



Community Involvement Committee (CIC) Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: April 12, 2023 | Time: 5:00 -7:00 pm

Location: Zoom meeting

Attendees:

Rachel Bernstein, Harranie Chavers, Valeria McWilliams, Brandon Spencer-Hartle (BPS), Cayla McGrail (BPS), Harmonee Dashiell (BPS), and Sarah Omlor (Enviroissues).

Apologies:

- Susan Novak, Daniel Hafner, Nikoyia Phillips (BPS), Anita Yap (MutliCultural Collaborative)

Welcome + Check-in (5:00 pm)

Harmonee Dashiell welcomed the committee and reviewed the meeting guidelines and agenda for the evening.

Project updates (5:15 pm)

Brandon Spencer-Hartle and Cayla McGrail briefed the committee about the National Park Service (NPS) grant to research LGBTQ+ sites that could be good candidates for the National Register of Historic Places. They asked for feedback on how the project can:

- Engage with underrepresented communities for a project that does not have a regulatory consequence
- Engage a small group of people with lived experiences to help guide a project with little time and budget
- Provide adequate public information on the BPS webpage and to community partners
- Not over-engaging a community based upon identities

They noted that they presented to the CIC in the past on a similar project which evaluated existing national register sites and identified new candidates with the intent of making the regulation around historic sites and districts more equitable. In this project the team heard from the community that there was a desire to allow for more flexibility in allowing underrepresented histories and flexibility around building rehabilitation in order to more easily save historic sites.

When this work was done in the past the team used engagement strategies such as mailers and listening sessions to specifically reach Black and African American residents. The team had better success once they brought on a consultant team who had existing connections in the community. At that time they also piloted a program to give stipends to folks who shared their stories. The team noted that the current project will be different from this past work in that the queer community has a lot of history that is not tied to physical places. They mentioned one of

the most famous queer sites recently added to the National Register was Darcelle XV's Showplace, but this designation was made possible through the effort of individuals rather than research by the project.

Cayla shared their background in historic preservation with a focus on queer preservation. They've recently completed research on other city's work in identifying and documenting LGBTQ+ sites for the Nation Register and has been specifically using San Francisco as a model for Portland. San Francisco has a historic planning document to offer guidance and NPS has also released a nationwide thematic study of LGBTQ+ histories.

The team shared that this project has a very short timeline, so they hope to begin engagement this summer. They are expected to have a list of potential sites compiled in 18 months, in the Fall of 2023.

CIC shared the following questions and feedback regarding the potential engagement strategies:

- Clarification on if historic landmarks need to still be there, or if they can be places that have been redeveloped?
 - Brandon said it's possible to be a building or home that has since been redeveloped, however some places may not be good candidates for a landmark designation if they are redeveloped into a parking lot for instance.
- Interest in Cayla's research on intersectionality in the LGBTQ+ community and how to engage with people around this.
- Suggestion to create a stakeholder committee or use focus groups to hear from and build relationships with people representing different interests in the work. This form of engagement is more personal than a survey.
- Suggestion to give project briefings to other existing commissions, even if they aren't a decision maker on the project there would be interest and could help spread the word.
- Recommendation to look into political histories around LGBTQ+ legislature like "No on 9". This campaign included a benefit concert that Nirvana played at here in Portland. Maybe that venue could be a landmark.
- Suggestion to look into recent history as well as political campaigns and past generation stories.
- Conversation around the level of formality that feels right in selecting a stakeholder committee for this work. There is a formal process for applying through the City but would that make some people uncomfortable or be too cumbersome for the timeline.
- Suggestion to start with individual stakeholder interviews or focus groups to gauge interest.
- Suggestion to begin with 'off-the-record' conversations if folks have personal histories to share.

- The project team plans to provide forms of anonymous feedback to protect privacy when appropriate and avoid outing anyone.
- Recommendation to use the City’s Pride employee resource group through the office of equity and human resources as a way to connect to interested people.
- Recommendation to start with broader community outreach because people not in the queer community could still spread the word or hold generational knowledge about friends and family.
- Recommendation to take out newspaper ads or seek earned media. The City has used Willamette Week before and Street Roots would be a good local paper because homelessness rates are higher in the queer community unfortunately.
- Suggestion to also try social media ads and posts if print schedules don’t align.
- Recommendation to create and hang posters at locations related with the LGBTQ++ communities. Could include QR codes since they are very popular these days.

Bureau updates (6:10 pm)

Harmonee shared an update about the new Interim Director of BPS and a new Chief Planner. She noted there are unlikely to be changes to our work but it’s possible. She also said that BPS staff are beginning to go back to the office at least one day a week. She also reminded everyone about the new state policy going into effect for public meetings that will require accommodations for in-person participation beginning this fall. Hybrid remote and in-person accommodations are being planned to accommodate everyone. The committee staff still welcomes suggestions for meeting spaces that have technical components for joining Zoom meetings and aren’t in downtown since the Portland building will be available there.

Discussion (6:20 pm)

Harmonee kicked off discussion about the future of the CIC. She asked for honest feedback on the members’ experience and suggestions for improvement.

The following summarized a few points of discussion:

- Appreciated receiving the agenda and relevant project information before the meetings. This was shared days before in the digital calendar invite and made it easier to come prepared than in-person meetings when the information was only provided at the meeting.
- Appreciated having a list of specific questions that the project team has for the CIC to guide the discussion, rather than being too open ended.
- Recommendation for project teams to provide a short briefing of the engagement work they’ve already done so that CIC suggestions aren’t duplicative.

- Appreciated the size of the CIC when it had 10+ members, but appreciate the smaller groups for more in depth discussion.
- Recommendation to make the CIC's role very clear in comparison to the (PIAC) so there isn't confusion for project teams.
- Recommendation to set a consistent standard for compensation for the committee.
- Suggestion to provide space for sharing individual values in participating in this work at onboarding. People are here for different reasons and it's helpful to know.
- Discussion around the CIC's role becoming a requirement rather than just a resource.
- Discussion around the CIC's capacity to review multiple projects per meeting.

Meeting Evaluation + Next Steps (6:55 pm)

The meeting evaluation was shared digitally. The group adjourned approximately at 7:00 pm.

Adjourn (7:00 pm)