Meeting summary

Meeting:	Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Grants Pilot Program Design and Review Committee Meeting #12
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022
Time:	4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.
Place:	Zoom
Purpose:	Guidebook and Request for Proposal development
Outcome(s):	Finalizing decisions for the program Guidebook and Request for Proposal

Recording: https://vimeo.com/723126869/d73d048a54
RFP Presentation: https://vimeo.com/716476950/f24d3198b5

Attendees

Committee Members
Jairaj Singh, they/he, Unite Oregon
Jeffrey Lee, he/him, (City of Portland, BES)
Theresa Huang, she/her, Urban Greenspaces Institute
Kevin Hughes, he/him, City of Hillsboro Parks and Recreation Department
Alisa Chen, they/them, Grow Portland

Absent:
Anthony M. Bradley
Blanca Gaytan Farfan

Staff
Crista Gardner, Metro
Gabrielle Brown, Metro (PSU Fellow)
Allison Brown, JLA Public Involvement
Travis Rumohr, JLA Public Involvement

Welcome and Introductions
Allison Brown, JLA Public Involvement, opened the meeting and checked with the group about any access needs She then verified that the summary from the previous meeting was approved by all in attendance and noted that this was the group's last meeting. Crista Gardner, Metro, then reviewed the general meeting plan and explained that Gabrielle Brown, Metro, would walk through the nine subject areas from the survey that the group took in order to finalize some remaining issues for the guidebook.

Subject Areas Discussion
Gabrielle Brown, Metro, explained that the group would begin by reviewing the questions and the poll results that the group was assigned between meetings to clear up any areas of disagreement and find consensus. She then shared a summary of results from the survey to begin the discussion.

Gabrielle first reviewed the results of Q1: "Please select at least one (but as many as you'd like) of the following program criteria:".

She then moved on to the results of Q2: "Should the Budget Delegate Summit (where project ideas are developed with implementers) be one large community event or split up into a few smaller events? Choose one:".

- The result was unanimous for "Multiple smaller events".

She then moved on to the results of Q3: "Should the Project Expo (where final proposals are shown to the public to kick off the Community Vote) be one large community event or split up into a few smaller events? Choose one:".

- The result was close to unanimous, with three people selecting "Multiple smaller events" and one selecting "One large event".
- **Gabrielle**: asked if the person that selected "One large event" would like to discuss their reasoning for selecting it.
- **Committee Member:** It may have been me that selected that, as someone that coordinates events like listening sessions and focus groups. I know that coordinating and organizing events can take a lot of work. That's one reason I selected one event, because I know organizing multiple events is a lot of work.
- **Allison Brown checked in with the rest of the group on their thoughts.**
- **Committee Member:** Will the events be operated by Metro, and then will there be support from Metro staff to perform those events or what?
  - o **Christa Gardner:** It will be a combination, Metro staff, local jurisdictions, and a contractor to bring the community together. Multiple events and how many depends on the budget, as does the amount of staff.

Gabrielle then moved on to the results of Q4: "What should be the age minimum for idea submission? Please note that staff will try to implement these age minimums contingent on logistic and security considerations (e.g., online safety, photo voting, verification, etc.). Please rank your preference:".

- **Gabrielle**: noted that, while there were differences in ranked choices, "11+" was an area where there was some coalescence of some agreement. She asked if that was an age that the group could somewhat agree on, at least for the "Idea Submission" component.
- **Committee Member:** I think I put down "6+", but recognize the security issues and the logistics issues. I know that "6+", from previous outreach, gets some really cool and weird ideas that are difficult to capture otherwise. So, if there's a way to select "11+" but encourage people to engage with young people while they think of these ideas that could be a nice way to get around not grabbing that younger population.
- **Allison Brown confirmed that the group is generally alright with the "11+" group.**

Gabrielle then moved on to the results of Q5: "What should be the age minimum for the community survey? Please note that staff will try to implement these age minimums contingent on logistic and security considerations (e.g., online safety, photo voting, verification, etc.). Please rank your preference:".

Gabrielle noted that the results were very similar to the previous question, and "11+" was still a nice sweet spot for all the ranked choices.

- **Allison confirmed that the group was generally alright with the "11+" group.**

Gabrielle then moved on to the results of Q6: "Should voting eligibility and credentialing be the same for idea submission and/or the survey? Choose one:".

- **Committee Member:** I don't have a strong preference for yes or no. There's a potential for lower threshold for the survey, as opposed to idea submission where we would have multiple touch points, whereas the survey is a one-off with a lower credentialing threshold.

Gabrielle then moved on to the results of Q7: "Should idea submission and the survey be limited to individuals and groups within the program geography? Choose one:".

Gabrielle noted that this question was split evenly between yes and no.

- **Committee Member**: I said that for idea submission, ideas can come from across the whole region and offer benefits. What I'm trying to say is that the program geography, the lines aren't always clear cut for residents, whereas for the survey I thought that should fit more within the program geography.
  - **Gabrielle Brown**: If I'm hearing you correctly, we're saying idea submission could really come from anybody, whereas the survey, we really want to target the geography of who gives feedback.
- **Committee Member** Do we have to try to flesh out an answer today?
  - **Allison Brown:** That would be our goal, yes. We can come back to it later today, though.

Gabrielle then moved on to the results of Q8: "Should the two Votes (Preliminary and Final) have different parameters? Ex. Preliminary Vote participation is limited to program geography while the Final Vote is Metro-wide. Choose one:".

Gabrielle noted that only three people answered and asked if there was no preference for the abstaining vote or if the wording of the question was confusing.

- **Committee Member:** The question makes sense, but I think it is worded weirdly.
- **Committee Member:** I skipped it because it was confusing.
- **Committee Member:** Program geography is that neighborhoods or focus area?
  - **Gabrielle Brown:** It will likely be a geographic focus area, that decision has not been finalized just yet.

Gabrielle then moved on to the results of Q9: "What voting method should be used? Note: this choice will affect how the vote is conducted. Some methods require facilitation and may not allow for physical ballots. See the Mural board for more context. Ex., multiple votes: GreensboroEx., vote to budget limit: New York CityEx., Ranked choice: DieppePlease rank your preference:".

Gabrielle noted that the clear-cut leaders for the question were "Ranked Choice" and "Vote to Budget Limit", with "Ranked Choice" having the narrow lead.

- **Committee Member:** "Ranked Choice" to me, since it doesn't include a budget limit, is probably a better representation of the community, but I also voted for "Budget Limit". Ideal vs practicality.
- **Committee Member:** I selected "Vote to Budget Limit" and also "Ranked Choice" as my top two, but "Ranked Choice" is my favorite. I think some of the practicality should be coming from Metro staff. It's most effective for people to be creative and then practicality is translated by Metro staff to make sure we're not limiting people's ideas.
- **Gabrielle Brown:** I think it's worth noting that there's a connection between the voting method that we use and some of the voting logistics we have access to. There are certain drawbacks and benefits to each method. "Vote to Budget" would be online and likely preclude a physical ballot, which is not true for the other methods.
- The group indicated that "Ranked Choice Voting" was the winning methods.

Allison then noted that the survey results review had concluded, and the group would now return to some discussion points. The group then opened up the Mural board to solidify some further elements.

Program Criteria
Gabrielle shared the Mural board and Allison led some discussion about preferences for the amount of criteria that the group wanted to include: 6 Criteria, 5 Criteria, or 3 Criteria.

- **Gabrielle Brown:** It's important to note that these are essentially what you will be scoring when trying to winnow down to wining projects.
- **Committee Member:** For me, "Improving human mental and physical health" was broad as a criterion, I might have voted for it, but as a criteria, I am rethinking that. Curious to hear others thoughts. I do like "Increase accessibility" too, just because it ties in with some of the other requirements.
- **Gabrielle Brown:** You will have some discretion too, once we get into the vetting stage, as to the weight of the criteria.
- **Committee Member:** I agree, I think that "Increase accessibility of public, park, and other natural spaces" is important to me, but it could be complicated for some projects and some people depending on their skillsets. I'm a little anti-"Built wealth in communities of color", just because I feel that adds a layer of complication that will naturally be integrated into proposals depending on their nature but could be a barrier for some folks. I do like the idea behind it, but it may not be the easiest thing to include.
  - o **Gabrielle Brown:** So, to answer that, there is a mechanism for that for contracting and jobs called COBID Certification. It's a kind of accreditation that certifies businesses as being women-, minority-owned, or emerging businesses. So generally, the contracting and jobs criteria is met by agreeing to use COBID contractors to do the work itself.
    - ▪ **Committee Member:** Isn't a barrier, as well, you have to apply to be under that COBID?
    - ▪ **Committee Member:** In some BIPOC groups that I have worked with, they have expressed that COBID can be a barrier. I did vote for this criterion.
      - • **Christa Gardener:** I can answer that. This "building wealth" it goes beyond just COBID. COBID is one of the ways this program has built wealth in communities of color, but we also look at things like internships, mentorship programs, and tradespeople programs. We're looking at groups that are generally not COBID certified, for example non-profits.
  - o **Allison Brown:** Knowing that here are different metrics that can be used to measure this, do folks feel like that should still be in the mix?

- **Gabrielle Brown:** I'll also add, you will have some discretion over that as well. There will be ways of them demonstrating if they meet this criterion or not, and you will have discretion.
- **Committee Member:** I don't just want to set a precedent that building wealth is only through money.
- **Committee Member:** I thought about building wealth is, a lot of me and my colleagues is through white dominant culture.
  - **Allison Brown:** I think that aligns with the language Alisa just added in chat through "through opportunities, contracting and jobs." Maybe we can do a poll for how many we want as criteria.
- **Committee Member:** For "Increasing accessibility" is it correct that it includes "increasing cultural inclusivity"?
  - **Gabrielle Brown:** There's some leeway in changing them as long as they adhere to the same intent. Where we start getting in trouble is when we start changing language and getting away from original intent. I think "inclusivity" better falls under other criteria, and we are hesitant to move the intent of "accessibility" further away from its original intent.
- **Committee Member:** Do projects have to fulfill all 5?
  - **Allison Brown:** I believe the answer is no, you have discretion and can score accordingly.
    - **Committee Member:** That changes how I think I guess, to differentiate between different projects.

The group took a poll on how many criteria should be used. There was agreement that 5 criteria will be used.

- 6 criteria – 2 votes
- **5 Criteria -3 votes**
- 3 criteria – 1 vote

Event Piece/Project Expo
Allison moved the group on to the next point of discussion revolving around the number and size of events.

- **Allison Brown:** Are we still feeling like wanting to hold multiple smaller events instead of one event?
- **Committee Member:** I'm not strongly thinking about one event, I'm open to multiple events as well.
- **Gabrielle Brown**: Slightly different setup, want to clarify the difference between the Budget Delegate Summit and the Project Expo, which is presenting the projects and starting the project voting process.
- **Allison**: Are we still feeling good about multiple smaller events?
- **General agreement from the group. Multiple smaller events.**

Idea Submission & Community Survey

Allison confirmed with the group that they are good on the "11+" selection for the age piece, on both survey and idea submission components.

The group confirmed "11+" for both survey and idea submission.

Program Geography
Allison moved the group to discussion revolving around Program Geography. She noted that there were a couple of ideas put forward: idea submission and survey both being limited to being within the program geography; both not be limited; or idea submission is open, while survey is limited.

- **Committee Member:** I have on last clarification, the program area is, say a person leaves Portland or?
- **Gabrielle Brown:** It would be if our ultimate program geography, lets just say North Portland, no matter what all projects funded submitted would have to be in that area. The question is can people outside that area participate in idea submission and/or the survey. There is likely to be only one project area at a time. So, one complete round and then move on.
- **Committee Member:** Are we saying if they live in that Geography or live and work?
- **Crista Gardner:** So, participatory budget office says live, work, play. But how we chose this committee was just by live, not work and play.

The group took part in a poll regarding the options.
- Both Limited – 0 votes
- **Survey Limited, idea submission unlimited – 4 votes**
- Both Unlimited – 1 vote

The winner of the poll was Survey Limited, Idea Submission Unlimited.

Voting Parameters
The group then moved on to discuss the voting parameters questions.

- **Allison Brown**: One final piece to discuss, the confusing question. Should voting eligibility & credentialing be the same as for idea submission and/or the survey?
- **Crista Gardner**: As a disclaimer, we took a step back from what is typical for the participatory budgeting process and said "what is the core here of what we are trying to figure out?" and examine how we engage the folks we want to engage. This credentialling is a little awkward, it's trying to get at how you are meeting the criteria for racial equity and how you are engaging the people you want to engage. This language keeps coming up because we are trying to bring in participatory budgeting, but ultimately it is going to be more holistic than this credentialing piece. I hope that's helpful context.
- **Gabrielle Brown:** So, real quickly, there were two questions last time, one on the two votes on different parameters and the one on eligibility and credentialing being the same for idea submission and the survey. The one that there was particular confusion on, was "Should the two Votes have different parameters? Is one more targeted than the other? (Ex: Preliminary Vote participation is limited to program geography while the Final Vote is Metro-wide)".
- **Committee Member:** Does Metro have a responsibility for the final vote being Metro-wide?
  - ○ **Crista Gardner:** The projects have to be Metro-wide, but that's the whole pilot program, so if you decide you want the geography to be smaller that's fine.

The group conducted another poll: Should the two votes have different parameters? Is one more targeted than the other? (Ex: Preliminary Vote participation is limited to program geography while the Final Vote is Metro-wide)

- Both Limited – 0 votes
- **Prelim limited; final Metro-wide – 4 votes**
- Both Metro-wide – 1 vote

The group selected "Preliminary limited; final Metro-wide".

- **Committee Member:** I think prelim limited, final metro wide makes sense, but I could see it getting complicated, my only concern.

Voting Eligibility and Criteria
The group then moved on to discuss the Voting Eligibility and Criteria question "Should voting eligibility & credentialing be the same as for idea submission and/or the survey?"

- **Committee Member:** I like the idea of Zip code as eligibility criteria, just from my experience doing surveys. It excludes houseless people, but it is a broad criteria in terms of funneling down. So, if people from out of the state start filling out the survey, we don't want that, for example.
  - o **Committee Member noted their agreement.**
- **Allison Brown:** How do the rest feel, is zip code a good one? Assuming that folks are okay with that, do you have any strong feelings about these prompts that are on the board, do we just want to keep them the same, do we want to differentiate?
  - o **Gabrielle Brown:** For "Idea Submission" we will definitely want contact info to be able to reach out to collaborate on the idea. Whereas we won't need contact info on the survey.
  - o **Committee Member**: I think Zip code is fine. Also contact info. I don't see the need to get into robust credentialing.
  - o **Committee Member:** I wouldn't go all the way to addresses, also ok with ZIP code.
- **Allison Brown:** So, everyone is cool with both, **its zip code for both and then contact info for the idea collection.**

Next Steps and Closing
Crista then noted that the results of the day's discussions would be drop this into the guidebook. She mentioned that if anyone hadn't had a chance to look at the guidebook and provide comments, now would be the time, as it is the final culminating product for this committee and then a proposal. Crista thanked everyone for all their work and for participating in the process.

Gabrielle thanked everyone and explained it was wonderful experience that she is grateful for. She then reviewed the next steps and handed it over to Allison.
Allison made space for questions and comments. She then reviewed the ask of people to perform a guidebook review, and to add comments.

- **Committee Member:** What happens for the next phase of this? Are we automatically included?

- **Crista Gardner:** Yes, you are. One question in the survey will be about your availability. It's an opt out situation.

The meeting was then brought to a close.

Appendix A: Zoom Meeting Chat

Theresa Huang (she/hers):   yes
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   I think I skipped it because I was confused
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   sorry☹
Allison Brown (she/her):   No worries, Kevin. We're talkin' criteria!
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   👈
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   do projects have to fulfill all 5?
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   it doesn't do anything when I click
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   oh
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   I was dumb. I was clicking on the zoom screen
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   thank you Alicia
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   yes
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   aare we still in the same mural
Jeffrey Lee (he/him, Chinese-American):Thanks, Crista!
Jeffrey Lee (he/him, Chinese-American):
       https://app.mural.co/invitation/mural/natureinneighborhoodscapital3991/1648151204571?sen
der=u510993bb8e3e9858cacb2354&key=b3662903-4fd6-4692-bccb-363344dbb553
Jeffrey Lee (he/him, Chinese-American):
       https://app.mural.co/t/natureinneighborhoodscapital3991/m/natureinneighborhoodscapital39
91/1648151204571/56c935687d314013ebd52c31e9af4c8a32d10189?sender=u510993bb8e3e9858cacb
2354
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   I wouldn't go all the way to address
Jeffrey Lee (he/him, Chinese-American):Thanks so much for this opportunity -- I've learned so much
from you all and feel so inspired at so many levels! Will miss our awesome meetings! H.A.G.S.! =D
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   Thank you so much for facilitating these meetins and answering so
many questions. It's so great to be part of this process
Allison Brown (she/her):   https://naturalareas.wufoo.com/forms/z5c40fa176cxl5/
Jeffrey Lee (he/him, Chinese-American):Lots of wildflowers at this site!
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   is Clear Creek accessible any other times
Theresa Huang (she/hers):   I can't make Monday
Jeffrey Lee (he/him, Chinese-American):Yay, we rock!

Appendix B: Land acknowledgement – Oversight Committee

The greater Portland area is built upon the ancestral homelands, villages and traditional use areas of multiple Indigenous tribes and bands who have stewarded these lands we cherish since time immemorial.

The lands at the confluence of the Willamette and Columbia rivers have long served as a major crossroads for the economic, social and political interactions of tribal nations for thousands of years and a place of significance in the homelands and traditional territories of many tribal nations.

We owe a special acknowledgement to the many tribes and bands and their descendants who ceded these lands in treaties with the United States.

We recognize the strong and diverse tribal nations and Native communities in our region today and offer respect and gratitude for their stewardship of these lands past, present and future. Metro seeks to establish meaningful relationships and explore opportunities to collaborate and consider tribal priorities and interests in our work, including our parks and nature bond work. We are building our understanding of tribal interests in the greater Portland area as we implement our parks and nature work.

As we learn more, we hope to refine Metro's approach to land acknowledgements in the future;
We recognize land acknowledgements are important and can be sensitive. We are hoping to learn more to integrate this into our work appropriately and in a good way honoring tribal interests going forward.