered when you think of how many different scales need to be working in concert to address the “problem”.**
- Considering the “**pareto principle**”, or 80/20 rule. A majority of people will most likely be interested in the most directly relevant level of engagement, “How does this impact me?” “What do I need to do?” “Do I want to change?” Fewer people will want to be involved with the Tactical considerations of how these actions are collectively orchestrated. Fewer still will want to discuss the strategic intent. Fewer still would be invested in the mission or values level discussions around these actions.
- **In every instance of correspondence or actions, there should be a key developed to quickly orient the participants to what level of discussion is taking place, and if they do not want to engage in that specific level, resources on how to engage at different levels should be provided.**
 - How does this process start? Essentially, by waiting for the public to describe what “they” think of a problem, they will use words which identify the context in which they frame. Based on the clustering of data from these *listening* sessions, staff can start to identify both what the public is concerned about, and at what operational scale. At that point, they can begin to propose operational techniques to respond to the public concerns, verifying the conclusions and asking “I heard you say this... did I get that right?”

5. Lessons Learned from Case Studies

(Lisa)

Housing Issues, Right Sizing, North TSA, etc.

6. Recommendations and Solutions

A. Create Structures that Support Improved Engagement

(DeAnne and Darwin)

1. Create Office of Engagement and Communication

- Elevate the quality and importance of engagement
- Responsible to promote the Principles and move the culture through the organization
- Expertise to serve as internal consultant to all departments for design of public process
- Modify emphasis on “push” communication for most contacts with community members to promote and enhance 2- way communication between the City, residents and groups

- Help the Boulder community better understand how residents and groups can play in the civic space with clear expectations and roles while also having constructive input and impact on issues they care about
- Manage interconnections of P2 activities among projects and departments
- Advise Council & Manager on infusing public engagement into decision processes and work plans
- Monitor and evaluate public process during and after

2. Build Skills of Residents, Interest Groups, Neighborhoods, Staff, Boards and Council

- Bring on/ develop in- house expertise (or consultants) that have a deep understanding of engagement models and how to build a stronger, more interactive culture of engagement- with community members and internally within city departments and administrative functions.
- Help develop a learning culture where skills development and learning around innovative/ interactive engagement tools becomes the norm.
- Offer the above skills development throughout the city's departments and administration... while setting the stage to develop similar (appropriate level) skills amongst other key stakeholder groups (including citizens, not-for-profits, neighborhood associations, HOA's, business owners, boards and commissions, etc...)

What might they learn?

- Conversation and Dialogue Skills
- Conflict Resolution
- Agenda Building- Process Design
- Facilitation Skills from Basic to Advanced, including tools for decision- making and problem-solving
- How the city and its processes work- the basics.
- Engagement Models and the Tools and Skills they require.
- Risk Analysis

3. Continue to develop the Neighborhood Summit model (or similar) formats that may engage different aspects/ perspectives in the community (Business, town-university, newcomers to Boulder, low income, workers and employers, etc.)

- Help to build community engagement understanding and skills
- Bring together a diversity of opinions and perspectives that can help different viewpoints engage productively
- Build opportunities for dialogue and conversations that can "cement" Boulder community values or help us all understand how they may be changing and be better able to set a new course

4. Community impact statement created before each decision of an appropriate scale. This will provide consistency, communication and transparency for decision-making process.

(Carol)

6. Conclusion

7. Some questions from Cultures and Systems Subcommittee that remain unanswered... **present these to the entire group**

- 1) **Too much going on.** How much can our community members take in/ take on? And, still feel knowledgeable/ productive? Are we overwhelming our community members? Exhausting them with too many initiatives to care about or take action on? (related to ongoing input that community members may be exhausted and perception that Boulder tries to do too much or “be the best” at the expense of excellence) This also impacts city staff, council and other community organizations.
- 2) Do we need to do a better job of articulating our community’s assumptions around shared values? Do we still have the same shared assumptions on...
 - Affordable housing
 - Open Space
 - Levels of density
 - Cooperative housing
 - Transportation
 - And many others...
- 3) Would we consider advocating for a different starting point for conversations for creating a shared community vision (related to #2)? Right now, the assumption may be that everyone is on the same page- perhaps thinking that the Comp Plan accomplishes this.
- 4) Should there be an “Advisory Council” or some structure in place to support any Office of Community Engagement that is formed... assuming council and staff like the idea?
- 5) What other questions????