



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting summary

Meeting: Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Grants Pilot Program Design and Review
Committee Meeting #8
Date: Tuesday April 12, 2022
Time: 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.
Place: Zoom
Purpose: Guidebook and Request for Proposal development
Outcome(s): Develop the program Guidebook and Request for Proposal

Recording: <https://vimeo.com/699887993/2f09b26462>

Links:

[Purpose, Principle, and Criteria webinar](#)

[Project Type webinar](#)

[Criteria, Type and funding amount](#)

Attendees

Committee Members

Kevin Hughes, he/him, City of Hillsboro Parks and Recreation Department
Alisa Chen, they/them, Grow Portland
Jairaj Singh, they/he, Unite Oregon
Blanca Gaytan Farfan, she/her, East County Rising Community Projects
Jeffrey Lee, he/him, (City of Portland, BES)
Theresa Huang, she/her, Urban Greenspaces Institute

Absent: *Anthony M. Bradley*

Staff

Crista Gardner, Metro
Humberto Marquez Mendez, Metro
Mychal Tetteh, 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 reviewed Zoom logistics. Crista Gardner, Metro, shared a land acknowledgement and then introduced Mychal Tetteh, Metro. Mychal introduced himself and explained his role. Allison noted the summary from the previous meeting and made space for committee members to raise any issues regarding the summary. Committee members approved the summary. Allison reviewed the previously agreed upon group amendment, asked the group about any access needs, and asked for people to reach out with any problems during the meeting.

Allison reviewed the agenda and the goal of the meeting.

What are we doing over the next three months?

Crista reviewed the tentative future timeline and shared her screen, explaining that the ultimate goal is to get to the program guidebook. Crista explained that the intent would be to come back to the group in the next meeting with a more fleshed-out guidebook that takes into account the decisions made in the day's meeting and begin looking for additional support from consultants. Once those elements are in places, the next phase of the project will begin, which will be the participatory budgeting phase.

After leaving space for any questions, Crista discussed the one-on-ones held with committee members, and reviewed the suggestions heard:

- Interest in learning the big picture, committee's role, where are we in the process of the decisions, what is the vibe of the committee.
- Looking for more opportunity to discuss things during the meetings themselves, perhaps more breakout rooms, Mural boards, Jamboards, and other means of discussing collaboratively. Some of the things that are changing to address this are:
 - Starting to change formatting of presentations to be pre-recorded presentations for people to view prior to meetings.
 - Materials will be provided in advance of the meetings. By providing activities a week in advance people can do some thinking and contribute prior to the meetings.
 - Looking to have the focus of the meetings be the discussions and decision making.
 - Looking to put the guidebook together and have something to review in May or June.

Crista then reviewed that the first half of the meeting will be having discussions and coming to decisions, while the second half will be reviewing those decisions to make sure they are correct.

What are we doing today?

Allison shared her screen and provided an introduction to voting procedures and what constitutes a consensus with the group based on what the group had discussed regarding decision-making. There was a strong interest in high levels of agreement, which Allison confirmed again with the group.

Activity to make decisions

Gabrielle Brown, Metro, shared her screen to display the Mural board to begin group discussion. Crista explained the process by which Gabrielle would take notes and Allison and Humberto Marquez Mendez, Metro would assist in facilitating discussion around the topics on the Mural board. Crista then began to review the sections of the Mural Board.

Goals and Values

Crista explained that this section is what the group had previously discussed about the participatory budgeting process. The group would be looking to confirm or clarify if the criteria are still correct. Crista asks for sticky notes about whether people agree or have clarifications. The group then discussed the Process Goals and Targeted Populations sections under Goals and Values. There was relative consensus on Process Goals, but more discussion revolving around the Targeted Populations topic.

- **Gabrielle Brown:** A point to clarify regarding target populations, that it is important to consider when looking at "neighborhoods that have been historically redlined, underinvested, and/or gentrified" some redlined neighborhoods have now been gentrified. So, targeting those neighborhoods could possibly wind up targeting more affluent groups. Would suggest rewording to "communities" instead of neighborhoods or removing redline.
 - **Committee Member:** How do people feel about that?

- **Committee Member:** I do generally agree with what Gabrielle just said. The initial intention was to target the ones that are still going through the process of gentrification, but that may have been misinterpreted when writing these. Intention with that language is to focus on communities that have been historically redlined and neighborhoods at risk of gentrification.
- **Committee Member:** I recall that discussion we had about differentiating, that it should be based on a community-based definition of redlining. I agree with what Gabrielle pointed out.
- **Crista Gardner:** Do any of these ideas meet the intent in a better way than the language that is already there? Referencing things from older Jamboards in the chat and ideas expressed on the topic by the group regarding this issue.
- **Committee Member:** If the data shows it in the right way that would make sense to me. “Targeted nature deficient areas...”
- **Committee Member:** I like how it’s worded – the nature deficient areas – I also liked “at risk for gentrification” – curious, how would you capture the groups that have been displaced?
 - **Gabrielle Brown:** We have GIS information on that and can find areas that have influxes/outfluxes and that way we can track where people have been displaced from and to.
 - **Committee Member:** I would think about adding info about those that have been displaced to.
- **Crista Gardner:** I also put the comments that you all put in the Jamboard about targeted populations in the chat.
- **Committee Member:** To clarify, are we trying to fit this into one bullet, or can it be two separate things?
 - **Crista Gardner:** It can be two separate things and we can find ways they overlap.
- **Committee Member:** I’d be interested to hear people on also including communities that haven’t benefited from capital grants in the past. Both geographic and otherwise.
 - **Crista Gardner:** These will go to different or more communities than the capital grants distributed in 2016.

Critical Selection

Crista then moved the group on to discuss the Criteria Selection surrounding Community Engagement & Racial Equity Criteria, Climate Resilience Criteria, and Program Criteria, all of which were discussed and organized at the previous meeting. She noted that all of the parks and nature and capital grants will adhere to the community engagement and racial equity criteria. For the Climate Resilience Criteria, Crista noted that the committee will need to pick one or more to focus on. The question is whether the group would want to have there be a narrower focus of project types/Climate Resilience Criteria or a more open project type/Climate Resilience Criteria. For the Program Criteria, Crista noted that it would revolve around thinking about valuation by communities.

Crista noted that the group wants the criteria to be tight and solid, so that when decisions are made it is easier to point to the reasons why the decisions were made in the way they were.

Climate Resilience Criteria

- **Committee Member:** I have questions about this part where we were asked to rank these. I’m still confused about what happens to the rankings, we were asked to choose one or more. Does that mean two are chosen and the others are discarded?
 - **Crista Gardner:** What we are doing right now is putting down the sticky notes and seeing if this ranking still seems right, if not why, if so, why? We are just discussing it right now. You can

decide when we do our poll if you want to limit it or if you want to pick two three four or even all to make it more expansive. The question right now is “should it be narrow or expansive?” We want to make sure capacity is considered and we want it narrow enough that people can still get projects funded.

- **Allison Brown:** Seems like folks are interested in a more expansive approach – maybe you can tell me why?
 - **Committee Member:** I like the expansive approach. Looking at the criteria individually, it seems like there is already funding for some of those. Expansive approach covers a lot of different needs.
 - **Committee Member:** I also wanted to comment on my sticky note. It feels like a lot of projects out there can satisfy more than one criterion at once, and that should be encouraged, and that should be written into the final product some way. It might encourage people to be a little more creative.
 - **Committee Member:** Would this make it more difficult for implementing CBOs – thinking about CBOs that haven’t implemented these type of climate resilient projects before – would having a broader set of criteria make it easier for these groups to get their foot in the door?
- **Gabrielle Brown:** As a point of clarification on voting for Climate Resilience criteria. You will be able to vote for as many as you want, so you won’t have to prioritize or rank them, at the end we will have a tally, and those that meet the threshold will be considered as criteria. There are pros and cons of narrowing or expanding criteria. With a broader approach, the group will have a much larger pool of projects that you will be responsible for vetting and that communities and groups will have to invest more time in with no guarantee of being chosen. Narrowing or targeting the criteria increases the odds that a given project gets funded.
 - **Crista Gardner:** Broader criteria may pull in projects that don’t necessarily accomplish the goals the group is looking to accomplish. It could impact the type of things we may receive.
 - **Gabrielle Brown:** Also consider that it may siphon off funds for projects that could potentially be funded a different way.
- **Allison Brown:** Is the value for this group still to keep it relatively open or do we want to reconsider narrowing it?
 - **Committee Member:** I think more expansive is better, for me. I don’t think casting the widest net possible is the best approach, but if we pigeonhole ourselves too narrow, we are going to remove ourselves from a variety of stakeholders. It will definitely make reviewing and trying to decide what is getting the funding a lot more difficult than it needs to be, but I think it has a need for a broad approach when it comes to climate resiliency. Why reduce the scope when we could take a broad approach?
 - **Allison brown:** Does that land with folks
 - **The group generally agrees.**

Program Criteria

Crista explained that this is similar to the Climate Resilience Criteria, in that the group could choose one or more than one, also there are pros and cons to making it a broader set of criteria or a narrower set. Crista reviewed the criteria and asked group to think about what is echoed what is important and what the group wants emphasized.

- **Allison Brown:** Are you feeling expansive with this one or is this one different?
 - **Committee Member:** I like the openness. It makes me think about the function and scope of the capital grants. It could be creating a burden for groups that apply but don’t really fit into the scope.

- **Crista Gardner:** Yes, talking about some of the capacity issues, if an organization that deals with houselessness applies, is that putting the burden on them even if they don't fit the criteria super well.
- **Committee Member:** Regarding the houselessness topic, I kind of feel like there could be a problem with the approach being too broad. I am more concerned about how some projects use resources to work against houselessness groups in a negative way. Maybe the criteria could be shifted in a way that prevents groups from using funding to cause harm to houseless individuals.
- **Gabrielle Brown:** Remember you will have some say in this, you have a vetting role.
- **Crista Gardner:** Through that vetting process you can determine whether those projects meet your standards and move to the next stage.
- **Gabrielle Brown:** This also raises the issue of tokenism. Is a project using these communities in a token way? You will have the ability to look at these projects, which way they are going to work and what role these groups actually have in the projects.
- **Allison Brown:** Looks like there's support for the idea of 3-4 instead of the broad approach. Taking a look at how you prioritized in the previous meeting, does that still stand? Are the top four still good?
 - **Committee Member:** So, the overall view is that the broad approach here isn't achievable and we should perhaps just go with top three or four.
 - **Committee Member:** Applications that would include more than one criterion would be scored more favorably, correct? yes
 - **Crista Gardner:** Yes, typically. Most of the vetting comes up front, by the time the programs get through to the decision-making level, they are usually all pretty great.
- **Allison Brown:** The group wants to narrow the criteria down and use top three or four (not necessarily the top ones at the moment, but just the quantity of three or four criteria). Currently top choices are not favored.

Voting Session

Gabrielle set up the voting session and explained voting mechanics in Mural. The group first voted on the **Climate Resilience Criteria**:

The group voted to remove the criteria that stated, "Invest in segments of the regional trail system to expand active transportation opportunities for commuting, recreation and other travel."

The committee confirmed that it was in favor of removing the trails criteria only, after it received just one vote, and keeping the remaining criteria.

The group then voted on the **Program Criteria** and the resulting votes were:

- **7 votes** – Build wealth in communities of color, indigenous communities, low-income and other historically marginalized communities through contracting and jobs,
- **6 votes** – Improve human mental and physical health, particularly in communities of color, Indigenous communities, low-income communities, and other historically marginalized communities.
- **5 votes** – Partner with and empower Indigenous people.
- **4 votes** – Nurture a relationship with land and create educational opportunities (including Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Math (STEAM) opportunities), and promote careers in the environmental and agricultural sector, especially for people and youth of color.
- **3 votes** – Demonstrate that people of color influence the project identification, selection, design, and implementation.

- **2 votes** - Consider and approach the issue of houselessness in a sensitive and humanizing way.
- **1 vote** – Create easy access to nature from transit and for people walking or biking.

Allison noted that, based on the committee's established criteria for voting, there would be three top criteria to include. She then performed a temperature check on how the committee was feeling about the vote.

- **Committee Member:** For me, "Consider the approach to houselessness in a sensitive and humanizing way" is important to include. A lot of times government doesn't do a good job of this, and people don't often have a place to go when experiencing houselessness. Then, for "Nurture a relationship with land and create educational opportunities...", I'm interested if people have thoughts on that. I think including low-income and indigenous communities is important. Could use a possible language change to include these groups.
 - **Committee Member:** I like the language change. Also, I'm on the same page about the piece of houselessness, that's what's preventing me from being ready to go.
 - **Committee Member:** What I would have liked more from the Houselessness one, is more specificity, working with people in the houseless community or there is the other side of it, people complaining about houselessness. Improving human mental and physical health might be a bit broad too.
 - **Committee Member:** I feel like some of these votes and rankings could change if we do a round of language changes and address how people interpret them or if they are too broad or too narrow.
 - **Crista Gardner:** To clarify, this is not the only way people will know about what type of projects we are asking them to submit. There are other criteria to take in conjunction. We can also add to our guidebook "project examples" and highlight on our website some projects that address houselessness in a humanizing way. I don't want us to get too hung up on this being our "only chance" to influence on projects that are coming our way.
- **Allison Brown:** My sense from the group is that we need more time to talk through the Program Criteria. The Mural Board remain open, and between this meeting and next go put your ideas on the board and we can see where we land next time. The group is not ready to move forward on this yet. Let's take time between this meeting and the next for you all to think and wordsmith on this.

Funding Projects

Crista moved on to the Funding Projects discussion. Crista explained that the committee will address the bigger question (of two), as it is the priority for remaining minutes. For the next meeting, Gabrielle and Crista are working on a larger mural board and more detailed memo about what the process looks like based on what the committee has said, what are the values and principle in the Parks and Nature bond, and what is a participatory budgeting process. Crista noted that the big question is would the committee want grant fund to be divided?

The committee placed some notes on the Mural board as Crista explained the options. Gabrielle noted that it would be important to make sure that there's a balance, dividing by budget means the committee wants some balance between large projects and smaller projects

Allison Brown: Consensus here seems to be divide the pot. The question becomes how do we divide it?
Committee confirms divide the funding pot.

Next Steps and Closing

Allison and Crista closed the meeting with the following items:

- Allison reviewed the pieces reviewed throughout the days meeting.
 - Process Goals – The committee is good on this.
 - Targeted Populations – There may be some wordsmithing changes, then the committee is good with this.
 - Climate Resilience Criteria – The committee is good with the top 4, removing one option.
 - Program Criteria – This needs wordsmithing, the committee members will make notes and review before revisiting next meeting.
 - Funding – The committee has decided on “divide the pot”. The committee is not sure how yet, but will discuss next time.
- The next meeting is scheduled for April 26, but there may be a reschedule.

Allison thanked everyone for their participation and then closed the meeting.

Appendix A: Zoom Meeting Chat

From Gabrielle Brown (she/her/Mrs.) | Oregon Metro to Everyone 04:28 PM

Can you promote me,

From Allison Brown (she/her) to Everyone 04:31 PM

Hi Crista, I think folks are here...can you promote us to panelists?

From Kevin Hughes to All Panelists 04:33 PM

I'll be off camera for about 20 minutes. Thank you!

From Humberto | Metro (he/him) to Everyone 04:35 PM

hi all! finishing a snack :)

From Theresa Huang (she/hers) to Everyone 04:35 PM

will have my camera off while I finish snack

From Blanca Gaytan Farfan to All Panelists 04:39 PM

I'll be off camera majority of the time but I'm here and listening 😊

From Theresa Huang (she/hers) to Everyone 04:40 PM

I'm good

From Mychal Tetteh (he/him) to All Panelists 04:55 PM

I have to head out to prep for my next meeting. Thanks again for your service on this committee. Great to share space with you all today. Kind regards - Mychal

From Gabrielle Brown (she/her/Mrs.) | Oregon Metro to All Panelists 04:57 PM

<https://app.mural.co/t/natureinneighborhoodscapital3991/m/natureinneighborhoodscapital3991/1649113734615/fd3e2036a3f2360b1cf874655f84323fb69a4dc6?sender=udb943acb45109510e5263334>

From Jairaj Singh (they/he) to All Panelists 05:07 PM

<https://grist.org/justice/extreme-heat-redlining-portland/>

From Crista Gardner (she/her) to Everyone 05:12 PM

From Jamboard: JL: "targeted nature-deficient areas, affordable housing, and/or low-income communities" used in past Metro projects

From Jamboard: "at risk for gentrification"

From Jamboard: "at risk for further gentrification"

Targeted populations from Jamboard: "projects led by residents who hold marginalized identities"; JL:

Metro Park & Nature's 24 "Target Areas"; JL: "communities of most need" (e.g., have NOT benefited from capital investments in recent years) by Philadelphia PB; I like this a little better: "projects led by people who identify as holding marginalized identities."

From Alisa Chen to All Panelists 05:30 PM

Hello! I think the link led me to join as as attendee, can I be switched over?

From Alisa Chen to All Panelists 05:32 PM

Thank you!

From Crista Gardner (she/her) to Everyone 05:32 PM

<https://app.mural.co/t/natureinneighborhoodscapital3991/m/natureinneighborhoodscapital3991/1649113734615/fd3e2036a3f2360b1cf874655f84323fb69a4dc6?sender=udb943acb45109510e5263334>

From Jeffrey Lee (he/him) to All Panelists 05:57 PM

Sorry, have to grab my laptop power cord

From Gabrielle Brown (she/her/Mrs.) | Oregon Metro to All Panelists 06:31 PM

Decisions!

From Crista Gardner (she/her) to Everyone 06:31 PM

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1KhtwJkV6Gih0gJNoFg3bfmEnYdJ9Izv7P50LDfbM-OQ/edit?usp=sharing>

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.