MEETING SUMMARY

City of Boulder
Public Participation Working Group (PPWG)
Monday, December 12
4 pm – 7 pm
.
Agenda

Time	Topic
4:00 – 4:10	**Introductions and Agenda Review**
4:10 – 4:20	**Public Comment**
4:20 – 4:30	**Communications Report: How is Google Group Working?**
4:30 – 4:45	Review: Revisit the PPWG Purpose and Charge. **Desired Outcome: Ensure that the PPWG is on track. Make adjustments as needed.**
4:45 – 6:00	Discussion and Agreement: Review, refine and prioritize sub-committee topics and issues. Form subcommittees. **Desired Outcome: Identify and form subcommittees. Develop subcommittee questions and priority issue areas for subcommittees. Develop and standardize a structure and report-out system. Generate next steps and action items.**
6:00 – 6:10	**BREAK and Public Engagement**
6:10 – 6:40	Discussion: PPWG Report for Council **Desired Outcome: Determine PPWG Report deadline, topics, format, PPWG member contribution and drafting plan.**
6:40 – 6:50	**Agenda item suggestions for January Meeting** *Topics suggested so far:* *- Public engagement and event/workshop/outreach/survey* *- Re-examine the June timeline for final recommendations.*
6:50 – 7:00	**Public Comment**

MEETING SUMMARY

Introductions and Welcome and Agenda Review

Invited PPWG Attendees: Darvin Ayre, DeAnne Butterfield, Michael Caplan, Carol Cogswell, Sean Collins, Ann Cooper, Sandra Diaz, Lisa Harris, Marjorie Larner, Claire Riley, Brady Robinson, Bill Shrum and Seth Spielman

City Council Representative: Lisa Morzel

City Staff: Jean Gatza, Amanda Nagl, Patrick Von Keyserling

Facilitators: Jonathan Bartsch and Taber Ward

Members of the Public: Lydia Reinig, Peter, Beth Bennett, Gregory Medvin, David Edwin Ward, Lynn Segal, Susan Balint

Communications Report: How is Google Group Working?

The PPWG would like to get going on Google Group. The next step is to get directions of how to subscribe on the City's PPWG website so the group can receive public comment.

The Communications subcommittee will be meeting again to go over moderation, receiving public comments etc.

Revisiting Purpose and Charge

Excerpted from the PPWG Operating Protocol:

I.   *Public Participation Working Group Purpose*

The purpose of the Public Participation Working Group is to develop meaningful and actionable recommendations that improve dialogue between the city (Council, Boards and staff) and community members, resulting in increased transparency and civic representation in decision-making processes, improved relationships and informed community conversations.

II.   *Working Group Charge*

The Public Participation Working Group (PPWG or Working Group) will:

- *Review and assess current city public processes and decision making;*
- *Identify best practices, current successes and lessons learned from previous city efforts;*
- *Employ active listening communication techniques to ensure mutual understanding*
- *Recommend ways for making improvements for civic engagement processes which foster success for both the city (Council, Boards, staff) and community members;*

- *Make recommendations to the City Council and Boards and community about possible modifications to public participation processes that improve the effectiveness of city decision making;*
- *Make recommendations that promote mutual respect and clarify responsibilities of the city (Council, Boards, staff) and community members to engage with and listen to each other more effectively.*

Note: *The PPWG will <u>not</u> make recommendations that address specific City projects. Instead, the PPWG will use lessons from the past and/or current projects to focus on ways to improve future civic engagement processes and efforts across the city.*

PPWG Discussion:

- Group members suggest that they would like to start talking about "participation" instead of engagement. Can look to Susan Balint's definitions of these words.
- There is discussion around "what is 'open and transparent?' If the City says "we are open and transparent" and people didn't know about it, is it open and transparent? It is important to think about how these principles translate into action.
- The Purpose requires that the PPWG makes recommendations to "improve" dialogue. Charge doesn't talk about dialogue.
- There is a question of ethical ideal versus practice. The PPWG is trying to understand mutual accountability of all parties.
- As we dive into subgroups - don't want to end up doing autopsies that become a political football. Not a productive use of time. Better to focus on lessons learned. Don't need to engage in maelstrom.
- We need to make sure we don't go so deep into assessment and find right level of detail.
- Subcommittees need to bring their recommendations to the big group and we need to come up with METRICS to measure success of recommendation and evaluate whether this is working properly.
  - What would success look like?

A suggestion for a starting point:

1. Use IAPT2 – can we accept these as principles?? Just move on
2. Case studies – we were asked to dive into case studies. Lens of case studies very helpful
3. Need to focus on public good. What is success for City (council, board, staff, city manager)
4. Success is creating shared narratives and doing good policy analysis to look at what is good and what is not good.

City Council Report

The PPWG does not need to give a status report or update. Lisa Morzel would appreciate the following questions answered by PPWG members **as individuals** who are on the PPWG workgroup. This is optional:

1.   How do you think the city can improve the current public process and how can the city better engage the public?
2.   What do you think are the City's three major challenges over the next five years?

3. What do you think the City's top three priorities should be?

This is an individual exercise that is part of the PPWG – please identify yourself as part of PPWG.

Subcommittee Formation

Subcommitee Discussion

1. Systems and culture of engagement
2. Standards and principals for public process (IAPT2 and/or other ones)? MERGE WITH # 1?
3. Issue Identification subcommittee
4. Case Studies
5. Best Practices/Worst Practices

Systems and Culture of Engagement Subcommittee

a. Need a cultural and systemic view of how we move forward
b. Vision of what we want Boulder to be
c. Explore decision-making processes
d. Can there be more informal/unofficial meetings with decision-makers and community
e. Can there be dialogues with decision-makers? (e.g. informal co-op meeting between Council members and community)
f. How do we approach the problem that the decision has already been made? When is there a benefit to the City to hear from people early on?
g. Education plan - How do we structure and educate the public on how to participate?
h. What "story" are we telling?
i. How do we ensure that the decision-makers in our community that really care about public participation?

Need to scope this really tightly and doing some more definitional work. Standards and principals of public process could role into this really nicely – Use IATP2 to start. Need to think about broader system, structure and culture.

Recommendations that come out of this subcommittee:

1. IDing behaviors, attitudes
2. Code of ethics
3. Certain processes
4. More inclusive
5. Public engagement that is proactive
6. Be clear on what processes and structures you create and what expectations you create.
7. We are creating expectations that are not playing out?
8. EX: "roll up your sleeves" BVCP – creates the assumption that people will get in there as part of a workgroup. This wasn't it. They were looking for discreet inputs.
9. Specific places that we can make recommendations, i.e. Planning work
10. "Vision of what we want Boulder to be" – this is general, this seems really airy fairy. Would like to quickly narrow it to tangible things to address.
11. Need to figure out language to use, identifying an issue and the issue is, how to make sure that we are using appropriate language and defining terms appropriately. So when people come to meetings they know what their expectation is.

12. We are talking about process side of it. Using IATP2. This model was used in Longmont 15 years ago, how is it working now? 15 years later? Understanding where you can be most effective?
13. Creating expectations around different types of decision-making and processes.
14. When you look at culture it is the story we tell, standards and beliefs. Looking at what could be a culture that values public participation. Supporting bringing in standards, principles and metrics

Standards and principals for public process (some suggested this topic go under Systems and Culture Subcommittee)

SHOULD WE MERGE 1 and 2?

1. looking into different departments and what they do
2. Can the public participation process be standardized across departments? Development of a city-wide process or principles?
3. How do we engage the public in a timely manner?
4. How do we report back to the community?

We as a group need to get to recommendations. Are we going to get there?

Issue Identification subcommittee

1. Movement for some of the other subcommittee topics to be put in issue identification subcommittee
2. Does outreach stay here or get split off?
3. Case studies can go here

Best practices will complement all subcommittees

Case Studies – what does this subcommittee do?

1. Identify issues
2. Lessons learned
3. What was effective not effective

PPWG would like to see a quick process – 6 weeks and then subcommittee is over. Next 4-6 weeks: understand problem statements, key issues, topics, strategies, we are not making recommendations yet.

The PPWG Proposed the following Subcommittees

1. Systems and culture of engagement and Standards and principals for public process

2. Issue Identification subcommittee and Case Studies

3. Best Practices/Worst Practices

4. Public Outreach (as a working group and for the City)

GROUP 1 & 2: Systems and culture of engagement and Standards and principals for public process

BIG TAKEAWAY: Look at IATP Framework to have a better understanding of how this can inform our group in different scenarios. Cannot have the same thing happen all the time. Different scenarios. Put together another subcommittee meeting by the end of this week/weekend. Share information on Google Group.

This subcommittee will meet again later this week. Come up with some bullet points of what we want to investigate and synthesize what we've read and what other people have said and how we can rank what is important.

We are excited as the IAP2 as a grounding document – likes that the city is also using this document.

Need to define words

Look at what is the current culture, mindset, attitude that the city perceived and what the city would find to be a better mindset.

Group 3&4: Issue Identification subcommittee and Case Studies

- Separate issue identification and case studies (specific issues that have happened – lessons learned – new analysis)
- Take existing content and response to neighborhood summit, e-mails etc.. internal
- Get together to reconcile;
- Tabled discussion of public outreach, who we aren't hearing from to make sure we target the right people.
- Both groups are identifying issues in different ways.
- For the future be able to ask the right questions, ask them directly. -

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT BACK TEMPLATE– January 9

Problem Statement

Topic Areas

Key Questions

Strategies (potential)

Data Gaps and Evaluation

Public Comment

Susan Balint – Need to develop questions for reaching out. What is the maximized effort to reach out? Two ways to define the PPWG – 1. A work group or an 2. Advisory group.

How does the city perceive public participation as compared to the public's expectations and protocols. City doesn't often think about public input.

Issues specific – emergency attitude is different than public participation, more than one arm or leg to focus on; see it differently. Not who is left out but how those who participate are they being evaluated.

David Ward - Grateful to be met with; if you want to find out what the public input/engagement is, first ask – who has too much of a voice? Who do we listen to every day, minute etc…?Business has a lot of weight, bigger businesses have bigger voices; people need shelter and need a place to sleep at night. Make sure that everyone is heard not an easy task to turn the volume down on some and up on others.

Lynn Segal – There are fundamental issues in this town impact fees and housing costs; public process needs to be changed (CU South, Twin Lakes, Academy on the Hill), reduce the demand for public communication – more real dialogue with the community. 1st 20 people that come in, it isn't iterative and not overwhelming. Who's not talking about housing costs, property tax higher than my mortgage now!?!?