



Meeting Notice

Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee

Goal 1, Citizen Involvement: Develop a citizen involvement program that ensures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

Zoom Video Conference:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84975334914?pwd=MmZjVkJVtUUUJmb052ZDJ2NFZlQVJaUT09>

Toll Free: 1-888 683 5191
ID: 849 7533 4914

Meeting:

Friday, January 28, 2022
9:00am – noon

9:00am – Teleconference Meeting

Item 1	Welcome and Agenda Review	9:00am
Item 2	Public Comment	9:10am
Item 3	Achievement in Community Engagement (ACE) Awards <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Press Release and Media Sharing• Timeline• Application review process• Next Steps	9:20am
Item 4	CIAC 2022 Workplan Development	10:00am
Item 5	DLCD Presentations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Implementation of SB 762 – Wildfire Omnibus• Climate Vulnerability Assessment• Legislative Preview – Environmental Justice Task Force Legislative Concept	11:00am
Item 6	Other Business	11:50am
Item 7	Next Steps/Recap	11:55am
	Adjourn	noon

All times are estimates. Items may be taken in an order different than shown on this agenda. For more information contact: Ingrid Caudel, 971-701-1133, ingrid.caudel@dlcd.oregon.gov

Oregon's Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee is comprised of ten volunteers, one from each of Oregon's six Congressional Districts and four at-large positions. CIAC is a permanent committee established by ORS 197 and is only an advisory body; it has no explicit or implied authority over any local government or state agency. It does not set policy nor review local land use plans or decisions.



Current Committee Members:

Jena Hughes (District 1)
Steve Faust, Chair (District 3)
Vacant (District 5)
Zechariah Heck, Vice Chair (At-large)
Fran Warren (At-large)

Chantal Ivenso (District 2)
Jennifer Eisele (District 4)
Artemio Paz Jr (At-large)
Leah Rausch (At-large)



The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities, please make requests at least 48 hours before the meeting to Ingrid Caudel at 503-934-0000, ingrid.caudel@dlcd.oregon.gov, or by TTY: Oregon Relay Services 800-735-2900.

Public Comment:

This part of the agenda is for comments on topics not scheduled elsewhere on the agenda. The chair may set time limits (usually three minutes) for individual speakers. The maximum time for all public comments under this agenda item will be limited to 30 minutes. If you bring written summaries or other materials to the meeting please provide the committee with 20 copies prior to your testimony. The committee is unable to take action, at this meeting, on items brought to their attention on this forum.



NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: January 10, 2022

CONTACT: Sadie Carney, 503-383-6648, sadie.carney@dlcd.oregon.gov
Ingrid Caudel, 971-701-1133, ingrid.caudel@dlcd.oregon.gov



2022 Achievement in Community Engagement (ACE) Awards Opportunity Open **Application Deadline: 5:00p.m., Wednesday, March 30, 2022**

SALEM - The State's Community Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC) of the Department of Land Conservation and Development is pleased to announce that it is now accepting applications for the 2022 Achievement in Community Engagement (ACE) awards to recognize excellence in community engagement.

One of the CIAC's goals is to help communities create more diverse, equitable, and inclusive planning processes that create an equitable and inclusive planning program for Oregon. This desire is supported by the [State of Oregon Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Action Plan](#) and the DLCD Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Committee and agency-wide inclusion work.

The CIAC is particularly interested in learning about projects that demonstrate a commitment to racial justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion. Community engagement practitioners should be sure to highlight engagement with individuals and communities from historically and currently underserved and under-resourced communities.

Eligibility. Projects must have completed *at least* one phase of public outreach in the period January 2021-March 2022, which ideally has been assessed and evaluated. Individual community members, community organizations, and government entities are eligible for award consideration. Applications will be evaluated based on the size of the population served and the resources available to the organization or individual being considered for the award.

Application and Deadline. Competitive applications will demonstrate community engagement projects that:

- Have a rationale and are intentionally designed to engage the community;
- Are well thought out, identifying those potentially affected early on;
- Involve historically marginalized communities;
- Exhibit innovative elements;
- Make creative use of available resources;
- Build partnerships to maximize success;
- Communicate clearly throughout the project;
- Provide feedback to participating citizens on how their input was incorporated; and
- Assess and evaluate methods to improve future community engagement processes

To be considered, applicants will complete the one-page application, available at the agency website at <https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/About/Pages/CIAC.aspx>. Supporting materials may be included in your application package. Applicants are encouraged to provide links to such materials wherever feasible. The CIAC encourages electronically submitted applications to either staff contact attached to this press release. Applications are due by 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 30, 2022. If you have questions, please contact department staff Sadie Carney at sadie.carney@dlcd.oregon.gov or Ingrid Caudel at ingrid.caudel@dlcd.oregon.gov.

###

About the CIAC. The CIAC is a statewide committee authorized under ORS 197.160. The committee is charged with ensuring implementation of Goal 1 (Citizen Involvement) of Oregon's statewide planning goals. Since the adoption of Oregon's statewide land use planning program, the CIAC has been instrumental in providing guidance to the state's 242 cities and 36 counties on how best to involve their citizens in the development and adoption of comprehensive plans. Now that all Oregon jurisdictions have comprehensive plans in place, the CIAC mainly works to highlight best practices, and serves as a resource to local jurisdictions and DLCD staff.

Oregon's statewide land use planning program — originated in 1973 under Senate Bill 100 — protects farm and forest lands, conserves natural resources, promotes livable communities, facilitates orderly and efficient development, helps coordination among local governments, and enables citizen involvement.

The program affords all Oregonians predictability and sustainability to the development process by allocating land for industrial, commercial and housing development, as well as transportation and agriculture.

The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) administers the program. A seven-member volunteer citizen board known as the [Land Conservation and Development Commission \(LCDC\)](#) guides DLCD.



Achievement in Community Engagement Award ACE Award

Application

Date: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

Name of Nomination Contact Person [Click here to enter text.](#)

Address [Click here to enter text.](#)

Phone [Click here to enter text.](#)

Email [Click here to enter text.](#)

Name of Project Nominated

Lead Organization and/or Name of Individual Nominated

Project Location [Click here to enter text.](#)

Project Time Frame [Click here to enter text.](#)

In 2-5 pages, please provide the following information and attach it as part of this application.

1. **Project Description:** Please include a brief summary of the overall planning project.
2. **ACE Goals:** In detail, describe how your engagement efforts met each goal.
See Appendix B for more details on each goal and some examples of outstanding engagement strategies. For those nominating an individual choose only the goals that relate to the individual's contributions to the engagement efforts.
3. **Project Outcomes:** Briefly describe how the project engagement efforts created successful outcomes for the nominated planning project.
4. **Lessons Learned**:** If you are nominating yourself/organization, please provide a short description of the main lessons you learned from this process.

Contact References (2) At least one must be a community stakeholder in the nominated project.

Reference 1 – Name [Click here to enter text.](#)

Address [Click here to enter text.](#)

Phone [Click here to enter text.](#)

Email [Click here to enter text.](#)

Reference 2 – Name [Click here to enter text.](#)

Address [Click here to enter text.](#)

Phone [Click here to enter text.](#)

Email [Click here to enter text.](#)

Notes:

1. Project must have been completed by December 31st of the previous year.
2. Nomination applications must be limited to five (typed) pages, not including references.
3. Nominations should be submitted before 12:00am March 1st PST.
4. Nominations may be submitted by individuals and organization that are not directly involved in the land-use related project, or by a third party.
5. **Any recipient of the ACE Award will be asked to provide a "Lessons Learned" component to include with future materials in order to further improve our shared knowledge base.





Achievement in Community Engagement Award

ACE Award

CIAC Member Review Form

Name of Plan Click here to enter text.		0	1	2	3	4
CIAC Reviewer Click here to enter text.		No examples of this goal were being presented in the project.	1 or 2 examples of this goal being represented, but no conscious decision behind why adding this into the project would be useful. Were they just following the basic requirements set by the state/region /local governments? (e.g. public hearings)	1 or 2 examples of this goal being represented with some through to why it is needed to make a successful project. There was some intention to why they decided to choose these methods, but didn't fully use all the tools needed to engage a variety of stakeholders.	3 or more examples of this goal being represented within the project with the intention to focus on getting a variety of engagement through various methods.	A full range of examples of this goal being excellently represented within the project and carefully thought out as to why they would be effective. A variety of engagement tools were used to make sure all of the stakeholders were engaged.
Date Click here to enter a date.						
Review <div>_____ Total Goals Addressed</div> <div>_____ Total Strategies Addressed</div>						
Goals		Comments				
	Diversity and Equity	The project promoted diversity and has been an equitable representation of stakeholders Stakeholders were involved in the design, development and implementation of the project. Community input was incorporated into the project. The project used new or different strategies that can be replicated to improve upon future planning and community engagement efforts. Worked with community organizations, government entities, local stakeholders, etc. to build partnerships that contributed to a successful planning process.				
	People Centered					
	Community Influence					
	Innovation					
	Building Partnerships					
Strategies						
Outreach		Comments				
	Provide early notice					
	Identify diverse stakeholder groups					
	Youth					
	Minorities					
	People with Disabilities					
	Vulnerable Populations					
	Communication is clear, effective and accessible for all stakeholders					
	Uses resources creatively					
	Resources (time, money, staff) were used efficiently and effectively					
	Provide incentives					
	Childcare					
	Travel reimbursement					
	Food & Drink					

Methods		Comments
	Surveys	
	Focus Groups	
	Workshops	
	Charrettes	
	Open Houses	
	Public Hearings	
	Info Sessions	
	Interviews	
	Canvassing	
	Experiential Activities	
	Tours	
	Anything 'out of the box'?	
Collaborations and Capacity Building		Comments
	Foster Relationships	
	Create mutual learning opportunities that empower the community and project team	
	Develop and support community advocates	
	Promote inter-agency collaboration	
Transparent Process and Communication		Comments
	Encourage authentic dialogue – provide information in a manner that respects the knowledge and expertise of the community and stakeholders	
	Translate materials as needed to appropriately reach communities that may be affected	
	Provide technical information that is easily understood	
	Maintain relevant online resources that are easy to navigate	
	Project website or webpage	
	Social Media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)	
	Give project notice and updates via traditional media	
	Local newspapers	
	Press releases	
Community Feedback		Comments
	Create stakeholder committees for project	
	Ensure and monitor participant satisfaction	
	Verify that community members felt their ideas and experiences were heard and validated	
Evaluation and Assessment		Comments
	Identify areas for improvement	
	Evaluate “lessons learned”	
	Effectively create a replicable planning model	

Timestamp	Reviewer Name:	Project Name	Initial Requirements	Initial Requirements	Initial Requirements [The application is no more than 10 typed pages and was submitted on the 2018 ACE Award application form.]	RATIONALE / INTENTIONAL DESIGN. A rationale exists for the project's public participation engagement strategy. Evidence of an intentional public process and plan design exists.	RATIONALE / INTENTIONAL DESIGN. Strengths/weaknesses:	STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS. Conducted early in project planning to ensure the project has reached out to the relevant stakeholder groups.	STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS. Strengths/weaknesses:	PEOPLE CENTERED. Stakeholders have been actively involved in the project's design and development, with a strong emphasis on community input.	PEOPLE CENTERED. Strengths/weaknesses:	DIVERSITY AND EQUITY. The project has promoted stakeholder diversity and equity with early notice and input opportunities for people likely to be affected by the project, with a focus on diverse, historically marginalized communities.	DIVERSITY AND EQUITY. Strengths/weaknesses:	COMMUNICATION. Clear and accessible communication, and as appropriate, provided in multiple languages and in non-traditional ways.	COMMUNICATION. Strengths/weaknesses:	RESOURCES. Available resources used prudently and effectively.	RESOURCES. Strengths/weaknesses:	PARTNERSHIP BUILDING. The project has resulted in strengthened partnerships with local stakeholders, community organizations, government entities, etc.	PARTNERSHIP BUILDING. Strengths/weaknesses:	INNOVATION. New or creative strategies that can be used as an example and tool for implementation in future planning and community engagement efforts.
5/23/2018 18:12:58	Jerry Gerspach	City of La Pine Code Assistance, Engagement, and Revitalization Strategy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Get comments from as many stakeholders as possible regarding development of a one block area in the center of the downtown La Pine.	Yes	Focused outreach to specific groups, particularly age, income, and veteran status.	Yes	Stakeholder comments were collected through a survey. The survey was distributed widely throughout the city. Stakeholder's comments will be considered in the design of the project.	Yes	The Study Advisory Committee performed outreach to specific groups, particularly age, income, and veteran status. No mention of targeting marginalized communities.	Yes	Offered websites and flyers that explained the project	Yes		No	Not apparent in application text.	Yes
5/23/2018 18:51:44	Jerry Gerspach	City of Salem NESCA-Lansing Neighborhood Plan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Effective public engagement is critical to the development of a neighborhood plan.'	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	This was apparent particularly in their use of a professional translator.	Yes		Yes
5/22/2018 15:37:00	Jerry Gerspach	City of Woodburn Alleyway Beautification Project	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Stakeholder comments were the basis for the project design. Don't know how this outreach was done.	No	Stakeholder groups seem relevant but no apparent effort to pursue diversity.		Appeared to involve community (at least local businesses) whenever possible.	No	No apparent effort.	Yes	Apparently this was done through Woodburn Downtown Ass. & Chamber of Commerce.	Yes	Substantial support from local community.		The City partnered with local businesses in several aspects of this project.	No
5/22/2018 17:17:48	Jerry Gerspach	Estacada Active Transportation Plan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	To provide optimum pedestrian and bicycle facilities for Estacada residents. These facilities would be defined by local stakeholder input.	Yes	Wide variety of stakeholder groups. Project staff attempted to promote stakeholder diversity and equity.		Project driven by community input.	Yes	Project staff attempted to promote stakeholder diversity and equity.	Yes		Yes		Yes		No
5/22/2018 20:48:17	Jerry Gerspach	Washington County Transportation Futures Study	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes

Timestamp	Reviewer Name:	Project Name	INNOVATION. Strengths/weaknesses:	FEEDBACK ON COMMUNITY INPUT. Public participants made aware of how their input was/will be incorporated into final outcomes.	FEEDBACK ON COMMUNITY INPUT. Strengths/weaknesses:	EVALUATION METRICS. Methods of public engagement have been evaluated as the project has evolved. Evidence exists of project adaptation as a result of evaluation.	EVALUATION METRICS. Strengths/weaknesses:	LESSONS LEARNED. Lessons learned, areas for improvement identified, methodological strengths/weaknesses identified.	LESSONS LEARNED. Strengths/weaknesses:	Overall Project Rank	Comments, if any, on your ranking:
5/23/2018 18:12:58	Jerry Gerspach	City of La Pine Code Assistance, Engagement, and Revitalization Strategy	Worked with the University of Oregon to be the "Small City Pilot". The pilot program was not well defined in the application but more information can be found here at the link below: https://sci.uorego	No	Not apparent in application text.	No	Not apparent in application text.	No	Not apparent in application text.	Medium	
5/23/2018 18:51:44	Jerry Gerspach	City of Salem NESCA-Lansing Neighborhood Plan	The team found contacts of marginalized communities by attending school functions.	Yes		Yes	Went from traditional open houses, web-page, and surveys to attending local school functions.	Yes		High	This sounds like a very thoughtful and successful project.
5/22/2018 15:37:00	Jerry Gerspach	City of Woodburn Alleyway Beautification Project	Not apparent.	No	No feedback by the City is noted.	No	Not apparent.	No	Not apparent.	High	Although some technical aspects of the planning and evaluation process are missing, this seems to have been a very well received project.
5/22/2018 17:17:48	Jerry Gerspach	Estacada Active Transportation Plan	Nothing innovative. Focused on 'best practices' and 1-on1 casual conversation.	Yes		Yes		Yes	Open house facilitation has been identified as a weakness.	Medium	
5/22/2018 20:48:17	Jerry Gerspach	Washington County Transportation Futures Study		Yes		Yes		Yes		High	The project team and consultant team implemented an outstanding public/community involvement process throughout this project. They appear to have met or exceeded (mostly exceeded) all evaluation categories for the ACE Award.

Timestamp	Reviewer Name:	Project Name	Initial Requirements	Initial Requirements	Initial Requirements [The application is no more than 10 typed pages and was submitted on the 2018 ACE Award application form.]	RATIONALE / INTENTIONAL DESIGN. A rationale exists for the project's public participation engagement strategy. Evidence of an intentional public process and plan design exists.	RATIONALE / INTENTIONAL DESIGN. Strengths/weaknesses:	STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS. Conducted early in project planning to ensure the project has reached out to the relevant stakeholder groups.	STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS. Strengths/weaknesses:	PEOPLE CENTERED. Stakeholders have been actively involved in the project's design and development, with a strong emphasis on community input.	PEOPLE CENTERED. Strengths/weaknesses:	DIVERSITY AND EQUITY. The project has promoted stakeholder diversity and equity with early notice and input opportunities for people likely to be affected by the project, with a focus on diverse, historically marginalized communities.	DIVERSITY AND EQUITY. Strengths/weaknesses:	COMMUNICATION. Clear and accessible communication, and as appropriate, provided in multiple languages and in non-traditional ways.	COMMUNICATION. Strengths/weaknesses:	RESOURCES. Available resources used prudently and effectively.	RESOURCES. Strengths/weaknesses:	PARTNERSHIP BUILDING. The project has resulted in strengthened partnerships with local stakeholders, community organizations, government entities, etc.	PARTNERSHIP BUILDING. Strengths/weaknesses:	INNOVATION. New or creative strategies that can be used as an example and tool for implementation in future planning and community engagement efforts.
5/22/2018 20:35:23	Sebastian Lawler	City of Salem NESCA-Lansing Neighborhood Plan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
5/22/2018 20:23:33	Sebastian Lawler	Washington County Transportation Futures Study	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Exceptional use of a diverse array of outreach tools. The online open houses were creative and successful. Identification and outreach to a diverse array of stakeholders was another strength.	Yes	Understood that Washington County consists of urban, rural, and suburban communities comprised of many different identity groups.	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	Excellent partnership building with LatinX community groups and non-profits.	Yes
5/22/2018 21:43:37	Sebastian Lawler	City of La Pine Code Assistance, Engagement, and Revitalization Strategy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Oregon's newest city is actively creating plans to engage its residents in community development.	Yes		Yes	A lot of planning but not too much in the way of results yet.	No	Nothing concrete yet. Plans to engage protected communities.	No		Yes	Great use of University students and grants.	Yes		Yes
5/22/2018 20:48:46	Sebastian Lawler	City of Woodburn Alleyway Beautification Project	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes		No		No		Yes		Yes		No

Timestamp	Reviewer Name:	Project Name	INNOVATION. Strengths/weaknesses:	FEEDBACK ON COMMUNITY INPUT. Public participants made aware of how their input was/will be incorporated into final outcomes.	FEEDBACK ON COMMUNITY INPUT. Strengths/weaknesses:	EVALUATION METRICS. Methods of public engagement have been evaluated as the project has evolved. Evidence exists of project adaptation as a result of evaluation.	EVALUATION METRICS. Strengths/weaknesses:	LESSONS LEARNED. Lessons learned, areas for improvement identified, methodological strengths/weaknesses identified.	LESSONS LEARNED. Strengths/weaknesses:	Overall Project Rank	Comments, if any, on your ranking:
5/22/2018 20:35:23	Sebastian Lawler	City of Salem NESCA-Lansing Neighborhood Plan		Yes		Yes	The team realized that they should bring their translator to community events and utilize community leaders as translators as well.	Yes		High	
5/22/2018 20:23:33	Sebastian Lawler	Washington County Transportation Futures Study	Online open houses were very creative.	Yes		Yes		Yes		High	Exceptional applicant, and not just because I call Washington County home!
5/22/2018 21:43:37	Sebastian Lawler	City of La Pine Code Assistance, Engagement, and Revitalization Strategy	Use of University resources.	Yes		Yes		Yes		Medium	I like the energy that this young City has for only being twelve years old. I think they have some great plans in place for the future. I like the use of University resources. The only detractor is the fact that their only concrete accomplishment is a survey. I'd be curious to read their submission for next year.
5/22/2018 20:48:46	Sebastian Lawler	City of Woodburn Alleyway Beautification Project	This seemed like a pretty standard community improvement project. No evidence of anything new or creative.	Yes		No		Yes	Discovered that the service provider was willing to be a key partner in the project.	Medium	

Timestamp	Reviewer Name:	Project Name	Initial Requirements	Initial Requirements	Initial Requirements [The application is no more than 10 typed pages and was submitted on the 2018 ACE Award application form.]	RATIONALE / INTENTIONAL DESIGN. A rationale exists for the project's public participation engagement strategy. Evidence of an intentional public process and plan design exists.	RATIONALE / INTENTIONAL DESIGN. Strengths/weaknesses:	STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS. Conducted early in project planning to ensure the project has reached out to the relevant stakeholder groups.	STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS. Strengths/weaknesses:	PEOPLE CENTERED. Stakeholders have been actively involved in the project's design and development, with a strong emphasis on community input.	PEOPLE CENTERED. Strengths/weaknesses:	DIVERSITY AND EQUITY. The project has promoted stakeholder diversity and equity with early notice and input opportunities for people likely to be affected by the project, with a focus on diverse, historically marginalized communities.	DIVERSITY AND EQUITY. Strengths/weaknesses:	COMMUNICATION. Clear and accessible communication, and as appropriate, provided in multiple languages and in non-traditional ways.	COMMUNICATION. Strengths/weaknesses:	RESOURCES. Available resources used prudently and effectively.	RESOURCES. Strengths/weaknesses:	PARTNERSHIP BUILDING. The project has resulted in strengthened partnerships with local stakeholders, community organizations, government entities, etc.	PARTNERSHIP BUILDING. Strengths/weaknesses:	INNOVATION. New or creative strategies that can be used as an example and tool for implementation in future planning and community engagement efforts.
5/22/2018 21:16:19	Sebastian Lawler	Estacada Active Transportation Plan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Standard community stakeholder committee model.	Yes	The City seemed to reach out to the usual suspects in community planning.	Yes		No		No	Very passive engagement. Only offered that a translator would be provided if asked.	Yes		No	The project seemed in process and their community meeting seemed to have had some issues.	No
5/21/2018 12:27:06	Steve Faust	City of La Pine Code Assistance, Engagement, and Revitalization Strategy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Well thought out plan. Only the very first phase of outreach has been completed.	Yes	Conducted a community survey. Outreach was done to promote the survey.	No	Many stakeholders have been involved through the survey tool.	Yes	The applicant documented some techniques through which specific communities were reached. In other cases, the specific techniques are not detailed.	No	There is not evidence of multi-lingual communications.	Yes	Grant funds and partnerships.	Yes		Yes
5/21/2018 12:46:59	Steve Faust	City of Salem NESCA-Lansing Neighborhood Plan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Researched demographics	Yes	Reached out to stakeholders to learn how to engage more community members - through schools	Yes	Great efforts to include the Latino community	Yes	Hired a translator/interpreter for the project	Yes		Yes		No
5/21/2018 11:43:48	Steve Faust	City of Woodburn Alleyway Beautification Project	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	There is no evidence of stakeholder analysis. However, downtown businesses are clearly the main stakeholder.	Yes	Unclear how involved business were in project development, but have been involved in identifying the problem and implementing the solution.	No	No evidence.	No	No evidence.	Yes	It seems they did a great job creating partnerships to implement the plan.	Yes	Great job working with businesses and the trash hauler.	No

Timestamp	Reviewer Name:	Project Name	INNOVATION. Strengths/weaknesses:	FEEDBACK ON COMMUNITY INPUT. Public participants made aware of how their input was/will be incorporated into final outcomes.	FEEDBACK ON COMMUNITY INPUT. Strengths/weaknesses:	EVALUATION METRICS. Methods of public engagement have been evaluated as the project has evolved. Evidence exists of project adaptation as a result of evaluation.	EVALUATION METRICS. Strengths/weaknesses:	LESSONS LEARNED. Lessons learned, areas for improvement identified, methodological strengths/weaknesses identified.	LESSONS LEARNED. Strengths/weaknesses:	Overall Project Rank	Comments, if any, on your ranking:
5/22/2018 21:16:19	Sebastian Lawler	Estacada Active Transportation Plan	Applicant admitted that this project was not innovative.	No		Yes	Looked at ways of facilitating a better community meeting.	Yes	I think the community should be more actively engaged rather than passively recruiting the usual suspects in City politics. The community meetings should be facilitated in a way that leads to everyone having an opportunity to civilly communicate.	Low	Having started my public service career in City community engagement, I was disappointed by this application.
5/21/2018 12:27:06	Steve Faust	City of La Pine Code Assistance, Engagement, and Revitalization Strategy	Innovation in terms of partnerships, funding sources and the Oregon Kitchen Table tool.	No	It sounds like people appreciated the outreach and more activities are planned, but no evidence of feedback to the community on survey results.	No		No		Medium	Seems like the only outreach was a survey.
5/21/2018 12:46:59	Steve Faust	City of Salem NESCA-Lansing Neighborhood Plan		Yes		Yes		Yes		High	Great job on public involvement and great job filling out the form and answering all of the criteria!
5/21/2018 11:43:48	Steve Faust	City of Woodburn Alleyway Beautification Project		Yes	While little detail was provided for public involvement strategies, it appears the outcomes are evident.	No	The project description included metrics for project outcomes, but not for public engagement.	No		Low	This is a great project, and there is good community involvement in partnerships with downtown businesses. However, there is only brief mention of actual public involvement activities.

Timestamp	Reviewer Name:	Project Name	Initial Requirements	Initial Requirements	Initial Requirements [The application is no more than 10 typed pages and was submitted on the 2018 ACE Award application form.]	RATIONALE / INTENTIONAL DESIGN. A rationale exists for the project's public participation engagement strategy. Evidence of an intentional public process and plan design exists.	RATIONALE / INTENTIONAL DESIGN. Strengths/weaknesses:	STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS. Conducted early in project planning to ensure the project has reached out to the relevant stakeholder groups.	STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS. Strengths/weaknesses:	PEOPLE CENTERED. Stakeholders have been actively involved in the project's design and development, with a strong emphasis on community input.	PEOPLE CENTERED. Strengths/weaknesses:	DIVERSITY AND EQUITY. The project has promoted stakeholder diversity and equity with early notice and input opportunities for people likely to be affected by the project, with a focus on diverse, historically marginalized communities.	DIVERSITY AND EQUITY. Strengths/weaknesses:	COMMUNICATION. Clear and accessible communication, and as appropriate, provided in multiple languages and in non-traditional ways.	COMMUNICATION. Strengths/weaknesses:	RESOURCES. Available resources used prudently and effectively.	RESOURCES. Strengths/weaknesses:	PARTNERSHIP BUILDING. The project has resulted in strengthened partnerships with local stakeholders, community organizations, government entities, etc.	PARTNERSHIP BUILDING. Strengths/weaknesses:	INNOVATION. New or creative strategies that can be used as an example and tool for implementation in future planning and community engagement efforts.
5/21/2018 13:00:38	Steve Faust	Estacada Active Transportation Plan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Environmental Justice Report	No		No	EJ Report showed no one in need of language assistance. However, I did not see evidence of efforts made to reach other marginalized communities.	Yes		Yes		Yes		No
5/21/2018 13:12:42	Steve Faust	Washington County Transportation Futures Study	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	They said this was an ongoing effort throughout the process.	Yes	It seems the focus was on the Latino community. Not much was said about other diverse or historically marginalized communities.	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
4/4/2018 11:48:48	Wendy	City of La Pine Code Assistance, Engagement, and Revitalization Strategy	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Desire to revitalize downtown: TGM funding, UO Small City investment, OR Kitchen Table (cool!), transit Ctr survey	N/A	Following ODOT guidelines for Phase 2, Public Involvement. But hasn't happened yet. Phase 1 seems mostly internal.	N/A	It will be	N/A	It will be							

Timestamp	Reviewer Name:	Project Name	INNOVATION. Strengths/weaknesses:	FEEDBACK ON COMMUNITY INPUT. Public participants made aware of how their input was/will be incorporated into final outcomes.	FEEDBACK ON COMMUNITY INPUT. Strengths/weaknesses:	EVALUATION METRICS. Methods of public engagement have been evaluated as the project has evolved. Evidence exists of project adaptation as a result of evaluation.	EVALUATION METRICS. Strengths/weaknesses:	LESSONS LEARNED. Lessons learned, areas for improvement identified, methodological strengths/weaknesses identified.	LESSONS LEARNED. Strengths/weaknesses:	Overall Project Rank	Comments, if any, on your ranking:
5/21/2018 13:00:38	Steve Faust	Estacada Active Transportation Plan		Yes	Ongoing	No		Yes		Medium	A good project and evidence of good public involvement activities. I would have liked to see more detail about how the reached out to the communities identified through the EJ Report.
5/21/2018 13:12:42	Steve Faust	Washington County Transportation Futures Study	The map graphics are definitely innovative.	Yes		No		Yes		High	A thorough PI project.
4/4/2018 11:48:48	Wendy	City of La Pine Code Assistance, Engagement, and Revitalization Strategy								Low	Confusing application, which suffers from not following CIAC format. Thus, failed to articulate until page 4 (!) the community engagement effort, which turns out to be in the future. Only one significant public involvement to date (p. 4). Other efforts, pgs. 1-3, have yet to occur. Recommend they resubmit, following CIAC format, on either the p. 4 survey, or more interestingly, once the entire effort is concluded. This will make the effort more competitive.

Timestamp	Reviewer Name:	Project Name	Initial Requirements	Initial Requirements	Initial Requirements [The application is no more than 10 typed pages and was submitted on the 2018 ACE Award application form.]	RATIONALE / INTENTIONAL DESIGN. A rationale exists for the project's public participation engagement strategy. Evidence of an intentional public process and plan design exists.	RATIONALE / INTENTIONAL DESIGN. Strengths/weaknesses:	STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS. Conducted early in project planning to ensure the project has reached out to the relevant stakeholder groups.	STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS. Strengths/weaknesses:	PEOPLE CENTERED. Stakeholders have been actively involved in the project's design and development, with a strong emphasis on community input.	PEOPLE CENTERED. Strengths/weaknesses:	DIVERSITY AND EQUITY. The project has promoted stakeholder diversity and equity with early notice and input opportunities for people likely to be affected by the project, with a focus on diverse, historically marginalized communities.	DIVERSITY AND EQUITY. Strengths/weaknesses:	COMMUNICATION. Clear and accessible communication, and as appropriate, provided in multiple languages and in non-traditional ways.	COMMUNICATION. Strengths/weaknesses:	RESOURCES. Available resources used prudently and effectively.	RESOURCES. Strengths/weaknesses:	PARTNERSHIP BUILDING. The project has resulted in strengthened partnerships with local stakeholders, community organizations, government entities, etc.	PARTNERSHIP BUILDING. Strengths/weaknesses:	INNOVATION. New or creative strategies that can be used as an example and tool for implementation in future planning and community engagement efforts.
4/4/2018 11:22:00	Wendy	City of Salem NESCA-Lansing Neighborhood Plan	Yes	Yes	Yes		Not entirely clear why needed or how old the old plan was. But, an intentional process and design.	Yes	Thoughtful steps taken to identify and communicate with community leaders	Yes	Eunice and Bryan doing all the legwork. Working hard to get community involved and getting some useful feedback on the design. Not much said about the role of the steering committee after its intro on page 1.	Yes	45% Latino; strong effort to involve		Use of translator. Relied a lot on neighborhood leaders to translate (saved money). Website all in English.	Yes	Eunice and Bryan hard working; divide up labor btw La Casita and Enlace	Yes	Neighborhood leaders, City of Salem, planning dept (Eunice and Bryan). New rel's with neighbors	Yes
4/4/2018 11:53:06	Wendy	City of Woodburn Alleyway Beautification Project	Yes	Yes	Yes															

Timestamp	Reviewer Name:	Project Name	INNOVATION. Strengths/weaknesses:	FEEDBACK ON COMMUNITY INPUT. Public participants made aware of how their input was/will be incorporated into final outcomes.	FEEDBACK ON COMMUNITY INPUT. Strengths/weaknesses:	EVALUATION METRICS. Methods of public engagement have been evaluated as the project has evolved. Evidence exists of project adaptation as a result of evaluation.	EVALUATION METRICS. Strengths/weaknesses:	LESSONS LEARNED. Lessons learned, areas for improvement identified, methodological strengths/weaknesses identified.	LESSONS LEARNED. Strengths/weaknesses:	Overall Project Rank	Comments, if any, on your ranking:
4/4/2018 11:22:00	Wendy	City of Salem NESCA-Lansing Neighborhood Plan	For having limited resources, two staff were innovative in the sense of being strategic in locating and using neighborhood leaders. They expanded beyond the tradition White neighborhood meetings (usual cast of characters) to find successful ways to engage Hispani community.	Yes	Page 3	Yes	Expanded outreach strategy to locate and engage Hispanic comm. created a model for other such neighborhood efforts	Yes	Strategies that work for one outreach effort don't nec work for all - know your audience. Be flexible and correct course along the way.	Medium	Flexible, thoughtful. Too much placed on the shoulders of staff. Unclear just how engaged Hispanic leaders were from a design perspective. This is a high medium - a strong second.
4/4/2018 11:53:06	Wendy	City of Woodburn Alleyway Beautification Project								Low	Low medium. This is a "bare bones" application that only superficially followed the CIAC format (It uses the four broad categories, but fails to address the crucial subcategories, making evaluation impossible). Recommend they resubmit following the CIAC format.

Timestamp	Reviewer Name:	Project Name	Initial Requirements	Initial Requirements	Initial Requirements [The application is no more than 10 typed pages and was submitted on the 2018 ACE Award application form.]	RATIONALE / INTENTIONAL DESIGN. A rationale exists for the project's public participation engagement strategy. Evidence of an intentional public process and plan design exists.	RATIONALE / INTENTIONAL DESIGN. Strengths/weaknesses:	STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS. Conducted early in project planning to ensure the project has reached out to the relevant stakeholder groups.	STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS. Strengths/weaknesses:	PEOPLE CENTERED. Stakeholders have been actively involved in the project's design and development, with a strong emphasis on community input.	PEOPLE CENTERED. Strengths/weaknesses:	DIVERSITY AND EQUITY. The project has promoted stakeholder diversity and equity with early notice and input opportunities for people likely to be affected by the project, with a focus on diverse, historically marginalized communities.	DIVERSITY AND EQUITY. Strengths/weaknesses:	COMMUNICATION. Clear and accessible communication, and as appropriate, provided in multiple languages and in non-traditional ways.	COMMUNICATION. Strengths/weaknesses:	RESOURCES. Available resources used prudently and effectively.	RESOURCES. Strengths/weaknesses:	PARTNERSHIP BUILDING. The project has resulted in strengthened partnerships with local stakeholders, community organizations, government entities, etc.	PARTNERSHIP BUILDING. Strengths/weaknesses:	INNOVATION. New or creative strategies that can be used as an example and tool for implementation in future planning and community engagement efforts.
4/4/2018 11:39:12	Wendy	Estacada Active Transportation Plan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Need to update 2007 chapters on active transportation. ODOT grant (TGM) allows small city (pop: 3,280) to create a detailed, standalone plan in lieu of just revised chapters.		PMT forms PAC and TAC. Not much said about how and why particular mbrs were selected. Page 2		Consultants did all the design while PAC/TAC went on a walking tour and "met separately" (page 2). (Purpose and mtg outcomes not disclosed). Good community input.	N/A	Not a diverse community - 92% white	N/A	Clear, yes, but no need for multiple languages	Yes	Limited staff, small town, online open house		Safe Routes to School joined effort. Would've liked to have known more.	
4/4/2018 11:03:06	Wendy	Washington County Transportation Futures Study	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A growing county (500,000) - need to look ahead. JLA brings strong skills to the outreach and design.	Yes	First step in their process. JLA's work helpful.	Yes	Many interest groups involved; definitely a strong emphasis on comm. input.	Yes	15% Hispanic. Unite Oregon and Centro Cultural involved from beginning	Yes	Online open houses offered in Spanish and English, maps, brochures, telephone interviews	Yes	Online open houses saved staff a lot of face-to-face work. Planning Dept. very helpful with maps	Yes	Lasting rel's with Latino leaders and health and equity groups. SAC - broad county interests in a leadership role	Yes
5/20/2018 18:50:28	William Snyder	City of La Pine Code Assistance, Engagement, and Revitalization Strategy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes		No		No		N/A		Yes		Yes
5/20/2018 18:59:31	William Snyder	City of Salem NESCA-Lansing Neighborhood Plan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
5/20/2018 18:48:44	William Snyder	City of Woodburn Alleyway Beautification Project	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes		No		No		N/A		Yes		No
5/20/2018 18:55:17	William	Estacada Active	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		Yes		Yes		No		No		Yes		Yes		No
5/20/2018 19:02:40	William Snyder	Washington County Transportation Futures Study	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes

Timestamp	Reviewer Name:	Project Name	INNOVATION. Strengths/weaknesses:	FEEDBACK ON COMMUNITY INPUT. Public participants made aware of how their input was/will be incorporated into final outcomes.	FEEDBACK ON COMMUNITY INPUT. Strengths/weaknesses:	EVALUATION METRICS. Methods of public engagement have been evaluated as the project has evolved. Evidence exists of project adaptation as a result of evaluation.	EVALUATION METRICS. Strengths/weaknesses:	LESSONS LEARNED. Lessons learned, areas for improvement identified, methodological strengths/weaknesses identified.	LESSONS LEARNED. Strengths/weaknesses:	Overall Project Rank	Comments, if any, on your ranking:
4/4/2018 11:39:12	Wendy	Estacada Active Transportation Plan	Not really, but did use online open house		Next meeting has yet to occur	Yes	Ongoing, but did evaluate first open house. Unclear if they will correct course	Yes	Need for effective facilitator of hot-button issues (cars vs. bike/peds) Do they have the resources to hire a strong facilitator for next open house?	Medium	Refreshingly candid in their lessons learned, but sounded like staff would facilitate the next open house, albeit wiser than the first time. I felt that the ap might be a little premature since so much rests on their ability to reach compromise btw the car enthusiasts and the bike/ped enthusiasts. They say they learned a lesson, but it's unclear if they have the resources to pull it off.
4/4/2018 11:03:06	Wendy	Washington County Transportation Futures Study	HEWG, online open houses, futures maps/illustrated for simplicity, financial incentive for third and final open house	Yes	Three open houses w/ final discussing importance of input rcvd along the way	Yes	Missing partners identified and brought to table, tho not entirely clear if they did this.	Yes	No real weaknesses. Do homework in understanding public, build diverse partnerships, have a strong facilitator, incentives can be key at critical junctures	High	My top candidate. Excellent project that hit on all the criteria for solid public engagement. Well-written ap.
5/20/2018 18:50:28	William Snyder	City of La Pine Code Assistance, Engagement, and Revitalization Strategy		Yes		No		No		Low	
5/20/2018 18:59:31	William Snyder	City of Salem NESCA-Lansing Neighborhood Plan		No		Yes		Yes		Medium	
5/20/2018 18:48:44	William Snyder	City of Woodburn Alleyway Beautification Project		Yes		No		No		Low	
5/20/2018 18:55:17	William	Estacada Active		No		No		Yes		Low	
5/20/2018 19:02:40	William Snyder	Washington County Transportation Futures Study		N/A	Inferred based on the depth of the study,	Yes		Yes		High	Thorough study with evidence of true future impact results



Achievement in Community Engagement

2019 ACE Award Application

Application Deadline: By 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Eligibility: Submissions must address excellence in engaging the community in land use planning efforts (“project”). Individuals, community organizations, and government entities are welcome to submit applications. The person(s) completing the application do not necessarily have to be directly involved in the project, but they must submit the application package as a co-applicant with a cover letter signed by the applicant and the project lead. Projects must have completed *at least* one phase of public outreach in the period January 2018-March 2019, which ideally has been assessed and evaluated.

Deadline: Applications are due to DLCD (attn: Sadie Carney) by 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 27, 2019. If you have questions, please contact Sadie Carney, 503-934-0036, sadie.carney@state.or.us; or Casaria Taylor, 503-934-0065, casaria.taylor@state.or.us.

Award Notification: Awardees will be notified by summer 2019.

APPLICATION

Name of Project: Estacada Active Transportation Plan

Project Initiation Date: June 29, 2017 Project End Date: October 8, 2018

Applicant Name: Melanie Wagner Phone: (503) 630-8270 x203

Applicant email: wagner@cityofestacada.org

Affiliation: City of Estacada

Project Lead Name: Melanie Wagner Phone: (503) 630-8270 x203

Project Sponsor: City of Estacada

Project Sponsor email: wagner@cityofestacada.org

Project Sponsor Address: PO Box 958

City: Estacada Zip: 97023

Instructions

You must use this 2019 application and address all sections and related award criteria. Where a particular criterion is not relevant, be sure to say so and provide a brief explanation for the lack of relevance.

Be sure to refer to the CIAC Review Sheet

(https://www.oregon.gov/LCD/About/Documents/CIAC_Review_Sheet.pdf) to help guide your answers.

Applications are limited to 10 typed pages (not including this cover page) and we encourage electronically submitted applications. Supporting materials may be included in your application package, but you are encouraged to furnish links to such materials wherever feasible (social media pages, press releases, etc.).

Project Description. Provide a brief summary of the project, addressing the following, as relevant (see the CIAC Review Sheet for a description of each item).

- **Rationale/intentional design**

The City of Estacada's Transportation System Plan was last updated in 2007 with the Bicycle and Pedestrian chapters meeting the minimal standards and requirements. The City determined that with the assistance of the Transportation Growth Management program, these chapters could not only be updated to meet current expectations for active transportation, but that a stand-alone "Active Transportation Plan" could be developed to allow Estacada residents to enjoy not the minimum, but the optimum pedestrian and bicycle facilities for healthy, active and social lifestyles. The development of the Active Transportation Plan was intentionally designed to involve gathering information and ideas from residents, business owners, visitors and other stakeholders in the City. The project team set out to be committed to fair treatment and meaningful involvement of the public. There were many opportunities to participate planned into the project. The Project Management Team knew that the Active Transportation Plan would be successful to the degree that it reflects the visions and values of the City of Estacada's community members. Initially, a web page was developed to inform the community about what was going on and ways they could be involved. The web page can be viewed at: <http://www.cityofestacada.org/cityhall/page/learn-about-estacadas-active-transportation-plan>

An article in the local paper also helped raise awareness that the plan was going to be developed. <http://pamplinmedia.com/en/30-news/370562-253514-plan-encourages-residents-to-walk-and-bike-more-often>

A Public Involvement Timeline was developed, and an Environmental Justice Report was completed and posted to the website. The timeline was graphic in nature for ease of understanding. The Environmental Justice report indicated that the study area is above the 50th percentile and above the state average in one of the seven environmental justice indicator categories: "Population with Less Than High School education." 16% of eligible study area residents have less than a high school education, putting it in the 76th percentile in Oregon, which has a statewide average of 11%. The EJ Screen also indicated a 12% minority population, but 0% linguistically isolated population.

- **Stakeholder analysis**

Early in the project, the Project Management Team worked together to determine a group of stakeholders to engage. This developed into a Public Advisory Committee and a Technical Advisory Committee. Individuals invited to be involved in these committees included: City of Estacada Public Works, Estacada School District, ODOT Traffic staff, ODOT Active Transportation staff, Regional Solutions Team Land Use Representative, Clackamas County Planning, Estacada Fire District, PGE Parks, Oregon State Parks, Trimet, Sandy Area Metro, Clackamas County Public Health, Estacada Infrastructure Committee, Community/Senior Center, Estacada Public Library Board, Chamber of Commerce, HEAL – Healthy Eating Active Living, Local Community Members, Downtown Business Rep., Industrial Campus Rep., Clackamas County Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee, Clackamas County Economic Development Staff (Tourism), Oregon Walks, and The Street Trust. We were pleased to have a high number of these stakeholders engage in one or more meetings to offer their expertise and recommendations.

- **People centered**

This process has been facilitated by the Project Management Team, but truly driven by community input. The project was kicked-off with the PAC and TAC being invited to participate in a City Walking Tour so that the consultants could get their feet on the ground, out and about with people from the community, and with technical staff – both of which could provide valuable feedback about key routes, primary destinations and facility deficiencies. The PAC and TAC then met while the consultants were preparing for the first open house to offer feedback on priority routes and facility types. The Open House was well attended and a follow-up Online Open House continued to garner feedback from the

community. Here is a link to a news article following the open house in November 2017:
<http://portlandtribune.com/en/30-news/379132-265953-leaders-mull-changes-to-highway-224>

An Open House Summary was posted on the city website:
http://www.cityofestacada.org/sites/default/files/fileattachments/city_hall/page/11051/estacada_atp_open_house_1_summary.pdf

A second round of PAC and TAC meetings followed by another Public Open House took place in mid-May. Online comments were accepted through June 1, 2018.

<https://www.cityofestacada.org/cityhall/page/closed-comments-online-open-house-estacada-active-transportation-plan-may-18-june-1>

- **Diversity and equity**

The project has tried to promote stakeholder diversity and equity through announcing the public meetings in a variety of ways: posting at recognized locations around town, social media, city website, and the local newspaper. Although Open House announcements included a note that translators could be provided upon request, none were requested. This is an area that I believe could have been more successful if the City had “taken the show on the road” and gone to places where non-English speakers gather.

- **Communication**

Communication about the project was intended to be widespread through a variety of methods which are common to our community. Because the local newspaper published an article about one of the opportunity routes which would affect the highway that runs through Estacada, many more people became engaged. This was a positive because more people were able to learn about the planning process, however many of the more vocal people were very oriented toward motor vehicles so it also had some difficulties to make sure all voices were heard. The follow-up Online Open House garnered a lot of input and the community was able to send in their priorities to the city in a less confusing environment.

- **Resources**

The City has found that social media and the local newspaper are two of the most cost effective ways to get the word out about community projects. These were used extensively to inform the community of the project. Utilization of local agencies who are great partners for the city has been very helpful with this project. We can get a lot of professional guidance by including the school district, fire district, Clackamas County, PGE, and state parks staff, who all are stakeholders and very interested in what is best for our community.

Project Outcomes. If ongoing, discuss desired long-term outcomes and any outcomes achieved to date. If completed, discuss final outcomes achieved and any unanticipated outcomes that may have arisen along the way. Address the following, as relevant.

- **Partnership building**

This project was completed in October 2018. The City of Estacada has limited staff and limited resources as a very small city. Partnerships are one of our strongest assets, and anytime we do a project that can include our local partners, we feel our community benefits from it. This Active Transportation Plan has definitely been one of these projects. Through the TGM grant we are making progress to improve the safety, access, health and welfare of our community. When we work together with our community partners and, in this case, partners from the region, we believe it is a huge win for Estacada. Concurrently there has been work done for Safe Routes to School that city staff has been able to

participate in and we feel that as partners who are interested in positive outcomes for Estacada, we just keep moving forward together.

- **Innovation**

I don't believe that we came up with anything completely new or innovative with this project. We have been building on best practices learned from other communities, and other projects we have completed in the past. One thing that may not seem innovative, but sometimes gets lost amongst the new and improved bells and whistles that we sometimes come up with, is simply taking time to talk with our community members. Through phone calls that come in, or running into people in the coffee shop after an open house, or publication of a news article, or posting of an online open house – person to person communication is a great tool to calm worries, straighten out misconceptions, and increase community buy-in.

- **Feedback on community input**

This project was as successful as it was because the community was willing and able to offer their opinions early on in the process. One of their biggest concerns was that the ideas presented were already decided upon by “the powers that be” and the open houses were just out of obligation. Our consultant did well at noting what ideas were well received by the public and what ideas received a lot of push-back so the community could see that their voices were being heard and plans were being molded to fit the community desires as much as possible. Of course there were a variety of opinions expressed which were sometimes difficult to reconcile, but it was evident that the community became more comfortable with the project as time went on based on the level of intensity of their input.

Assessment/Evaluation. Discuss any assessments/evaluations of the community engagement work that have occurred to date. Explain whether assessment/evaluations have resulted in project adaptations? If the project and work is ongoing, explain what assessments/evaluations, if any, are planned?

The Project Management Team evaluated the effectiveness of the first open house. It brought in so many people who were concerned with changes to the highway that it was difficult to allow all voices to be heard. We determined that in spite of the evening having a lot of public input, we could have done a better job of facilitating. At the second open house, staff and volunteers were ready to handle a large attendance and planned to do better at allowing all voices to be heard. There was a more average attendance level however, and so it felt much more successful and it seemed like everyone was able to share their opinions in a positive environment.

Lessons Learned. What was learned and what areas for improvement have been identified? Do any lessons learned have the potential to inform other, future phases, or new citizen engagement efforts?

Lessons learned for city staff included better ways to facilitate an open house on a “hot topic.” Some of these lessons include only letting a person speak once until everyone has an opportunity to speak. Also, asking for anyone to speak who “might have a different opinion” would have allowed someone to admit that they did have a different opinion and that the people speaking the loudest weren't sharing scientific facts, but just their opinions. Through this project staff has really learned how better to manage a fair and equitable sharing of opinions when emotions are high and a couple of people would like to overrun the community members that have come to participate.

This project confirmed the effectiveness of holding an in-person open house, and then following up with an online open house. The City did this with a park design project that was completed a month ago, and we had only a few attend the in-person open house, but then were able to garner responses from over 100 more surveyors. We are still seeking ways to reach our Spanish speaking community. Although the percentages of our

population are small, the City would value being able to connect with them. We had posters printed in English and Spanish for the Park Design open house, but still did not feel successful with our outreach.

This project was finalized with an informational presentation for the City Council and the Planning Commission jointly. Then public hearings were held by the Planning Commission first and finally by the City Council. Future city projects will definitely be benefitted by the experience gained during the Active Transportation Planning Project. Much appreciation goes to our ODOT partners and consultant, DKS Associates, for their experience with public outreach and skill in developing a community informed project.

Oregon Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee

2021 Work Plan

April 9, 2021

Context:

To guide the work of staff and the Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC), staff prepare a work plan for CIAC consideration and Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) adoption. Priority items follow.

1. Work Plan Development (January – March)

At the CIAC's January meeting, members agree that the main priority for the year was to recruit and empanel a full CIAC that reflects the diversity of Oregon. Members agreed to the graphic schedule attached as Attachment A. Staff will work with members to present this to LCDC in March.

Staff leads: Ingrid Caudel and Kirstin Greene

2. Recruitment (February – April)

The CIAC has just three of its seven members currently. With a goal of a CIAC that represents the diversity of Oregon and the agency's priority populations, CIAC members and staff have developed a robust recruitment strategy for implementation for six weeks in February (February 22) through April (April 9). Staff will ask CIAC members to help recommend applicants for LCDC appointment at their May meeting.

Staff leads: Ingrid Caudel and Kirstin Greene

3. ACE Awards (Fall 2021)

Achievement in Community Engagement (ACE) Awards are given by the CIAC for excellence in community engagement. Individuals, community organizations, and government entities are welcome to submit applications. The person(s) completing the application do not necessarily have to be directly involved in the project. Projects must have completed *at least* one phase of public outreach in the period January 2020-July 2021.

Staff leads: Sadie Carney

4. Goal Review for Equity, Climate and Environmental Justice (TBD July 2021 – June 2023)

Like the US Constitution, Oregon's land use planning goals were constructed to be not easily changed. In addition to extensive analysis, ten hearings must be held around the state.

Recognizing, nearly 50 years into the program, it is time to reassess these goals, the Governor's Racial Justice Council recommended a goal review for equity in the Governor's Recommended Budget. A bill introduced by Beyond Toxics in the 2021 Legislature has the Goal Review beginning with a new Goal 20 and likely revisions to Goal 1. If funded, staff expects a great deal of interface w/ CIAC on this initiative.

Staff contact: Palmer Mason and Emma Land; Kirstin Greene

5. Rulemaking Processes for 21-23

Several rulemaking processes are initiating this year and are expected to continue into the 2021-2023 biennium. CIAC members are invited to advise on the charge and interests represented in the rulemaking. In addition, DLCD's Rules and Records Coordinator, Casaria Taylor is developing an updated guidance document for staff on populating an inclusive Rules Advisory Committee. We will bring this draft to CIAC before it is finalized.

Staff contact: Casaria Taylor, Kirstin Greene

6. Conferences – Fall 2021 and 2022

CIAC members wish to connect with organizations including but not limited to the Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association, the Urban Land Institute, and International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) and/or other conferences as a place to showcase best practices in public involvement at annual conferences.

Staff contact: Kirstin Greene and Sadie Carney

7. Best Practices - July – December, 2021

Research and provide information to the planning community about notice to renters as well as property owners. Timing to include and inform new members. Possible guest speakers: Gordon Howard, Ed Sullivan, Mary Kyle McCurdy.

In addition, CIAC members advised that inclusive community engagement should be a topic at all planners network meetings.

Staff contact: Sadie Carney and Kirstin Greene

Oregon Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee

2021 Work Plan

April 9, 2021

Context:

To guide the work of staff and the Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC), staff prepare a work plan for CIAC consideration and Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) adoption. Priority items follow.

1. Work Plan Development (January – March)

At the CIAC's January meeting, members agree that the main priority for the year was to recruit and empanel a full CIAC that reflects the diversity of Oregon. Members agreed to the graphic schedule attached as Attachment A. Staff will work with members to present this to LCDC in March.

Staff leads: Ingrid Caudel and Kirstin Greene

2. Recruitment (February – April)

The CIAC has just three of its seven members currently. With a goal of a CIAC that represents the diversity of Oregon and the agency's priority populations, CIAC members and staff have developed a robust recruitment strategy for implementation for six weeks in February (February 22) through April (April 9). Staff will ask CIAC members to help recommend applicants for LCDC appointment at their May meeting.

Staff leads: Ingrid Caudel and Kirstin Greene

3. ACE Awards (Fall 2021)

Achievement in Community Engagement (ACE) Awards are given by the CIAC for excellence in community engagement. Individuals, community organizations, and government entities are welcome to submit applications. The person(s) completing the application do not necessarily have to be directly involved in the project. Projects must have completed *at least* one phase of public outreach in the period January 2020-July 2021.

Staff leads: Sadie Carney

4. Goal Review for Equity, Climate and Environmental Justice (TBD July 2021 – June 2023)

Like the US Constitution, Oregon's land use planning goals were constructed to be not easily changed. In addition to extensive analysis, ten hearings must be held around the state.

Recognizing, nearly 50 years into the program, it is time to reassess these goals, the Governor's Racial Justice Council recommended a goal review for equity in the Governor's Recommended Budget. A bill introduced by Beyond Toxics in the 2021 Legislature has the Goal Review beginning with a new Goal 20 and likely revisions to Goal 1. If funded, staff expects a great deal of interface w/ CIAC on this initiative.

Staff contact: Palmer Mason and Emma Land; Kirstin Greene

5. Rulemaking Processes for 21-23

Several rulemaking processes are initiating this year and are expected to continue into the 2021-2023 biennium. CIAC members are invited to advise on the charge and interests represented in the rulemaking. In addition, DLCD's Rules and Records Coordinator, Casaria Taylor is developing an updated guidance document for staff on populating an inclusive Rules Advisory Committee. We will bring this draft to CIAC before it is finalized.

Staff contact: Casaria Taylor, Kirstin Greene

6. Conferences – Fall 2021 and 2022

CIAC members wish to connect with organizations including but not limited to the Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association, the Urban Land Institute, and International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) and/or other conferences as a place to showcase best practices in public involvement at annual conferences.

Staff contact: Kirstin Greene and Sadie Carney

7. Best Practices - July – December, 2021

Research and provide information to the planning community about notice to renters as well as property owners. Timed to include and inform new members. Possible guest speakers: Gordon Howard, Ed Sullivan, Mary Kyle McCurdy.

In addition, CIAC members advised that inclusive community engagement should be a topic at all planners network meetings.

Staff contact: Sadie Carney and Kirstin Greene