



CHITTENDEN COUNTY RPC

Communities Planning Together

Public Participation Plan Advisory Committee
Meeting # 6 – May 15, 2014, 4:00pm – 5:30pm

Meeting Notes

Present: Meredith Birkett, Infinite Culcleasure, Amy Bell, Kelly Stoddard-Poor, Sarah Launderville, Sara Osaba, Isra Kassim, Diane Meyerhoff

Absent: Debbie Ingram, Sarah Sinnott, Erik Filkorn, Isha Mohamed

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

.....
4:00 (10 min) Welcome / socializing

4:10 (75 min) Review and discussion

- Charlie gave an intro to the meeting.
- Kelly checked in about the timeframe for this project; how many more meetings? Charlie indicated that the June meeting should wrap up work on the draft document before the public has an opportunity to review, and noted that we need to determine how best to handle the public review process. Michele suggested a public forum to introduce the document and invite engagement; indicated we could utilize our network connections, create and distribute a simple questionnaire, and extract reaction to the document. Other ideas are welcome. Charlie suggested Sept. for a public forum.
- Charlie introduced the *Draft Stipend & Reimbursement Procedure*, noting that more explanation may be needed about details regarding child care, transportation. Comments:
 - Kelly suggested prep time, mileage, stipend info are all on one form;
 - Amy suggested we ask about compensation preferences immediately following 'name';
 - Meredith suggested that participants' address is not relevant/needed;
 - Diane suggested we add 'organization you represent';
 - Amy requested clarification regarding email – work or home?;
 - Snail mail was noted as missing from the form as a preferred contact method;
 - Sarah L. suggested adding language to include mileage, bus fare, taxi cost, wheelchair accessible vans;
 - Amy noted that mileage rates change and we should consider noting that the rate will be consistent with what the federal rate is;
 - Meredith noted confusion re: wording for # of approved hours per individual; Michele suggested we provide the *estimated* prep time per meeting for consistency;
 - Kelly suggested we add when reimbursement will be expected so people know; Charlie and Michele indicated 30 days should be doable;
 - Michele noted that for this particular committee (PPP), the intention is to go back in time and compensate participants for previous engagement as well as current and future;
 - Amy noted this may be a challenge to budget.
- Bryan gave an introduction to the changes made to the document since we last met. Changes were made to improve readability/flow; Spectrum of Engagement; list of strategies; evaluations, etc. Comments:

- Emma noted that we made the change from *Public Participation Plan* to *Public Engagement Plan*; feedback is welcome;
- Diane suggested giving more thought to the evaluation methods, particularly those that indicate we will track percentages of attendance; Emma noted that most research she's done show percentages as a measure, but more research is to be done;
- Bryan indicated the legal requirements will be moved to an appendix; within the document will remain as more of a narrative. Michele asked if we will meet all the federal requirements (Bryan – yes); Amy asked how we will keep up with all the federal changes? Michele suggested including wording that indicates the regulations that are applicable at this time will be used for the project.
- Charlie introduced the EIR Tool and Worksheet as draft documents, and noted we will talk about these IN the Spectrum;
- Kelly noted that expectations should be made clear about how much public input will influence decisions; noted that Board members can play a role by being the local contact for people, but that many people don't know who their town's Board member is;
- Michele noted that we can use Front Porch Forum, local newsletters, etc. to announce who the representatives are; Sara O. suggested CCTV as another good venue;
- In relation to how much the public can influence decisions, Infinite asked how a project rises to a particular level? Michele and Charlie indicated that municipalities decide priority and that this information would come out in their town plans;
- Sara O. provided a railyard example from Minneapolis where the public was empowered;
- Charlie indicated that it's easier to empower at a municipal level; Diane noted that we facilitate empowerment, using the North Ave. Corridor Study as an example – we are a catalyst for empowerment;
- Infinite asked if there's anything at the CCRPC that's ever gone to ballot? Not traditionally, but we do empower at the municipal level; Amy noted that we empower communities to continue their studies;
- Charlie and Michele introduced the Spectrum of Engagement and techniques; noted that we are still tweaking things and we'd like PPP AC members to go through and determine if they make sense; get us any suggestions you may have;
- Sara asked if the public will be able to use this document? Michele – it's designed as an internal document but can be used elsewhere;
- Sara asked that we put language in the 'How to Get Involved' section regarding interpreters and what to do if/when they are needed – early in the document;
- Charlie asked that PPP AC members go through the Draft CCRPC Engagement Worksheet and think through if the techniques make sense and are workable.

5:25 (5 min) Next meeting: content and scheduling

- Charlie introduced the concept of a Regional Equity Network and suggested we can talk more thoroughly about this during the next meeting.
- Emma noted that she will send a Doodle Poll for the next meeting, and will also include the organization list for everyone to consider/add to. At the next meeting, we will go over:
 - Draft Engagement Worksheet
 - Evaluation Methods update
 - Regional Equity Network / organization list

5:30 Adjournment