



CHITTENDEN COUNTY RPC
Communities Planning Together

Public Participation Plan Advisory Committee
Meeting # 2 - Wednesday, October 2, 3:30pm – 5:00pm

Meeting Notes

Present: Debbie Ingram, Meredith Birkett, Infinite Culcleasure, Erik Filkorn, Sara Launderville, Diane Meyerhoff, Kelly Stoddard Poor

Absent: Isra Kassim, Indra Acharya, Sara Osaba, Sarah Sinnott, Isha Mohamed, Wanda Hines

CCRPC Staff: Bryan Davis, Emma Long, Andrea Grayson, Charlie Baker, Michele Boomhower

.....
3:30 (5 min) Welcome and introductions

- Andi introduced Emma Long, the incoming CCRPC Communications Manager.
- Debbie provided an overall welcome.

3:35 (10 min) One-to-one conversations

- Debbie led an introductory exercise for us to get to know each other.

3:45 (70 min) Review and discussion of existing plan

- Provided handouts:

- Agenda
- Community Engagement Worksheet from King County (Seattle, Washington) for review
- Sara Launderville’s notes/comments on the current Public Participation Plan, through the lens of the Vermont Center for Independent Living.

- General comments review and discussion:

- The term “citizen” should be reviewed; possibly change to “resident” or “community member.”
- Spell out acronyms in the beginning of each section (ex: CCMPO).
- The general name “Public Participation Plan” should be reviewed; possibly make “Public Participation Plan” the tag line with a more community-focused title that indicates the plan is geared toward engaging individual community members/neighbors/organizations/groups who are directly affected. (Federal guidelines indicate Public Participation Plan is the widely used name, so we would keep that as part of the title.)
- Use of the word “minority”; change to “underrepresented.”
- Use of the word “disabled”; change to “people with disabilities” throughout.
- Videos on TV (meetings, *ECOS in Action*) and Web site - should be captioned for people who use American Sign Language.
- ADA screening of Web site.
- Public Participation Plan is currently very project-oriented; should be altered to reflect ongoing collaboration and outreach. (Ex: CCTA does this for Title VI.)
- Use of the word “elderly”; change to “elders” or “aging.”

- Kelly asked the question: “Who is the audience for the Public Participation Plan?”

- Michele answered: In addition to a federal audience, the audience for the Public Participation Plan is the staff, board and consultants, and serves as our “how-to guide.”

- There is a citizens’ guide for transportation planning; it could possibly serve as a companion piece?

- Boiling down the PPP to one user-friendly document for staff, and one user-friendly document/brochure for the community.

- Infinite brought up the Evaluation Techniques with a question about how number of people, comments, etc. are not necessarily adequate to evaluate participation.

- The Evaluation Process should include 1.) What did we learn from this; and 2.) What are we doing with that feedback?

- Perhaps the number of implemented changes would be a good evaluation tool.

- Detailed page-by-page review:

- See Sara’s notes.

- Everyone’s suggestions were noted and will be incorporated into the next version.

- More discussion:

- Title VI pieces need to be broader to extend beyond transportation.

- A section should be included about how we intend to monitor the entire process from start to finish.

4:55 (5 min) Next meeting: content and goals

- Scheduling:

- In addition to Andi’s Doodle poll, phone calls will be made, as some members don’t access e-mail frequently (Emma to handle).

- Next meeting will be scheduled for early November.

- Before next meeting, members were asked to:

- Research and review other community ideas and processes for engaging the public, including:

- Group outreach

- Evaluation techniques (including best practices)

- How to include more qualitative feedback

- Research and review other Public Participation Plans for ideas and suggestions.

- Assemble any ideas / examples / thoughts / suggestions for discussion.

5:00 Adjournment