



## Community Involvement Committee (CIC) Meeting Minutes

**Meeting Date:** December 13, 2022 | Time: 5:00 -7:00 pm

**Location:** Zoom Meeting

### Attendees:

Jim Gorter, Brian Romer, Calvin Hoff, Janette Clay, Susan Novak, Harmonee Dashiell (BPS), Nikoyia Phillips (BPS), Sarah Omlor (Enviroissues), Alan DeLaTorre (BPS)

**Apologies:** Hannah Walters

---

### Welcome + Check-in (5:00 pm)

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

### Public Comment (5:30 pm)

*No public comments were made.*

### Project Updates (5:15 pm)

Alan DeLaTorre, Age-Friendly Portland program manager at BPS, returned to the CIC to continue discussion on the Age-and Disability-Inclusive Neighborhoods (ADIN) action plan.

Alan shared that based on the feedback received from the CIC in November, and additional input from stakeholders, the project has revised their public involvement approach to collect information from existing partners citywide, rather than in specific areas of the city. The project is now asking the CIC's feedback on the following:

- 1. What advice do you have for ground-truthing the priorities identified in *Table 1* with the community? (Note: the challenge we're running into is sharing a long list of priorities and trying to get meaningful feedback that can guide our work.)**
- 2. What advice or suggestions do you have related to the proposed approaches (p. 3)? (Note: we highlighted the youth-oriented approaches as a CIC focus but are also interested any general feedback.)**

Alan began the discussion by showing a list of priorities and problems identified by the Age- and Disability-Inclusive Neighborhood Work Group. Two versions of this list were made, one that includes bolded priorities that were identified as being specific to land use since those are the priorities most closely related to BPS' work in Planning. He asked the CIC which list they thought was better to use to get meaningful feedback.

CIC shared the following feedback:

- Preference for the blank list of priorities as opposed to the land use highlighted list.
  - CIC members noted that by highlighting the land use specific priorities, other priorities like Climate appear to be de-prioritized.
  - Question about if the list could go back to the working group and be re-prioritized after feedback from the CIC or the public.
    - Alan confirmed that was possible. He said the project and working group are merely trying to guide the work to be successful by starting with the land use components since they would start with BPS, but are not limiting the process one way or the other.
- Question about the current level of buy-in from other bureaus and organizations on this project.
  - Alan explained that this project will require collaboration with other bureaus such as Prosper Portland with the economic development side, Portland Housing Bureau and other organizations on the housing side, and Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) with the mobility and public right-of-way portions. In the next few months the project will be working on reaching out to these bureaus and finding project managers to work with.
- Questions about why BPS is housing this project as opposed to other City bureaus since the project will require so much collaboration from other bureaus.
  - Alan explained that the project is an incomplete fit for any one of the city bureaus because it's such a multifaceted project and that other conveners were considered for this work. But BPS is the best fit because they house all of the code changes that would be at the core of the project.
  - Harmonie noted that this is a common configuration for projects and that BPS often acts as the 'convener' for projects that require cross collaboration.
- Suggestions to consolidate the list since some priorities feel overlapping like Communication, Education on Accessibility, Internet Access, and Libraries.
  - Alan offered a possibility to go back to the 'petal' model shown in the last meeting that included 8 categories of age friendly planning.
  - Another option would be to split up the priorities by the bureau that will house the work.
  - Preference for grouping them by bureau partnership because it is less abstract that way and seems to show that the work is actually getting done because it is assigned to a partner and holds them accountable to the goal.
  - Suggestion to categorize the priorities both ways so that you could see the implementation plan and accountability, but you could also note if any of the priorities fall off the list by lacking a partner to take it on.

- Suggestion to more widely leverage synergies between agencies for implementation. Concern for focusing too narrowly on an issue and cutting off potential partnerships or solutions.
- Alan summarized that he's hearing a need to dig deeper into some of these issues and figure out what it will take for them to be addressed which will be an exciting step to research and build into a list of potential partners and overlapping work.

Next, Alan asked for feedback on the proposed approaches list.

CIC shared the following feedback:

- Clarification on what Community Vision is.
  - Alan explained that is the name of a disability organization that Alan Hines, who attended the last meeting, works for. Community Vision is a current partner of the project to specifically help with engaging the disability community. Community Vision received a grant to help with work on this project and others for BPS.
  - Alan explained that they will help with work relating to people with physical disabilities, mental disabilities, and possibly including people on the autism spectrum. There will be a separate but related working group for caregivers of people with disabilities.
  - Question on whether this includes professional caregivers or family caregivers.
    - Alan clarified that it is a group of informal caregivers because professional caregivers are represented through the County counterpart, the Disability and Veterans' Services group.
- Questions about what age group is represented in the term 'youth'?
  - Alan noted in his past experience there's been engagement with 18-24 year old's or kids living in foster care 12 and under.
  - Alan asked what age group should be engaged that can give meaningful feedback?
    - Suggestions for high school student engagement. This age group makes the most sense because it's the first time as a child that you are probably starting to go into the community on your own.
    - High school students are also accessible through various programs to give presentations to classes i.e. Metropolitan Youth Commission, Sun Schools, Elevate Oregon.
    - High school students are also more likely to be living in multi-generational homes.

- Suggestion to leverage the connections that PBOT already has with the local public and private schools since they will be a project partner.
  - Clarification over if these means youth with disabilities, or all youth?
  - Alan said all youth would be considered as the other end of the age spectrum.
  - Suggestion for using design charrettes as ways to engage youth, like the PSU Architecture does often. It's important to use active and tangible engagement methods when working with the youth.
  - Harmonee highlighted a recent project in Parkrose as an example of using a design charrette and creating a zine from the outreach outcomes.
  - Suggestion to leverage the youth outreach program at the Office of Civic Life.
  - Suggestion to co present with someone closer in age to the students which has worked better in the past.
- The CIC gave additional suggestions to find people to engage in this work:
    - Neighborhood associations that might have particularly high population of elderly or disabled community members.
    - People participating in the SOLVE neighborhood cleanup events.
    - Library patrons.
    - Faith communities.
    - Public access TV and assisted living facilities to reach the elderly demographic.
  - Suggestion to engage different groups of people in multiple different places, but have one survey to consolidate the feedback.

### **Equity Toolkit Training (6:10 pm)**

Harmonee gave a brief training on the BPS Equity toolkit. The toolkit was developed with the help of a consultant and is designed to be used by all BPS employees. It includes a worksheet that projects may use in presenting to the CIC, so it's important that the CIC is familiar with it. Harmonee emphasized that the toolkit is not set in stone and doesn't mean that mistakes can't be made, but it will hopefully help project teams to be more intentional around equity and cause less harm. Feedback is always welcome on the toolkit.

The training included walking through the equity analysis checkboxes using Portland's animal code as a case study. Based on the example and the equity analysis worksheet prompts the CIC discussed the following:

- How many animals are allowed and what is the process for getting a permit for them?  
How easy is it for residents to access this information?

- Is there a way to waive permit fees for those that need to raise animals for economic reasons?
- What are the requirements for how animals need to be housed? Could be another economic barrier.
- How likely neighbors are to complain could be linked to how expensive the animal enclosures are. Fancier coops would be less likely to receive complaints.
- There is probably a direct correlation between how much land you have and how many complaints you would receive from neighbors, another economic divide.
- CIC members' personal experiences with the animal code and animals in their neighborhood.

After the case study the CIC had the following question:

- This exercise really requires empathy, or thinking about how something might affect others. What if you're not able to put yourself in their shoes because you haven't experienced the same things? Is diversity the answer?
  - Harmonee agreed that diversity is important to have people with an array of experiences at the table. However, you will always be missing someone at the table. The goal is that we do our due diligence to miss less.

### **Announcements/Housekeeping (6:50 pm)**

Harmonee discussed a few items of housekeeping for the committee:

- She reminded the committee that the Bureau will have a photographer to take headshots on site in January and invites the CIC to have headshots taken for the CIC webpage, and their own personal use. This will be available at the next meeting on January 13, 2023 and other dates that week if needed.
- She asked the CIC if they cared that the February meeting is scheduled on Valentine's Day. Options are to hold the February meeting as usual, cancel the meeting entirely, or keep it as a virtual meeting and only do some internal work. A poll will be sent out to ask for everyone's preference.
- She noted that since the recent Charter reform has passed, there's a chance that there could be impacts to the CIC like allowing for a wider range of projects, however it's unlikely that much will change. Staff will keep the CIC informed of any news as they hear about it.

## Adjourn (7:00 pm)

The group adjourned approximately at 7:00 pm.