Public Engagement Working Group Meeting #3: Minutes

Wednesday, December 5th, 2018

Follow along with PowerPoint, on website

1. Introduction → (Slides 1-6)
   - Why are we here?
     - At last meeting, spoke about guidelines/best practices to achieve the principles/values identified in the first meeting, review first draft outline of Public Engagement Strategy, hand out meeting-in-a-box.
     - Tonight: Review engagement tools & best practices; goal of creating a framework for public engagement for the City.
     - Note: there’s a typo on the website – the final meeting is January 30th NOT January 16th, 2019.
   - Review agenda. Purpose of activity is to think about the best ways to engage residents on various topics. Think about how we can ensure we have the best representation of community members so that feedback has legitimacy.
   - The relation of the PEWG to RCOs. At previous meeting, there was need for further information about RCOs. In addition to making it known that DCP can attend any community meeting requested to talk in depth about the RCO process, the Project Manager for RCOs, Stephanie Joy Everett, is in attendance to answer questions after the meeting. See slide 6 for more information.

2. Activity: Toolkit Framework → (Slide 7)
   - Breakout Session explanation (see slide). 20 minutes to assign tools to different categories (from the IAP2 framework, including: inform, consult, involve, collaborate & empower). 20 minutes to create a planning scenario and choose five engagement tools to use in completing the engagements for that scenario.
   - There are blank cards if there is an engagement tool not represented. There are also tools included that have been developed by Pittsburghers, including Deliberative Democracy and Float the Boat.
   - Goal: Assess the engagement toolkit being developed and which tools are best for what kinds of engagements/topics
   - Question from PEWG Member: How much power do people have in the decision-making process when we talk about “empowerment”? If the majority say you should scrap a plan, do you?
     Answer: You have to pick tools from each category, and you have to do so intentionally. There are subject-matter experts and resident experts engaged at every step, and – at the end – City Council, the Mayor’s Office, and the Planning Commission often have final say on what elements of projects are adopted. By being intentional about the way we communicate what we’re letting the public decide in these processes, engagement can promote transparency on decision-making.
Question: How should we categorize various engagement tools?
**Group A: Choose five tools for engagement around a planning scenario.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We inform you</th>
<th>We inform each other</th>
<th>The inform us</th>
<th>Multiple methods needed</th>
<th>What does the participant gain?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role:</strong> Community building</td>
<td><strong>Find videos:</strong> Consensus on solution</td>
<td>Posts</td>
<td>Information from diverse groups</td>
<td><strong>Engage/Influence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role:</strong> Research planning forward</td>
<td><strong>Engage/Influence:</strong></td>
<td>In-depth discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role:</strong> Engage fluidly with the community</td>
<td><strong>Engage/Influence:</strong></td>
<td>Early engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role:</strong> Expand the conversation</td>
<td><strong>Engage/Influence:</strong></td>
<td>Engaged opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role:</strong> Share outcomes</td>
<td><strong>Engage/Influence:</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholders need to be at this transition</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Social Media Posts &amp; Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role:</strong> Reach as many as possible</td>
<td><strong>Engage/Influence:</strong></td>
<td>Spread word through a variety of methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role:</strong> What does the participant gain?</td>
<td><strong>Engage/Influence:</strong></td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role:</strong> What does the participant gain?</td>
<td><strong>Engage/Influence:</strong></td>
<td>Early involvement on a deep level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tools:**

- Professional Engagement of Agencies/Government bodies, relevant users, stakeholders
- Diversity of perspectives/communication, expertise, reach
- Business District/Highway/Transportation
- Affordable Housing/Housing options/Validation/Consulting
- Parking/Accessibility/Transportation
- Project/Region/Planning
- DCC, ACID, and University

**Goal of the Engagement:**

- Community concerns
- Project/Region/Planning
- DCC, ACID, and University

**Scenario Name:**

- Group A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Name</th>
<th>Neighborhood Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>City, RCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description**

- Housing affordability;
- Transportation;
- Community development.
- Access is important!

**Goal of the Engagement**

- Foster stewardship;
- Neighborhood must be stewards of the plan - capacity building!
- Accountability (implementation, planning) - visioning
- Engaging stakeholders to ensure representation - multi-faceted engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Tools</th>
<th>What does the host gain</th>
<th>What does the participant gain</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Level and type of interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pop-up Visioning/ Idea Comment Posters</td>
<td>&gt; Community assets &amp; story-telling from community; &gt; Capturing range of audience participation</td>
<td>&gt; Conveying priorities; &gt; Learning that plan is coming (informing people); &gt; Imagination jump-start</td>
<td>Providing input at comfort level</td>
<td>Add Tactile Urbanism project participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community Mapping</td>
<td>&gt; Realistic vision/ environment of neighborhood; &gt; Balances a lack of engagement of certain demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community Walk shops</td>
<td>Opinions, preferences from the community</td>
<td>Actively assisting in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workshop (Charrette)</td>
<td>Prioritization of projects and phasing; &gt; Questions for experts</td>
<td>&gt; Context, history of the plan; &gt; options available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Deliberative Democracy Forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORM ACCOMPANYING ALL THE PROCESSES**
GROUP B: Choose five tools for engagement around a planning scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Mayor’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>To make sure that every child has access to free, equitable, safe, and quality early education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Concerns</td>
<td>&gt; How is this being funded &lt;br&gt; &gt; Consistent quality across schools and neighborhood &lt;br&gt; &gt; Access to the school through proximity and transit systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of the Engagement</td>
<td>Needs assessment and awareness, &lt;br&gt; Developing a plan that ensures participants from every family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Group worked mainly on the first tool and then discussed on engagement processes in general instead of specific tools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Tools</th>
<th>What does the host gain</th>
<th>What does the participant gain</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Level and type of interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Summits &amp; Piggyback on Community Events &amp; Website blog updates &amp; Community Mapping</td>
<td>&gt; Investment from community members&lt;br&gt; &gt; Understanding the challenges</td>
<td>Host’s commitment to ongoing resident collaboration and empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Currently, stakeholders don’t feel public meetings are of value

Stakeholder investment missing

Report back from engagement being held

Detailing the value of every engagement
3. **Open Discussion on Defining and Measuring Participation (Slides 8-10)**
   - PEWG members are here as representatives of the Pittsburgh community, helping to define what good participation is. In our second meeting, it was noted that the values we put together still didn’t *require* participation. We have added that as a value for this work, but how will we know that this plan results in participation that is “good enough”? How, a year from now, is City Planning doing better engagement than they are today? What will we need to capture from the teams doing engagement to decide whether what they did was appropriate, sufficient and moving the bar in a positive direction?
   - See below for specific questions & discussion.

4. **What defines good, inclusive and sufficient participation? (Slide 8)**
   - **Question from PEWG Member:** Are we talking about individual participation or the results from the participation for a project? **Answer:** We plan to measure participation throughout the entire process. You can have an unsuccessful event, but if you look across the few months you were engaging people on a topic, you should find successful exercises and events where you engaged people in ways that were meaningful to them and that you made changes based on that feedback.
   - **Comment from PEWG Member:** We should rephrase the question to “How can we learn from other people’s experiences? There’s different levels. There shouldn’t be participation for the sake of people just showing up in a room, but not getting to say anything. When people leave events where they get to engage with other people and they feel heard, they want to continue participating. When you show people you value their experiences and you’re willing to learn from them, your engagements will improve.
   - **Comment from PEWG Member:** I don’t think we should be satisfied with “good and sufficient”. Good is a feeling. We want meaningful participation that will lead to what we want. The goal of engagement isn’t simply to be heard—it’s to be heard when you have something to contribute, when we have an achievable objective. This requires more than a feeling. If we do that, we’ll find the starting point is having sufficient information to participate, putting a burden on those hosting the initiative. We should make all relevant information available and accessible. Sufficient means we checked the boxes—maybe try inspiring. What we really want is exceptional participation.
   - **Comment from PEWG Member:** The problem with “sufficient” is there’s a collection of different models; none by themselves is sufficient. You want options with multiple models. *Crafting an idea of what participation means to this group would be incorporated into the Public Engagement Strategy via the introduction and core values. Let’s start with defining participation and then discuss metrics for success.*
   - **Comment from PEWG Member:** Engagement opportunities should demonstrate an investment in the community. People participating should be invested in the outcome. This has to do with people showing up at meetings, and not hearing about some study and assuming the project outcome has already been decided. They’re investing their time but not their thoughtfulness or energy. Whoever’s hosting should support that engagement, supporting the agency of individuals.
   - **Comment from PEWG Member:** Participation should be welcoming and inspiring. Sometimes people don’t participate because they don’t feel included.
5. **Question: How would you know if you have representative participation? (Slide 9)**

- **Comment from PEWG Member:** Black people. Young people. Old people. If we’re talking about a neighborhood plan you should make sure the majority of the people in the room are representative of the neighborhood, whether that’s race, gender, age or education. On a larger scale, you want it to be the whole, but you want the minority included as well. People who are not the majority of the neighborhood have to have access to these initiatives. *Big issues that affect the entire city should have input from a group that is a cross-section of the total population, representative of everybody.*

- **Comment from PEWG Member:** However, these issues won’t affect everybody. Those who are most negatively affected will show up. If we can work with whoever is most negatively affected then what we are doing will be meaningful. What is working well for people is not what we’re looking to change. We want to make the City better for people who it’s not working for now. Representative might not be as important over the whole population, but more so for the people who are negatively affected. Part of this is that it’s important to have people there who are not the “usual suspects”—people who don’t usually participate in a process.

- **Comment from PEWG Member:** At some point, the City should have a registry that will generate more (better quality) representation. Like leftover people from jury selection—it’s not just outreach, it’s recruitment to get diversity along with those who are negatively affected.

- **Comment from PEWG Member:** However, these issues won’t affect everybody. Those who are most negatively affected will show up. If we can work with whoever is most negatively affected then what we are doing will be meaningful. What is working well for people is not what we’re looking to change. We want to make the City better for people who it’s not working for now. Representative might not be as important over the whole population, but more so for the people who are negatively affected. Part of this is that it’s important to have people there who are not the “usual suspects”—people who don’t usually participate in a process.

- **Comment from PEWG Member:** At some point, the City should have a registry that will generate more (better quality) representation. Like leftover people from jury selection—it’s not just outreach, it’s recruitment to get diversity along with those who are negatively affected.

- **Comment from PEWG Member:** However, these issues won’t affect everybody. Those who are most negatively affected will show up. If we can work with whoever is most negatively affected then what we are doing will be meaningful. What is working well for people is not what we’re looking to change. We want to make the City better for people who it’s not working for now. Representative might not be as important over the whole population, but more so for the people who are negatively affected. Part of this is that it’s important to have people there who are not the “usual suspects”—people who don’t usually participate in a process.

- **Comment from PEWG Member:** At some point, the City should have a registry that will generate more (better quality) representation. Like leftover people from jury selection—it’s not just outreach, it’s recruitment to get diversity along with those who are negatively affected.

- **Comment from PEWG Member:** However, these issues won’t affect everybody. Those who are most negatively affected will show up. If we can work with whoever is most negatively affected then what we are doing will be meaningful. What is working well for people is not what we’re looking to change. We want to make the City better for people who it’s not working for now. Representative might not be as important over the whole population, but more so for the people who are negatively affected. Part of this is that it’s important to have people there who are not the “usual suspects”—people who don’t usually participate in a process.

6. **Question: What information should be collected about participants to ensure we are reaching a broad cross-section? (Slide 10)**

- **Comment from PEWG Member:** I found that incredibly useful. You might have gotten more responses if you had told people why you were collecting the information. Did it have questions about the panel itself? Next time, maybe give people the form in advance so they can fill it out while waiting instead of at the end when they’re ready to leave. Yes, it did have two questions about the panel itself. It was also handed out at the beginning of the meeting when people checked in.
• **Comment from PEWG Member:** Use technology—you can fill out a form while you’re waiting. There are easier ways to gather information. You should also have someone not directly involved in the project writing up the responses and summary. Go a step further than this by letting people respond live via technology. The fact that you typed up the responses verbatim afterwards was good, but would have preferred an independent individual did it.

• **Comment from PEWG Member:** On topic of the City website – There’s a lot of literature that people aren’t familiar with the architecture of these sites, even if the developers think it’s secure, people don’t know where/when things are archived. When I do find information, I still don’t know how to engage it unless there’s a clear path given. Just putting things on the internet and calling it transparency isn’t enough. It’s also only available to people who know how to use technology.

• **Question from PEWG Member:** Was the information shared after the Panel on Public Engagement shared with everyone who attended? Yes, if they provided an email address.

• **Comment from PEWG Member:** I also always ask, “Do you want to volunteer? Do you want to work around this?” Not just background, but foreground. “What else do you do? Have you ever been to a meeting before?” Vast amounts of people who showed up and marched in the streets recently have never participated before. These are indicators that you can reach people that are harder to get out, to come speak to issues.

• **Comment from PEWG Member:** Specific neighborhood information would be helpful. You should know where you need more people knocking on doors. You should know who’s not in the room.

• **Comment from PEWG Member:** If can be useful to have ambassadors, but to also think about what opinions are not being captured by those ambassadors. You could reach out to CORO or Public Allies for names of people to call upon.

• **Comment from PEWG Member:** Provide incentives like gift card raffles to attendees. Also, ask how people got to the meeting—walk, run, drive, bike, etc.?

• **Comment from PEWG Member:** I know someone who was invited to a meeting in Beechview because the host wanted Hispanic representation. Only one other Latino went, but he wasn’t engaged when he got there. Cultural awareness is an important factor. You may have people to process information differently.

7. **Closing Remarks (Slide 11)**

• The DCP will work to have a draft of the Public Engagement Strategy to PEWG Members by January 30th, 2019, the date of the next and final Working Group meeting.

• Brief discussion of adding another meeting, or a shorter/optional meeting exclusively for PEWG Members to talk about past experiences in engagement.

• Email us if you have any further comments. We will also send you a survey with some follow up questions.