

 **Metro** | *Agenda*

Meeting: Metro Council Work Session  
Date: Tuesday, July 5, 2011  
Time: 1 p.m.  
Place: Council Chambers

---

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

- |                |   |  |
|----------------|---|--|
| <b>1 PM</b>    | <b>1. ADMINISTRATIVE / CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS</b>   |  |
| <b>1:15 PM</b> | <b>2. COO RECOMMENDATION, 2011 GROWTH MANAGEMENT DECISION - <u>INFORMATION / DISCUSSION</u></b>   | <b>Cooper<br/>O'Brien</b>              |
| <b>2:15 PM</b> | <b>3. BREAK</b>   |  |
| <b>2:20 PM</b> | <b>4. REVISED MCCI PROPOSAL AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT BEST PRACTICES - <u>INFORMATION / DISCUSSION</u></b>  | <b>Middaugh<br/>Unfred<br/>Withrow</b> |
| <b>3:20 PM</b> | <b>5. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATION</b>   |  |
|                | <b>6. EXECUTIVE SESSION HELD PURSUANT WITH ORS 192.660(2)(d). DELIBERATIONS WITH PERSONS DESIGNATED BY THE GOVERNING BODY TO CARRY ON LABOR NEGOTIATIONS.</b> |  |

**ADJOURN**

Agenda Item Number 2.0

**COO RECOMMENDATION, 2011  
GROWTH MANAGEMENT DECISION**

Metro Council Work Session  
Tuesday, July 5, 2011  
Metro Council Chambers

# METRO COUNCIL

## Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: July 5, 2011 Time: 1:15 Length: 1 hour

Presentation Title: COO Recommendation for 2011 Growth Management Decision

Service, Office, or Center:

Office of the COO and Planning and Development

Presenters (include phone number/extension and alternative contact information):

Dan Cooper X 1528 & Tim O'Brien X 1840

---

### **ISSUE & BACKGROUND**

In 2009 the Metro Council accepted the Urban Growth Report (UGR) which provided range forecasts of both capacity and demand, acknowledging uncertainty about the future and allowing for growth management decisions to focus on desired outcomes rather than numbers. In December 2010 the Council by ordinance narrowed the range of uncertainty by finding that actions taken by the Council and local governments provided capacity for at least 50 percent of the housing and employment forecast. What remains is how to address any remaining capacity gap for residential and large-site industrial needs.

Staff initiated an analysis of potential UGB expansion areas in 2010, prior to the October 2010 LCDC verbal decision on urban and rural reserves. The Council, at the May 24, 2011 work session, verbally approved a proposed map of urban reserve analysis areas to be considered for potential UGB expansion in October 2011.

Staff will distribute and present the COO recommendation on potential UGB expansion areas for Council consideration and discussion.

### **OPTIONS AVAILABLE**

No specific actions requested as this is an informational/discussion item

### **IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

Staff suggests initiating review of the recommendation by MTAC/MPAC as outlined in the previously approved project work schedule (attached), which will allow the growth management decision to remain on schedule for final consideration on October 20, 2011.

### **QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION**

No specific questions for consideration.

**LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION** \_\_Yes \_\_X\_\_No  
**DRAFT IS ATTACHED** \_\_Yes \_\_X\_\_No

**DETAILED LISTING OF EVENTS AND PRODUCTS TO DELIVER KEY MILESTONES INCLUDING PROPOSED MEETING DATES****Milestone 1 (Metro Council and county adoption of urban and rural reserves):**

- Council adopts reserves – Ordinance No. 11-1255 **April 21**
- Clackamas, Multnomah & Washington counties adopt reserves **Late April**

**Milestone 2 (Metro Council decision on study areas):**

- Notice to Mayors and County Chairs requesting submittal of any additional areas to be studied (we already have list from 2010) **April 26**
- Deadline for submittal of requests from local governments **May 20**
- Metro Council decision on study areas **May 24**

**Milestone 3 (Develop and release staff recommendation on potential UGB expansion):**

- Complete alternatives analysis study **June**
- Staff recommendation on proposed UGB expansion – release at Council WS **July 5**
- MTAC – introduce staff recommendation **July 6**
- MPAC – introduce staff recommendation **July 13**
- Intensive public outreach (incl. open houses) on staff recommendation **July 18-29**

**Milestone 4 (LCDC oral decision on urban and rural reserves):**

- LCDC hearing and oral decision on urban and rural reserves **August 18, 19**

**Milestone 5 (DLCD and general public notice):**

- Provide 45-day notice to DLCD on proposed UGB expansion area(s) **August 22**
- Provide general public notice in newspaper **August 22**

**Milestone 6 (26-29 Report distributed to potentially impacted households):**

- Staff work to complete 26-29 Report on proposed expansion area(s) **Aug.-Sept.**
- Distribute 26-29 Report to potentially impacted households **September 26**

**Milestone 7 (MPAC recommendation to Council):**

- MTAC discussion/recommendation to MPAC **September 7/21**
- MPAC discussion/recommendation to Council **September 14/28**

**Milestone 8 (Written order from DLCD acknowledging reserves):**

- DLCD to provide written order acknowledging reserves **Late September**

**Milestone 9 (Metro Council growth management decision):**

- Council work sessions **Sept. , Oct.**
- Metro Council first reading of growth management ordinance **October 6**
- Metro Council adopts growth management ordinance **October 20**

Agenda Item Number 4.0

**REVISED MCCI PROPOSAL AND PUBLIC  
ENGAGEMENT BEST PRACTICES**

Metro Council Work Session  
Tuesday, July 5, 2011  
Metro Council Chambers

# METRO COUNCIL

## Work Session Worksheet

**Presentation Date:** July 5, 2011      **Time:** 2:20 p.m.      **Length:** 60 min.

**Presentation Title:** Revised MCCI Proposal and Public Engagement Best Practices

**Service, Office, or Center:** Communications

**Presenters** (include phone number/extension and alternative contact information):

Jim Middaugh, Communications Director, x1505

Patty Unfred, Communications Manager, x1685

Karen Withrow, Communications Manager, x1932

### ISSUE & BACKGROUND

With the changing nature of communications, public involvement practices – and the review of those practices – are changing rapidly. To more effectively engage the public and review Metro’s public involvement practices, Communications staff has developed two proposals for Council consideration:

- 1) The charge for the **Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement**, and the rapidly shifting field of public involvement, made it difficult for them to provide guidance on best practices and eventually made it difficult to keep members engaged. As a result, MCCI was temporarily “disbanded” in 2010, with the promise to Council that a new proposal would be developed and enacted in 2011. Metro staff has developed a multi-track approach that we believe will be more effective, will increase best practices sharing and development among jurisdictions throughout the region, and will more successfully engage communities with Metro’s initiatives, helping to prioritize projects for public outreach. (This proposal will require a resolution to restructure MCCI.) For a recent Opt In survey on public involvement, visit [http://panel.decipherinc.com/images/uploads/optin/Metro\\_Opt\\_In\\_Public\\_Involvement\\_Survey\\_4--annot--May.pdf](http://panel.decipherinc.com/images/uploads/optin/Metro_Opt_In_Public_Involvement_Survey_4--annot--May.pdf)
- 2) Following the 2010 Community Investment Strategy engagement program and the 2010 Metro Auditors report on public involvement practices, Communications staff identified a need for more strategic development of community engagement tools and practices. We need to carefully consider the nature of the policy decision, the role of the public or stakeholders in making the decision, and select the appropriate engagement tools for that effort. With the assistance of a public involvement consultant, Metro’s planning and policy communication team developed a “**Metro Community Engagement Strategy Assessment**” tool, outlining best practices to achieve effective and right-sized engagement. We propose using this tool in the early phases of any Metro project to assess and develop a public involvement or community engagement plan. We’ll provide a case study example at the work session to show how the tool would be used.

### OPTIONS AVAILABLE

- 1) MCCI proposal – Staff reviewed a number of options and determined that some required more resources than are currently available. The current draft proposal, which was reviewed by internal and external stakeholders, would provide a more balanced approach in terms of resources and also promises to deliver more substantive results. An option to keep the existing MCCI structure would pose

challenges to recruit active members and structure meetings to effectively provide direction for staff, and would require resources to staff the committee and monthly meetings.

- 2) Best practices – Using the proposed tool would guide development of public involvement plans in a way that would best use existing resources. Previous practices tended to rely more on history/tradition and less on strategic assessment and evaluation of tools and approaches.

### **IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

- 1) Communications staff recommends adopting a resolution changing the public involvement review process from a committee structure (MCCI) to a peer and community review process as outlined in the proposal.
- 2) Communications staff recommends using the attached Community Engagement Strategy Assessment tool to develop public involvement plans going forward. We propose working collaboratively with each project manager to develop effective and right-sized plans and review with Council liaison(s).

### **QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION**

*Does the proposal for public involvement review (replacing MCCI) meet Council approval?*

*Does the proposed process for developing public involvement practices meet Council approval?*

Communication staff will develop public involvement plans for each project, in collaboration with the project manager and in accordance with the identified best practices. We propose engaging the Council liaison(s) to review the proposed plan. *Does this approach meet the Council's needs? If not, how would Council prefer to engage when developing public involvement plans?*

**LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION  Yes  No**  
*(for MCCI proposal only)*

**DRAFT IS ATTACHED  Yes  No**

Date: June 20, 2011  
To: Metro Council  
From: Jim Middaugh, Communications Director  
Patty Unfred, Communications Manager  
Karen Withrow, Public Involvement Manager  
Subject: Metro Public Involvement Review Proposal (replacing the former Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement)

---

The Metro Council has demonstrated a strong commitment to engaging and informing the public on issues and decisions that affect the residents and livability of the region. To ensure that this commitment was implemented in practice, in the past the Council has relied on an appointed Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement to review and inform Metro's public involvement plans.

With the changing nature of communications, public involvement practices – and the review of those practices – are changing rapidly. MCCI was unable to provide effective guidance on best practices and found difficulty keeping members engaged. As a result, MCCI was temporarily “disbanded” in 2010, with the promise to Council that a new proposal would be developed and enacted in 2011.

Metro staff has developed a multi-track approach that we believe will be more effective, will increase best practices sharing and development among jurisdictions throughout the region, and will more successfully engage communities with Metro's initiatives, helping to prioritize projects for public outreach.

The following proposal is a revised version of the draft reviewed by Council at meetings in April and May. Feedback from internal and external stakeholders was sought and incorporated into the final version. We look forward to discussing this with you at the Council work session on July 5, 2011.



## **Metro Public Involvement Review Proposal**

### Purpose statement

Develop a productive advisory process to help Metro staff develop and implement successful public involvement outreach with residents of the region.

### Background

The Metro Office of Citizen Involvement and Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement (MCCI) were established under Metro's home-rule charter in 1992 to assist with the development, implementation and evaluation of Metro's citizen involvement program and to advise on how to best involve residents in regional planning activities.

#### ***Metro Charter - Chapter 5, Section 27. Metro Office of Citizen Involvement.***

*(1) Creation and Purpose. The Metro Office of Citizen Involvement is created to develop and maintain programs and procedures to aid communication between citizens and the Council.*

*(2) Citizens' Committee in Office of Citizen Involvement. The Council shall establish by ordinance (a) a citizens' committee in the office of citizen involvement and (b) a citizen involvement process. The Council shall appropriate sufficient funds to operate the office and committee.*

At one time the Metro Office of Citizen Involvement had a designated director; that position no longer exists but the duties are encompassed in the work of the communication staff on the planning and policy team. Since its inception, MCCI has undergone a number of structural changes in terms of representation. The most recent iteration was a 20-member committee, made up of representatives from each council district, two at-large representatives from the region, representatives from unincorporated areas of each of the three counties and representatives from county committees for citizen involvement. By 2010, membership had dwindled to five or six members who regularly attended the monthly meetings and not every part of the region was represented. In April 2010, the remaining committee members agreed to temporarily dissolve the committee; the Metro Council directed Metro staff to have a revised proposal and process in place by the end of June 2011.

### Problem

The previous committee structure and process for MCCI had the following problems identified:

- Role – The committee often engaged in policy discussions rather than focusing on the quality of the public involvement plan.
- Membership – The committee had dwindled to five or six members who attended monthly meetings and therefore was not representative of the region.
- Focus – Committee members represented specific geographic areas so tended to focus on outreach only to their respective areas, rather than evaluating public outreach across the region and to all demographic groups, particularly those groups traditionally underrepresented.
- Knowledge/expertise – As citizen representatives, MCCI members were not necessarily knowledgeable about best public involvement practices or new tools, therefore it was difficult to review or give advice on the best approach to engage audiences in specific ways and at appropriate levels.
- Usefulness – Presenting public involvement plans to MCCI was generally viewed by staff as a necessary step, not as a productive exercise likely to yield useful insight or suggestions. It often

became a hurdle that delayed projects without qualitatively improving Metro’s public involvement practices.

- **Materials** – While the guidelines developed collaboratively by Metro staff and MCCI members over the years – including the public involvement planning guide and principles of citizen involvement – have merit, they need to be updated to include new best practices, new tools and new terminology, including replacing the word “citizen” with “resident” or “community member”.

### Proposal

Metro public involvement and community engagement professional staff have developed a proposal to address both the problems above and the desired outcomes of best practices in public process. **It is important to note that this proposal addresses public and peer review of and input into Metro’s public involvement plans. It does NOT cover or address – or replace - the numerous public involvement activities and engagement efforts offered by Metro staff throughout the year.** It is also worth noting, based on some staff feedback, that this document does not address perceived inequities in public involvement activities or resources across departments – but that this may be something that should be addressed through the budget process.

We propose the following:

- **Public involvement and community engagement professional peer group** – Metro staff would convene two to four meetings annually of peers in local government and others engaged in public involvement. These meetings would provide an opportunity for staff across the region to:
  - Share and learn about best practices and new tools, including international, national and local examples
  - Share information, upcoming policy discussions and events in order to facilitate collaboration and leverage individual jurisdiction outreach efforts
  - Problem solve and trouble shoot individual projects
  - Document best practices for public engagement
  - Review and update public involvement principles and planning guide

*Budget implications: Some M&S for training, consultants or best practices development. Staff time.*

- **Stakeholder review group** – Metro staff would convene an annual half-day meeting of a diverse group of community stakeholders representing all aspects of the region, including geography, race, income, age, interest (e.g., business development and environmental conservation), CPO’s, neighborhood associations, etc. Participants would also include members of Metro citizen advisory committees and oversight committees on existing projects. The Metro Council would provide input on the membership of this group and the meetings would be advertised and open to the general public. This group would provide an evaluation of Metro public involvement practices from the previous year, share local community information, and would primarily focus on giving advice on priorities and strategies for upcoming Metro policy initiatives. This meeting should be timed to allow input on budget priorities, so ideally would occur in early fall.
  - **Option:** Convene a half-day session at which participants would share information, learn about upcoming Metro policies and programs and engage in discussion on priorities and tools. Participants would take this information back to their respective

communities or organizations to get feedback and reconvene as a larger group in a month or two to report back and provide direction.

- **Option:** To establish a more permanent committee, Metro staff could convene an advisory committee that would assist with developing the agenda for the annual stakeholder meeting, assisting with outreach to participants, and helping facilitate the meeting.

*Budget implications: Some M&S for advertising, outreach and meeting costs. Staff time.*

- **Opt In internet panel** - In 2011, Metro launched Opt In, an online research panel that will gather public opinion from and engage residents of the metropolitan area. The goal of the new panel is to create a timely, cost-effective way for the region's residents to learn about and provide input into decisions affecting them and their communities. Panelists will be asked to participate in one or two short online surveys each month. Metro's Opt In panel is part of a larger strategy aimed at creating and sustaining online engagement with a diverse representation of the region's residents.

*Budget implications: M&S to operate surveys (average cost of \$4,000 to \$7,000 per survey), M&S to recruit participants, staff time.*

- **Annual public engagement report** – Following the annual stakeholder review meeting and the opinion survey, Metro public involvement staff will compile a report evaluating the processes, practices, tools and success of public engagement efforts and preview the plans for the coming year. Staff will present the **report to the Metro Council for review, comment and direction.**

*Budget implications: Staff time.*

- **Metro staff communication** – Recognizing that Metro project staff are equal partners in implementation of public involvement efforts, Metro communications staff will report back to project staff on the outcomes of the annual stakeholder meeting, annual report and to share best practices and upcoming plans for engagement. These might be most effective by giving presentations at department all-staff meetings.

*Budget implications: Staff time*

### Review process

Metro public involvement staff sought feedback from internal and external stakeholders in April and May, including:

- Metro Council – Met individually with Metro Councilors to preview draft proposal.
- Internal project managers – Reviewed draft proposal with project managers from across the agency and incorporated feedback in a revised proposal.
- Former MCCI members – Distributed the draft proposal to the most recent MCCI members for review and offered to meet with them. Met with former MCCI co-chair, Gerritt Rosenthal, and incorporated his feedback in a revised proposal.
- Agency peers – Distributed the draft proposal to local government public involvement peers. Met with staff from the City of Portland's Bureau of Environmental Services and Parks Department to get feedback. Received written comments from several other peers.
- Community members – Distributed the draft proposal to community members, non-profit and community organizations for review. Met with Eleanor Hunter, President of Oak Lodge Community Council, and George Beard, consultant and former communications professor.

Feedback was generally very positive, particularly from the peer group. Everyone who provided feedback from that group indicated interest in participating in the semi-annual peer group meetings and said they would find those useful. Feedback from community members was also generally positive, with several suggestions that were incorporated into the proposal. Some Metro project managers expressed frustration at what they felt were unequal levels of public involvement resources available across departments but felt comfortable with the proposed process. One former MCCI member expressed disapproval of the proposal, but did not suggest alternatives.

# Metro Community Engagement Strategy Assessment

*June 2011*

---

This document supplements the *Principles of Citizen Involvement* guidelines adopted by Metro Council in February 1997. It is intended as a guide to aid in the selection of public participation tools and techniques and to provide insights into how they can support Metro goals. Although community engagement is, by its very nature, a non-scientific, subjective discipline that defies efforts to effectively quantify results, this assessment is based on widely accepted standards for the practice and is informed by recent nationally recognized studies on effectiveness of participation principles and practices.

This guide assumes a basic understanding of preliminary activities that should occur as part of developing a public involvement process. Because every process is different, no one tool or technique can be prescribed as a best practice for all situations. The selection and application of tools should be part of an adaptable and iterative process that uses feedback to determine the best methods to meet the needs of Metro and stakeholders. It may be necessary to revisit this assessment at multiple points over the course of each project, particularly if significant changes are made to the scope, schedule or budget.

This document was developed collaboratively by JLA Public Involvement with Metro.

## What is the appropriate strategy for public participation?

---

This guide includes a series of strategic questions and a matrix of common public participation tools and techniques. Together they are intended to help Metro make effective choices regarding methods of engaging the public. Before using this guide, it is important to identify the purpose of the project and the anticipated public engagement. **(See Appendix A for a form to complete, and Appendix B for an example.)** With that framework, you are prepared to explore methods of engaging the public.

### Does full participation make sense?

Selecting tools to help achieve your project purpose should begin with an affirmation that participation will actually be helpful to Metro and to the public. These initial questions can help determine whether a full engagement effort is appropriate:

- Can anything change as a result of participation?** *Are there real choices to consider? Or, for instance, is a decision driven by regulation? Processes that imply stakeholders can influence a decision but cannot genuinely allow for the possibility of real options may damage an organization's reputation<sup>1</sup>. If providing options is unlikely, it may be appropriate to limit your focus to the using the **Information** family of tools in the Tools and Techniques matrix to present the decision and inform the public/stakeholders about the reasons/bases for it. If you are unsure, then a further consultation process – presenting proposed decision or approach and asking for input – may be appropriate (see “Consultation” column on the Tools and Techniques Matrix).*
- Is the decision maker or problem holder supportive of wider participation and open to influence by the public?** *It is important to give participants clear expectations about what they can and cannot affect.<sup>1</sup> If the final decision makers are not open to influence, a focus on **Information** tools, as with the above condition, is often the most appropriate approach.*
- Is the issue of interest to your intended participants?** *Low interest may require a more resource-intensive process to achieve a significant level of engagement by the broader public. Long range planning efforts without concrete impacts generally do not generate significant interest. Therefore, a smaller scale engagement process that proactively targets representatives of a range of interests is often appropriate to ensure a legitimate, defensible outcome.*
- Is this the first effort to try and involve the public on this issue or project?** *Has the public or have stakeholders already addressed this problem? Have previous efforts been successful? Most people do not distinguish between different planning efforts or even agencies – they distinguish between issues.<sup>2</sup> Consider whether it makes sense to undertake a new process or to review past efforts and first spend time addressing any issues that may have resulted from previous attempt(s).<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, if previous, related efforts have already provided the public/stakeholder input necessary to make a proposed decision, then a simplified Consultation process may be an appropriate means of verifying the legitimacy of the proposal.*
- Is your process the only attempt to involve these participants around this issue at this time?** *The public in the Portland metro area has limited time to devote to multiple processes and limited patience for duplicated efforts.<sup>1</sup> Ask whether Metro should lead the process or whether a partnership or coordination with another agency or entity on another process may make more sense, particularly if they are already engaging your target audience. This can range from shared*

*events and/or committees, to merely providing space at each other's events and updates on each other's agendas, websites and other information materials,*

If you answered “no” to any of these questions, consider whether a full public engagement process makes sense. Additional consultation may be advised and the **Scoping** tools described in the Tools and Techniques Matrix may help to clarify the best way to carry the process forward.

## **What should Metro's role be?**

If the process affects the full Metro region or a large portion of it, *and* the nature of the issue warrants a full participation effort, then Metro should consider the respective roles of Metro and its partner cities, counties and other regional jurisdictions with regard to how the engagement effort is conducted:

**If the cities, counties and/or other jurisdictions do not fully share authority, but their communities may be affected**, then you should consult with local partners about Metro's proposed process and request their help in leveraging Metro's outreach efforts through existing processes (standing community groups, existing communication channels, etc.). *Example: High Capacity Transit System Plan.*

**If any cities, counties and/or other jurisdictions share fully in the decision making authority and/or implementation**, then it may be appropriate for Metro to act as a convener for the partner jurisdictions in establishing the framework (approach) for the participation effort and to manage the centralized effort (Metro-wide committees and outreach) while relying on local partners for the community-based engagement. *Example: Urban and Rural Reserves, corridor projects.*

With the latter option, Metro relies on (and accepts) the process choices of the local jurisdiction for their community; whereas, for the first option, Metro designs and manages the process, and coordinates with the local jurisdiction.

In deciding how much to rely on partner jurisdictions, there are considerations beyond the level of shared authority. The cities and counties often have specific insights into particularly effective tools for reaching their populations; they may be more trusted by the community; and they may be able to help defray costs by taking a more active role in implementing regional projects. Working with preexisting committees or community organizations may also be an efficient and effective way to reach populations over broad areas. On the other hand, they often do not have the resources to conduct a public process and coordination with local entities may add extra levels of complexity (and cost) to managing the process. In that case, consider whether additional effort serves to build capacity that will make future work easier, or whether it makes the most short and long-term sense for Metro to carry out the work on its own.

Whether applied by Metro or by partner jurisdictions, the following questions should help define a list of tools and techniques that are the most useful for your project goals.

## Using the Tools and Techniques Matrix

The questions in this document are intended to help you refine the list of possible engagement tools listed within the Tools and Techniques matrix (included in the appendix). As you answer each question, it may be helpful to highlight the column(s) that correspond with your answer(s).

For each question you may select as many answers as apply, though this will result in a less specific list of applicable tools.

A. Participation Objective									
Consensus Building	Problem Solving	Stakeholder Sharing	Relationship Building	Information/Idea Gathering	Broad Outreach	Building Understanding	Building Awareness	Capacity Building	

## Purpose of the Process

### A. What are the primary participation objectives for this project phase? <sup>2</sup>

Select all that apply:

- Consensus Building** (*Work toward an outcome that addresses the needs of, and is accepted by a range of interests/stakeholders.*)
- Problem Solving** (*Engage stakeholders in exploring options that not only address the primary project purpose, but also address potential impacts on and/or needs of the various interests.*)
- Sharing Between Stakeholders** (*Provide a means for stakeholders hear and understand each others' concerns, issues, needs and ideas.*)
- Relationship Building** (*Foster the trust and familiarity that allows for more transparent and effective communication.*)
- Information/Idea Gathering** (*Proactively seek and encourage input from the public and/or key stakeholders.*)
- Broad Outreach** (*Provide information along with an "open door" for the broader public to provide input and engage with the process.*)
- Building Understanding** (*Foster deeper comprehension of the issues, needs, options and/or outcomes of the process.*)
- Building Awareness** (*Build broad public consciousness that the project and/or process exists.*)
- Building Capacity** (*Work toward a more informed, engaged community, better able to effectively participate in the future.*)

*A well defined objective for each phase of your project will be significant in informing which tools are the most appropriate. If you cannot easily categorize your objectives, it may also be difficult for the public to understand your needs.*



## B. What level(s) of participation are you trying to achieve? <sup>5</sup>

These levels of participation were developed by the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2). Higher levels of involvement (Collaborate, Empower) will allow stakeholders and/or the public to have more impact on your process, but they are not inherently better than lower levels (Inform, Consult), nor are they always ideal. It is most important to choose levels that are appropriate for everyone's needs.<sup>3</sup>

For assistance in selecting the appropriate level of public engagement, consider using the IAP2 expectations worksheets included in the appendix (p. 10). The City of Portland Public Involvement Toolkit recommends using a facilitated group to answer the worksheet questions and help assess public expectations.<sup>4</sup> **Select all that apply:**

- Inform** (*Participation Goal: To provide balanced and objective information to assist in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.*)
- Consult** (*Participation Goal: To obtain feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.*)
- Involve** (*Participation Goal: To work directly with participants throughout the process to ensure that concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.*)
- Collaborate** (*Participation Goal: To partner in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of preferred solutions.*)
- Empower** (*Participation Goal: To delegate final decision-making authority.*)

## Scope of Participation

---

The following questions will help further refine which tools make sense for your needs.

### C. Does the project focus on issues that are relevant to a specific geographic area?

- Small area** (*neighborhood or CPO*)
- Large area** (*one or two Metro districts*) \*
- Medium area** (*city or cities in a focused area*) \*
- Full Metro region** \*

*\* If your process focuses on issues that span a significant area, consider Metro's role in the process (see "What should Metro's role be?" above) and if it may be more appropriate to engage and support other jurisdictions as partners in the public process.*

## D. What kind(s) of participants are most appropriate for this particular project? <sup>1</sup>

Participation may be open to anyone or designed to ensure that certain perspectives are represented. Participants may be members of the public, Metro, or other jurisdictions. Different tools work better for engaging different types of participant groups.

- Self selected participants attending as individuals** (*open access*)
- Directly impacted groups or individuals** (*affected stakeholders, voters*)
- Controlled membership groups representing specific communities, interests or populations** (*business associations, neighborhood groups, civic organizations, homeowners*)
- Specific individuals** (*subject experts, elected officials, specific businesses or property owners*)
- Users of specific services** (*customers, clients, utility users, facility users*)

## E. Does your project specifically seek input from particular underrepresented groups? <sup>1</sup>

Engaging underrepresented populations is typically an expected part of any outreach process. In some cases, it may be important to specifically target these populations as part of a larger process, or as a stand-alone effort because one or more of these populations may be disproportionately affected. Tools that are *not* able to reach these populations may be inadequate for your needs.

- Children and young people**
- People with disabilities**
- Senior citizens**
- Marginalized or minority groups**

*Many tools can be adapted to the needs of specific populations, or they can provide feedback about whether a population is being adequately engaged. Incorporating feedback mechanisms into tools is both important for determining their effectiveness and the extent to which they are reaching the desired populations. For example, although online surveys may not adequately reach populations with limited computer access, gathering demographic information from other respondents can help to reveal who is missing. Such feedback can help focus one-on-one contact or outreach to groups that can in turn reveal the most effective means to involve underrepresented populations.*

## Refining the Tools List

If you have not yet done so, highlight your answer(s) to the applicable questions on the matrix (A-E). For each full circle in a column, give that tool 1 point. For each half circle, give the tool ½ point. Mark the total points in the “Point Totals” column (see example below.)

Tool Families & Types	Tool(s) or Technique(s)	Purpose										Scope of Participation					POINT TOTALS												
		A. Participation Objective					B. Participation Level					C. Geography			D. Participants			E. Target Groups											
		Consensus Building	Problem Solving	Stakeholder Sharing	Relationship Building	Information/Idea Gathering	Broad Outreach	Building Understanding	Building Awareness	Capacity Building	Information	Consultation	Involve	Collaboration	Empower	Small area	Medium area	Large area	Full Metro region	Self Selected	Affected Stakeholders	Controlled Membership	Specified Individuals	Specific Service Users	Children and youth	Older people	People with disabilities	Minority Groups	
<b>Public Conversation Tools - Gatherings and individual contacts to consult with stakeholders that are not part of the formal committee structure.</b>																													
Public Gatherings	Forum	○	●	●	○	○	●				●	●	○		●	●	○		●	●	○				○	●	●		2.5
	Town Hall	○	●	○		○	●				○	●	○		●	○			●	○						○	●	●	1
	Open House		○	○	○		●				●	●	○		○	●	●	○		○	○				○	●	○	○	2.5
	Public Meeting				○						●	●	●		○	●	●	○		○	○				○	●	●	○	3
	Public Hearing				○						●	●	○		○	●	●	○		○	○					○	●	○	1.5

The point totals should give you a sense of how appropriate each tool may be for your process: the tools with the most points may be the most useful, but even tools with fewer points can be helpful in many situations. Also note which tool families tend to have higher point totals. At this point, you should also consider whether poor performance for a particular question is a make-or-break criteria for whether the tool should be used (for example, if it doesn't reach your target group.) The information provided about each tool on the right-hand side of the matrix can help you further determine whether it is in fact appropriate for your needs.

### Opportunities and Challenges

Different tool families have unique advantages and disadvantages and should be modified to fit your needs. This list primarily focuses on broad tool families and assumes some familiarity with basic tools. It is not intended to be comprehensive. ([Peopleandparticipation.net](http://peopleandparticipation.net) and [iap2.org](http://iap2.org)<sup>5</sup> provide more specific and thorough descriptions of how individual tools work.)

### Success Indicators

It is difficult to assess the effectiveness of tools based on objective metrics, particularly if they are being used in conjunction with other tools or under unique circumstances that impact their effectiveness. Although some tools may be evaluated quantitatively, it is usually impossible to measure effectiveness based solely on this information. (Even project success is somewhat subjective, as a “good” process might result in abandoning an effort because of low public support.)

The 2008 National Academy of Sciences study on Public Participation<sup>6</sup> recommends that evaluation be based on public process *outcomes* and how well they satisfy various indicators of a successful process. These are summarized below in the form of questions:

- ✓ **Quality of assessments or decisions:** Were public concerns addressed? Did the process change based on new information or concerns? Were conclusions consistent with the information available? Were innovative ideas generated?

- ✓ **Legitimacy of process and decisions:** Was preexisting conflict or mistrust reduced or addressed? Did participants accept the assessment or process even if they didn't agree with the outcome? Was the result widely accepted? Was the communication loop closed?
- ✓ **Capacity for future decisions:** Did participants become better informed about relevant issues? Did participants gain a better understanding of each other? Did participants gain skills in working with the process? Did Metro gain an understanding of public concerns? Were new methods born of the effort?

For the sake of evaluating a process, some tools in the matrix may be particularly helpful for achieving specific indicators. In terms of assessing success, it may be useful to incorporate a baseline assessment as part of the initial scoping efforts that can then be compared with feedback gathered at points throughout the process. A particular tool may be considered to be less effective if there is negative or stagnant feedback on its indicator(s). The NAS report specifically recommends assessment at or soon after the conclusion of the process.

## Resource allocation analysis

---

Once you have identified tools that could be applied to your process, you may want to narrow the list based on additional constraints:

- Does your schedule allow sufficient time to use these tools or techniques effectively?** <sup>1</sup> *Consider the amount of time needed for preparation, implementation, analysis, and (if necessary) iteration and adaptation. A poorly executed or partial process may damage your reputation or give the impression of a token process. Some tools lend themselves to short time frames better than others and it is important to be upfront about what can be reasonably accomplished without excess risk given schedule constraints.*
- Do you have enough resources (in terms of personnel, time and funding) to make proper use of all these tools?** <sup>1</sup> *Good process may not require a lot of money, but insufficient resources, including staff time – can result in inadequacies that damage your reputation. If resources are not available, using less ambitious tools may be more prudent. You may also consider whether there are opportunities to partner with other relevant jurisdictions that also have an interest in the process.*

## References

---

Research and document development was completed by JLA Public Involvement.

### Online

- <sup>1</sup> People and Participation Online - Process Planner, (<http://www.peopleandparticipation.net/display/ProcessPlanner/>)
- <sup>4</sup> City of Portland Bureau Innovation Project #9: Public Involvement Toolkit, (<http://www.portlandonline.com/oni/index.cfm?a=137141&c=39102>) November, 2006.
- <sup>5</sup> IAP2 Public Involvement Toolbox, ([http://iap2.affiniscap.com/associations/4748/files/06Dec\\_Toolbox.pdf](http://iap2.affiniscap.com/associations/4748/files/06Dec_Toolbox.pdf)) 2006.
- <sup>6</sup> 101 Social Media Stats to Make Your Spirits Bright and Your Head Spin, (<http://www.socialmediaexplorer.com/social-media-marketing/social-media-statistics/>) December 15, 2010.
- <sup>7</sup> Home Internet Access: Continuing To Grow, But Big Differences Among Demographics, ([http://blog.nielsen.com/nielsenwire/online\\_mobile/home-internet-access-continuing-to-grow-but-big-differences-among-demographics/](http://blog.nielsen.com/nielsenwire/online_mobile/home-internet-access-continuing-to-grow-but-big-differences-among-demographics/)) March 6, 2009.
- *Outreach and Involvement Handbook for City of Portland Bureaus*, (<http://www.portlandonline.com/shared/cfm/image.cfm?id=98500>) winter, 2005.
- *Metro Public involvement planning Guide* (<http://www.oregonmetro.gov/index.cfm/go/by.web/id=308>) December, 2008.

### Print Materials

- <sup>2</sup> Designing Effective Public Involvement Programs Training Workbook, JLA Public Involvement, 2010.
- <sup>3</sup> Planning for Effective Public Participation, International Association for Public Participation, 2006.
- <sup>6</sup> Public Participation in Environmental assessment and decision making, Thomas Dietz and Paul C. Stern, 2008.

## Appendix A

---

### PROJECT PURPOSE ARTICULATION

Clarity around project purpose and outcomes is fundamental to crafting an appropriate, meaningful and efficient public engagement strategy. This form must be completed by the project manager and Communications staff and approved by the department director prior to the development of a public involvement and/or communications plan.

<i>The purpose of this project is to:</i>
<i>This project will result in:</i>
<i>The purpose of public engagement for this project is to:</i>
<i>Members of the public who should be engaged are:</i>
<i>The public engagement will be successful if:</i>
<i>This project will be successful if:</i>

## Appendix B

### PROJECT PURPOSE ARTICULATION – EXAMPLE

Clarity around project purpose and outcomes is fundamental to crafting an appropriate, meaningful and efficient public engagement strategy. This form must be completed by the project manager and Communications staff and approved by the department director prior to the development of a public involvement and/or communications plan.

*FOLLOWING IS AN EXAMPLE OF HOW TO COMPLETE THIS FORM.*

<b><i>The purpose of this project is to:</i></b>
Fulfill the final NEPA-related processes for the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
<b><i>This project will result in:</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publication of the Final Environmental Impact Statement</li> <li>• Clearance from federal and state regulatory agencies, such as the State Office of Historical Preservation and the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration</li> <li>• Issuance of the Record of Decision from the Federal Transit Administration</li> <li>• Completion of the South Corridor II project as designated in the Regional Transportation Plan</li> </ul>
<b><i>The purpose of public engagement for this project is to:</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inform the public about impacts and resulting mitigation and any changes to the project since the SDEIS public engagement phase</li> <li>• Provide visualizations of the light rail infrastructure</li> <li>• Work with property and business owners displaced by the light rail project</li> <li>• Provide resources to partner jurisdictions in their communication with the public</li> </ul>
<b><i>Members of the public who should be engaged are:</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elected officials and staff from local governments along the alignment</li> <li>• Citizen advisory groups, business associations and neighborhood associations in areas along the alignment</li> <li>• Environmental justice and organizations serving special needs of local residents</li> <li>• Project partners</li> <li>• Members of the media, especially community newspapers</li> </ul>
<b><i>The public engagement will be successful if:</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro coordinates communication with partner jurisdictions</li> <li>• Residents and interested persons are able to access timely and meaningful information</li> <li>• The public understands how decisions leading up to this phase were made</li> <li>• The public is provided with opportunities to have input in future design phases</li> </ul>
<b><i>This project will be successful if:</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aforementioned results are met</li> <li>• Project partners -- TriMet, FTA, City of Portland, City of Milwaukie and Clackamas County -- are able to proceed on schedule at the close of the NEPA phase</li> </ul>

## Appendix C

### IAP2 Internal Expectations Worksheet (Planning for Effective Public Participation, p. 61)

**Directions:** Check the appropriate boxes 1-8. Then, follow instructions in the left column.

Assessment Questions	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
1. What is the legally required level of public participation?					
2. To what extent do internal staff members believe that the public interest in this project?					
3. At what level do internal staff members perceive public interest in this project?					
4. What is the potential for the public to influence the decision-making process?					
5. What level of media interest do you anticipate?					
6. What is the likelihood that decision-makers will give full consideration to public input?					
7. What levels of resources are likely to be available to support public participation?					
8. What is the anticipated level for political controversy?					
<i>Count the number of checks in each column</i>					
<i>Multiply number of checks by the weight</i>	x1	x2	x3	x4	x5
<i>Enter column score</i>					
<i>Add total of all five column scores</i>					
<i>Divide total score by the number of questions</i>	/8				
<b>Average score =</b>					



## IAP2 Public Expectations Worksheet (Planning for Effective Public Participation, p. 58)

**Directions:** Check the appropriate boxes 1-5. Then, follow instructions in the left column.

Assessment Questions	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
1. What is the probable level of difficulty in addressing the problem/opportunity?					
2. What is the potential for public outrage related to the project?					
3. How important are the potential impacts to the public?					
4. How much do major stakeholders care about the problem/opportunity to be addressed and decision to be made?					
5. What degree of participation does the public appear to want?					
<i>Count the number of checks in each column</i>					
<i>Multiply number of checks by the weight</i>	x1	x2	x3	x4	x5
<i>Enter column score</i>					
<i>Add total of all five column scores</i>					
<i>Divide total score by the number of questions</i>	/5				
<b>Average score =</b>					

### Score Indicates:

**Very Low to Low (1-2):** Work with key stakeholder groups to identify a comprehensive stakeholder information program to satisfy public concerns.

**Low to Moderate (2-3):** Public participation is probably a good idea. Consider how the *Consult* level will work with the issues and interests of stakeholders.

**Moderate to High (3-4):** Consider participation at least at the *Consult* level and probably at the *Involve* level.

**High to Very High (4-5):** Evaluate how stakeholder issues and interests and internal considerations can best be accommodated at the *Involve* or even move to the right side of IAP2's Spectrum at the *Collaborate* or *Empower\** levels.

---

*\* It is important to remember that community stakeholders are not elected to represent the broader Metro public. Therefore, because the highest level (Empower) requires delegation of decision-making responsibility, it typically should only be applied 1) when working with other governmental partners who share responsibility for the problem and/or implementation, or 2) when the process affects a narrow set of stakeholders who will benefit and/or be impacted by a decision, **and** when the full range of potential outcomes are feasible and acceptable within the context of Metro's goals.*

# Appendix - Tools and Techniques Matrix 1/2

Tool Families & Types	Tool(s) or Technique(s)	Purpose										Scope of Participation										POINT TOTALS	Contact Type (Remote/Personal)	Opportunities	Challenges	Example Success Indicators								
		A. Participation Objective					B. Participation Level					C. Geography				D. Participants			E. Target Groups															
		Consensus Building	Problem Solving	Stakeholder Sharing	Relationship Building	Information/Idea Gathering	Broad Outreach	Building Understanding	Building Awareness	Capacity Building	Information	Consultation	Involve	Collaboration	Empower	Small area	Medium area	Large area	Full Metro region	Self Selected	Affected Stakeholders	Controlled Membership	Specified Individuals	Specific Service Users	Children and youth	Senior Citizens	People with disabilities	Minority Groups						
<b>Scoping - Tools to identify stakeholders and issues.</b>																																		
Research	Review other efforts and existing information	●	●	●	●	●	●				●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	●	●			P	* Provides insights into potential challenges * Low resource use	* Information may be dated	<b>Quantitative:</b> On budget <b>Qualitative:</b> Did Metro gain an understanding of public concerns? Were new methods born of the effort?	
	Poll or Survey					●	●				●					●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P/R	* Can begin building stakeholder relationships * Helps target uninvolved populations or representative groups * High response rates, citizen interest	* Resource intensive, high cost per participant	<b>Quantitative:</b> Number of contacts made, diversity of contacts <b>Qualitative:</b> Did Metro gain an understanding of public concerns? Was preexisting conflict or mistrust reduced or addressed?	
	Focus Group					●					●					●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
Stakeholder interviews				●	●		●			●					●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P					
<b>Advisory/Problem-Solving Groups - Groups to share perspectives and concerns, provide advice, and/or develop consensus on plans of action.</b>																																		
Overall Project Groups	Advisory Committee	●	●	●	●			●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P	* Helps foster understanding, build relationships * Can be used to generate or test ideas * Supports compromise or consensus * Independent, diverse, or broadly representative members may generate credibility	* Long term commitment required * May not be perceived as representative * General public may not accept recommendations * Members may not achieve consensus * Requires give and take * Recommendations may not be specific enough	<b>Quantitative:</b> Number of meetings, attendance, diversity of representation, on schedule, on budget <b>Qualitative:</b> Were public concerns addressed? Did the process change based on new information or concerns? Were conclusions consistent with the information available? Were innovative ideas generated? Was preexisting conflict or mistrust reduced or addressed? Did participants accept the assessment or process even if they didn't agree with the outcome? Was the result widely accepted? Did participants become better informed about relevant issues? Did participants gain a better understanding of each other? Did participants gain skills in working with the process? Did Metro gain an understanding of public concerns? Were new methods born of the effort?
	Sounding Board			●	○	●		●			●	●	○			●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
	Task Force	●	●	●		●		●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P			
	Steering Committee	●	●	○	○	●		○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P			
Standing or Issue-specific groups	Citizen Involvement Committee				●	○		●	○	○	○				●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P	* Engages knowledgeable persons in decision making and problem solving * Can develop new alternatives and options for consideration * Can efficiently address technical questions or concerns	* Outcomes may not be accepted or trusted due to a perception of "closed-door" decision making * Outcomes may be targeted by the media or interest groups	<b>Quantitative:</b> Number of meetings, attendance, diversity of representation, on schedule, on budget <b>Qualitative:</b> Were conclusions consistent with the information available? Were innovative ideas generated? Did participants accept the assessment or process even if they didn't agree with the outcome? Was the result widely accepted?	
	Existing Boards or Commissions	●	●		●		●			●	●	●			●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
	Issue Resource Group	○	●	●				●			●					●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
	Technical Review Panel		●							●	●					○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
<b>Public Conversation Tools - Gatherings and individual contacts to consult with stakeholders that are not part of the formal committee structure.</b>																																		
Public Gatherings	Forum	○	●	●	○	●				●	●	○			●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P	* Can help promote transparency or openness * Creates face-to-face interactions between public and project staff * Opportunities for creativity and community/cultural considerations * Can support informal interactions * Presence of knowledgeable staff may efficiently address public concerns	* Resource intensive * May not attract new participants * Open forums may be dominated by certain interest groups * Tends to engage the "usual suspects" as opposed to new participants * Comments gathered may not be statistically valid * Facilitators may be necessary to moderate potential conflicts	<b>Quantitative:</b> Number of meetings, attendance, diversity of representation, feedback received <b>Qualitative:</b> Were innovative ideas generated? Did participants become better informed about relevant issues? Did participants gain a better understanding of each other? Did Metro gain an understanding of public concerns? Were new methods born of the effort?	
	Town Hall	○	●	○	●					○	○	○			●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
	Open House		○	○	○	●				●	●	○	○			●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
	Public Meeting				○					●	●	●				●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
	Public Hearing				○					●	●					●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
Public Events for Problem Solving	Workshop	○	●	●	○	●		●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P	* Can begin building stakeholder relationships * Allows participants to contribute to the process and feel ownership * Helps target uninvolved populations * Helps foster understanding, build relationships * Can be used to generate or test ideas * Creates informed involvement * Maximizes the usefulness of feedback	* Requires skilled facilitation and designated staff resources * May not attract new participants * May not be seen as representing the broader public * May draw out unpopular ideas and the need to address reactions	<b>Quantitative:</b> Number of meetings, attendance, diversity of representation, on schedule, on budget <b>Qualitative:</b> Were public concerns addressed? Did the process change based on new information or concerns? Were conclusions consistent with the information available? Were innovative ideas generated? Did participants accept the assessment or process even if they didn't agree with the outcome? Was the result widely accepted? Did participants become better informed about relevant issues? Did participants gain a better understanding of each other? Did participants gain skills in working with the process? Did Metro gain an understanding of public concerns? Were new methods born of the effort?	
	Work Session with Decision Makers	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○			○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
	Charette	○	○	○	●	○		○	○	○	○	○	○			○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
	Symposium/ Conference	○	○	●	●	○		○	○	○	○	○				○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
Local Resources & Events	Information Fair				○	○	○	○		○	○				●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P	* Promotes a sense of openness and transparency * Creates opportunities for face-to-face contact with project managers and staff * Builds relationships and trust * Improves accessibility for some groups * Informal format can be conducive to dialogue * May attract media attention	* May be resource intensive * May need to be adapted to fit community/cultural context * Requires highly informed staff * May attract media attention	<b>Quantitative:</b> Number of contacts, feedback, on budget <b>Qualitative:</b> Was preexisting conflict or mistrust reduced or addressed? Did participants become better informed about relevant issues? Did Metro gain an understanding of public concerns?	
	Coffee Klatch	○	○	●	●	○		○	○	○	○				●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
	Tabling				●	●	●	○		○	○				●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				
	Project Information Office				●	○		○		○	○				●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○			P				

**Key**

- A primary purpose of this tool (1 point)
- Something the tool can help accomplish, or be modified to do (1/2 point)

# Appendix - Tools and Techniques Matrix 2/2

Tool Families & Types	Tool(s) or Technique(s)	Purpose										Scope of Participation										← POINT TOTALS	Contact Type (Remote/Personal)	Opportunities	Challenges	Example Success Indicators							
		A. Participation Objective					B. Participation Level					C. Geography				D. Participants			E. Target Groups														
		Consensus Building	Problem Solving	Stakeholder Sharing	Relationship Building	Information/Idea Gathering	Broad Outreach	Building Understanding	Building Awareness	Capacity Building	Information	Consultation	Involve	Collaboration	Empower	Small area	Medium area	Large area	Full Metro region	Self Selected	Affected Stakeholders	Controlled Membership	Specified Individuals	Specific Service Users	Children and youth	Senior Citizens	People with disabilities	Minority Groups					
<b>Public Conversation Tools - Continued.</b>																																	
Online Participation	Blogs					●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Large area and population reached * Convenient for users	* Internet access broadly correlates with education and income level (7) * Requires constant updates to be effective and engaging	<b>Quantitative:</b> Number of site visitors, page hits, number of comments, forwarded content (number of "likes", recommendations, "re-tweets", etc.) <b>Qualitative:</b> Were public concerns addressed? Were innovative ideas generated? Was preexisting conflict or mistrust reduced or addressed? Was the result widely accepted? Did participants become better informed about relevant issues? Did participants gain a better understanding of each other? Did Metro gain an understanding of public concerns?	
	Wiki		●			●			●			●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Portland area in top 5 markets with the highest percentage of internet access (7) * Computer use and internet access is increasing (7)	* Content development and participation in online communities can be time consuming * Feedback may not be statistically valid		
	Social Networking Sites (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)		●		●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Social media use and access though mobile devices is high for some minority groups (6) * Live feedback can identify issues quickly	* Volunteer feedback may not be credible from the larger community * May be challenging to record and synthesize all input (if required)	
	Opt-In Style Tool		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Promotes a sense of openness and transparency * User trust in social media sites higher if sponsor is responsive and where dialogue is open to both positive and negative comments		
	Interactive Survey						●	●	●	●		●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Allows for minority opinions		
<b>Information - Tools to build awareness and understanding among the broader public and stakeholders.</b>																																	
Written & Graphic Information	Mailing list					●					●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Can help promote transparency or openness	* Absorption of information may be limited	<b>Quantitative:</b> Quantity of distribution, areas reached <b>Qualitative:</b> Did participants become better informed about relevant issues?	
	Door Hangers						●				●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Informs a broad audience	* Difficult to judge effectiveness - no guarantees about use		
	Public Meeting Notice					●					●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Can be used to provide geographic/thematic outreach to stakeholder groups and under-represented populations	* Some information can be expensive to produce and distribute		
	Newsletters					●	●	●			●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R		* Contact management: addresses are often out-dated, incorrect		
	Fact Sheet					●	●	●			●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R		* Printed material may not be environmentally sustainable		
	Letters					●	●	●			●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R				
Flyers/brochures					●	●	●			●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R					
Online Information	Online Video					●	●	●			●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Large area and population reached * Convenient for users	* Internet access broadly correlates with education and income level (7) * Requires constant updates to be effective and engaging	<b>Quantitative:</b> Number of site visitors, page hits, forwarded content (number of "likes", recommendations, "re-tweets", etc.) <b>Qualitative:</b> Were innovative ideas generated? Was preexisting conflict or mistrust reduced or addressed? Did participants become better informed about relevant issues? Did Metro gain an understanding of public concerns?	
	Online Mapping		●			●		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Portland area in top 5 markets with the highest percentage of internet access (7) * Computer use and internet access is increasing (7)	* Content development may be time consuming			
	Website					●	●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Social media use and access though mobile devices is high for some minority groups (6) * More environmentally sustainable				
	Podcast					●	●	●			●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Can help reach previously uninvolved or inaccessible populations * Can help inform and engage younger populations and others interested in minimal involvement				
	Social Networking Sites (Facebook, Twitter)					●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Easy to redistribute (particularly via social media)				
Community Presence	Event Booth					●	●	●	●		●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	P	* Builds awareness of unknown issues * Targeted outreach may help reach uninvolved populations	* May be cost or resource intensive * Materials and equipment may need to be frequently updated, refreshed, or repaired	<b>Quantitative:</b> Number of contacts, information requests, visits to community groups, attendance at community events, diversity of groups reached, on budget <b>Qualitative:</b> Was preexisting conflict or mistrust reduced or addressed? Did participants become better informed about relevant issues? Did Metro gain an understanding of public concerns?		
	Speakers Bureau, Targeted Presentations					●		●	●		●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	P	* Posters and kiosks can be used to engage specific service users				
	Traveling Kiosk					●	●	●			●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Can direct interest to additional resources elsewhere * Good for targeting users in a geographic area				
	Poster Campaign					●		●			●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R					
Media Coordination	Press Release (TV, Radio and Newspaper)					●	●	●			●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Reaches a large audience * May be taken more seriously	* May be difficult to control how a topic or message is covered * Not all items may be considered newsworthy	<b>Quantitative:</b> Number of contacts, information requests, stories used, amount of public response, on budget <b>Qualitative:</b> Did participants become better informed about relevant issues?		
	Display Ad					●		●			●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Can heighten interest * Can contribute to good relations with the media	* Ads may be very expensive			
	Legal Notice							●			●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R					
	Public access cable channel					●	●	●			●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Can be attention getting * Potential for large audience	* Cost or resource intensive * Questionable viewership			
	Radio/TV PSA					●		●			●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	R	* Less costly than in the past	* Online distribution may be more efficient			

**Key**

- A primary purpose of this tool (1 point)
- Something the tool can help accomplish, or be modified to do (1/2 point)

Materials following this page were distributed at the meeting.

CLICK HERE FOR REPORT

2011 Growth  
management  
decision



COMMUNITY INVESTMENT STRATEGY

Building a sustainable, prosperous  
and equitable region

Recommendations from  
Metro's Chief Operating Officer

2011 Growth management decision

July 5, 2011

CLICK HERE FOR REPORT

Preliminary analysis  
of potential urban  
growth boundary  
expansion areas



COMMUNITY INVESTMENT STRATEGY

# Building a sustainable, prosperous and equitable region

**Recommendations from  
Metro's Chief Operating Officer**

Preliminary analysis of potential urban growth boundary  
expansion areas

**July 5, 2011**