

City of Boulder
Public Participation Working Group
Tuesday, May 15, 2017
4:00 pm – 7: 00 pm
MSC Large Conference Room (5050 Pearl St.)

Agenda

Meeting Purpose: To 1) Solicit feedback from PPWG Members on Report, 2) Agreement on Report, and 3) Identify Next Steps and Action Items

Time	Agenda Topic
4:00 pm – 4:05 pm	Welcome, Agenda Review (CDR)
4:05 pm – 4:15 pm	Quick Review: Final Report Draft (PPWG Members review final report draft)
4:15 – 4:45 pm	Discussion: PPWG ask clarifying questions re:The Final Report Desired Outcome: PPWG has an understanding about the different sections of the Report
4:45 pm – 6:00 pm	Discussion: Review Report Framework and Content Desired Outcome: PPWG members refine and agree on final report. PPWG members answer the following questions 1) what is missing, 2) what can we agree on? 3) does this report reflect where the group is at this point?
6:00 pm – 6:30 pm	Discussion: Round Robin Desired Outcome: Identify areas of support as well as areas of where members have key concerns.
6:30 pm – 6:50 pm	Next Steps
6:50 pm – 7:00 pm	Public Comment

Meeting Summary

Introduction

Taber Ward, CDR Associates, opened the meeting by welcoming attendees, reviewing the agenda, and allowed Public Participation Working Group (PPWG) members a period of time to review the Report Draft in the current iteration. Following this period, the PPWG members moved to discuss any clarifying questions that they may have had.

Discussion: Clarifying Questions

Members of the PPWG were asked if they needed any clarification regarding the Report Draft. The questions were addressed during the meeting, with all questions leading to satisfactory conclusions. The goal of this Discussion was to ensure that all members of the PPWG has an understanding about the different sections of the Report. Following are the clarification questions asked:

- Located under section III. The Case for Change, #3C, the usage of the word “sufficient” is quite vague in the sentence, “The recruitment process often is not adequate in recruiting sufficient potential applicants.” This question will be resolved during the final editing of the Report, with sufficient being defined more clearly.
- Located on Page 6, the third sentence in the first paragraph, the term “wicked problem” should be defined. The term “wicked problem” will be defined in the “Definitions” section at the end of the report.
- Section IV. Core Principles of Good Public Engagement was brought up as a section that was not understood, in both purpose and meaning. This was resolved with a quick explanation connecting the section as a foundation for the Recommendations made by the PPWG.
- The phrase “level of involvement” in step 3 of “Create a Public Engagement Plan” is vague and needs to be more specific.

Discussion: Review Report Framework and Content

Following the clarification discussion, the PPWG was then asked three questions pertaining to the Report Draft. These questions included: 1) What is missing? 2) What can we agree on? 3) Does this reflect where the group is at this point? The desired outcome of this portion of the meeting was to refine and agree on the final report. The discussion flowed freely and organically, so responses were not directly addressed to specific questions. As such, responses included:

- Located in Section III. The Case for Change, #3E, the sentence, “There is a lack of coordination between Boards, etc. and City Council so that council is informed about what is happening regularly to avoid surprises. Boards, etc. could play a collaborative role between council and the community.” should be reframed into a problem statement.
- There was discussion about the need to be more specific in recommendations for the Council. Specific actions such as a “one stop website,” educating the public in workshops, and other actions should be included in the Final report
- The issue of scope and scale has been discussed frequently during PPWG meetings. The inclusion of a section that discusses and explains scope and scale is suggested.
- Suggestions to ensure that the order of any listed items is by priority and not random.

Discussion: Round Robin

Each member of the PPWG was asked what they were most excited about and what they were most concerned about. Members of the PPWG were each asked individually these questions, and the discussion moved around the room in an

orderly fashion, with everyone getting an opportunity to speak. The purpose of this discussion was to identify areas of support as well as areas where members have key concerns.

Key points included:

- Several members expressed their excitement and happiness with the recommendations of the group. Instead of prescribing specific tools and techniques, the group was bold in their address of the root problem facing public participation in the City of Boulder.
- The vast majority of the PPWG expressed their
- The usage of Public Engagement vs. Public Participation vs. Community Engagement was discussed as an area that could be improved in the Report. These terms all mean different things and the PPWG wishes to employ correct and consistent usage throughout the Report.
- The collaborative nature of the PPWG in forming this Report was mentioned as a positive by PPWG members. Most were proud of the way individuals were able to come together and produce a Report that they feel proud of.

Action Items

- Establishing a Drafting Subcommittee to finish editing the Final Report Draft