

## **Growing Public Trust | Innovation Team meeting | June 10, 2015**

**Location:** 7<sup>th</sup> floor boardroom, Urban Center Building, 506 SW Mill Street

**Presenters/facilitators:** Sam Diaz, Peggy Morell, Erin Pidot

### **Participants:**

#### *1000 Friends of Oregon*

- Sam Diaz, Community Engagement Coordinator
- Pam Phan, Hub Program Coordinator

#### *Metro*

- Peggy Morell, Senior Public Affairs Specialist
- Heather Coston, Project Manager, Office of Public Engagement
- Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner

#### *Center for Public Service (CPS)*

- Professor Marcus Ingle, Program Manager and PSU Professor
- Professor Masami Nishishiba, Associate Director and PSU Associate Professor
- Sara Saltzberg, Assistant Director
- George Beard, Marketing Manager
- Danielle Schira (notetaker)
- Erin Pidot, Hatfield Fellow and OI Award Project Manager

### **Part I. Meeting objectives**

- Developing the innovation team
- Building a shared rationale for our work together
  - What is the challenge and what is our vision of success?
- Discussing the opportunity for innovation

### **Part II. Introductions– what are our hopes for the meeting?**

- Opportunity to share perspectives, listen, and learn
- Partner and build relationships
- Figure out what we have created with the innovation award and how we can work together
- How can community organizations work with and align values with the public sector?
- Learn about the innovation process
- Get a better understanding of what we are trying to achieve
- Gain first-hand introduction to our proposed innovation
- Use the process to find community engaged decisions
- Lift up Erin in her role

### **Part III. Ice Breaker: developing a shared vision around 3 concepts in the context of our work**

#### *1. What is co-production?*

- Mutually agreed upon transparency
- Recognize complexity and that not every community has the same capacity to participate
- Mutually beneficial
- Sense of follow through and accountability
- Agreement that change can happen

- Don't let cynicism get in the way
- A trusting process – Do we have the right people at the table? Underrepresented communities? Important to appropriately set realistic expectations so that people understand how they can and cannot influence the outcome so the changes in the end are expected and don't undercut the process
- Notes from post-its:
  - Ideas are shaped through a process where values are exposed, communication is clear and relationships continue
  - Actions that lead to outcomes
  - Mutually agreed upon power dynamic between community and public agency
  - Mutually beneficial process – esp. not detrimental or furthering inequitable outcomes (ex. further entrenching distrust, “throwing communities under the bus at council time”)
  - Do what you say you're going to do, follow through
  - Transparency and accountability on both sides
  - Transparency and bringing people in at the right time
  - Agreement that another world is possible – not cynicism.
  - Calling on both sides
  - Purpose
  - Mutually beneficial process
  - Democracy
  - Understanding where points for engaging stakeholders are
  - Respecting and understanding complexity of interests
  - Partnership
  - Teamwork
  - Equal
  - Collaboration
  - Shared goals, objectives, and products
  - Shared ownership and responsibility for products and outcomes
  - Leveraging collective strength (bringing strengths together)

## 2. *What is breakthrough innovation?*

- Innovation is a process that includes many people and expands a body of work internally resulting in new external impacts related to better public service and an increased sense of public trust.
- Internally means internal to the team or community involved in the innovation process – in our case, the Portland region is internal
- Creating trust so that community trusts Metro when it does innovative things – expands opportunity for innovation
- Innovation changes the expectations around an outcome and the work of an agency
- Benefits of our innovation: new body of people/orgs to work with, trust, lower costs, resilience, better engagement, Metro is allowed a bigger stage and can do more innovative work
- Don't innovate the whole at the same time – start in one place and see the ripple effects.
- Notes from post-its :

- Facilitates synergistic linkages for more quality, more accessibility, lower costs, resilience
- New means to achieve a community goal or eliminate a community burden
- An innovation that changes expectations around outcomes, an approach that creates a new body of work around an issue; Culmination of many divergent ideas on an issue that lifts the solution beyond any one individual

### 3. *What is inclusive?*

- Notion of diversity: about representative democracy
- Good at representative about narrow sector, not as good at the breadth and broadness of community
- Fusion politics – using diversity to represent the fusion of all perspectives to create something new
- The idea of inclusion lives and breathes – has the ability to adapt with us
- Notes from post-its:
  - Safe space where diversity of ideas are accepted, barriers to livability are eliminated, and decision-making processes are made more accessible
  - Inclusiveness is: Strategy/strategic; fair/democratic; necessary; smart; whole > sum; listen/ hear/ understand/incorporate
  - Leads to better outcomes and decisions
  - Collaboration and co-production of engagement process and goals
  - Bringing different experiences and ideas to the table

### **Part IV. Agreement on working norms**

- Additions from group:
  - Sharing of a deep respect for the work
  - Be open to discomfort and create a safe space for discomfort

### **Part V. Introduction of the organizations at the table**

#### *1000 Friends of Oregon*

- Created by Senate Bill 100 to defend the statewide system of land use planning – a 501(C)3 that also does lobbying
- Traditional tool was litigation, but have been doing more proactive work focused on advocacy and pre-decision process.
- Became very focused on advocacy and public engagement in part in reaction to affordable housing issue because cannot litigate against gentrification
- Created Land Use Leadership Initiative (LULI) because land use and transportation planning process is not accessible to a lot of people.
- Trying to start conversations around equity and social capital management in land use and thinking about unintentional consequences of planning decisions – this hasn't undergone the level of scrutiny across the state that it should – goal to be intentional about this
- One of organization's main goals is public involvement – our contract with everyone in the state is that we engage them in planning - about to release a report about this

- Help people see their own lives reflected in planning

#### *Metro*

- Planning is geared to the future
- Challenge in making 20 year planning relevant to the community today
- Planning needs to account for growth

#### *Relationship between 1000 Friends and Metro*

- 1000 Friends advocacy efforts have targeted Metro’s planning and decision making process
- 1000 Friends was the impetus for Metro’s 2040 Growth Concept
- Metro participated in most recent round of the Land Use Leadership Initiative

#### *Center for Public Service*

- Vested in Portland State, but carries out 3 services: learning, research and publication, consulting and advising.
- The purpose is to improve public service and institutional effectiveness.
- Committed to working in an increasingly complex world and developing new approaches to this complexity. This is the motivation for innovation.

#### *On collaboration*

- This is values based work, and we would like to align those values
- Important to be deliberate with our language - when we talk about diversity let’s be specific about what type of diversity we’re talking about (racial, economic, geographic, etc.)
- Idea of evolving and innovating together

#### **Part VI. Sizing up the challenge**

- How we define the challenge determines how we design the innovation – need to hone in on where we focus
- Think about what public engagement and inclusive decision making is already happening and why what we’re striving for isn’t already happening. How would you grade effectiveness/quality of the engagement that is happening?
- Is part of the reason this challenge is important because Metro needs to comply with laws and regulations? Yes. Required to meaningfully engage diverse populations
  - Metro Charter created Office of Citizen (public) Involvement and mandated that there be public involvement on all decision making processes
  - Federal Title VI and related regulations such as The President’s Executive Order on Environmental Justice
    - Title VI states that “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.”
    - To comply, agencies expected to engage low-income and minority populations in planning process
    - Title 23

- “Communities of concern” according to federal law – racial minorities, low income, ESL, youth, seniors, disability (?)
- State statute also includes disability and sexual orientation
- Process silos
- Local Governments are making recommendations, but they may not represent their communities
- Advocacy mechanism?
- Success is determined over time, not in the moment. Need to incorporate community in planning that will not impact people in real time – will impact future generations
- Communities have different capacities
- “Under-represented” is short-hand, but we need to remember individual lives
- Political dynamics are central – how does the community influence decisions?
- Challenge – finding ways to better engage underrepresented and ensure people are being heard and have influenced results. How do we get there?
- Mechanism by which community engagement leads to trust?
- Need to match Metro’s decision making to the community engagement process
  - How many opportunities are there for community leaders to interact directly with elected officials for processing and movement – usually comes through direct engagement not synthesizing by Metro staff and presenting
  - Problem of who elected officials are listening to – whose input valued?
- How to get Metro to make decisions in a different way to represent what learning from engagement?
- How do we know that the public successfully influenced the decision?
- “I want to be heard and I want to see value from outcomes” → builds trust
- There is a difference between engaging community and hearing the community. Hearing the community matters.
- Would like to see value or outcomes of work – if I do not see the value, than I lack confidence
- Direction of information – engaging the public in a way the public values, being honest about when communication will be given updates, and knowing what the engagement strategy is
- Important to set expectations appropriately – be transparent about process and how decisions made/what role of public input is

**Part VII. Concluding remarks - what do you want the team to keep in mind throughout this process?**

- Daunting and thrilling opportunity
- Energized about the idea of community engagement and political power.
- Often, public spaces are occupied by people who are very powerful and strategic – we need to create new, safe spaces that cannot be co-opted
- Respect for the work and let’s stay involved and excited.
- Advocacy and creating a mechanism for people to be heard. Not only is this a great opportunity, but what will success look like and how will we know if we have done it
- Very enthusiastic about going forward.
- Always blown away when a group pulled together who shows up at the table. The people will change, but excited and faith in the process and people.

- When you have a clear, shared vision, amazing what you can do. Vision attracts opportunity, so what is our vision?
- Balancing breakthrough innovation with inclusiveness. Some of the language can seem imposing and imperialistic, so staying grounded in vision and the process.

#### **Part VIII. Next steps**

- Schedule follow up meeting to create a shared vision and discuss what orgs are already doing
- Discuss roles and responsibilities, and preferred means of communication
- Please feel free to touch base with Erin whenever – with questions, concerns, ideas, feedback, etc.

#### **Parking Lot**

- “I want to be engaged but I also want to be heard”
- Engaging with communities and local governments: how much do local decision-makers reflect the priorities of their communities?
- Not just engagement between agency and the public, but public and decision-makers
- Trying to find new spaces that have not be co-opted
- For Metro, where is the good governance?
- An advocacy mechanism for people to be heard by (Metro)
- “Refugee” = ouch. Let’s choose a different word to talk about people that are able to move to Oregon
- What is the role of government in facilitating conversations that bring the voices of underrepresented to spaces that are not safe for them?
- “long term vision” – innovation vs. immediate crisis felt by underrepresented community members. How do we reconcile these?
- How can we get Metro to make decisions in a different way? Who needs to be won over? What systems need to be changed or put in place?
- Political dynamic – “being heard” and “success” → challenge

#### **Hashtag ideas**

- #newsplaces, #RTP28, #Letsgo, #YIParticipate, #SmartPower, #Voice, #success, #manyvoices
- Idea of using “Why do I participate” as a slogan - we can share stories from people – get new voices in the conversation