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1) Participants were asked to sign in and were provided with the following handouts:
   a) Copy of the Presentation - Involving the Public in Park Planning: A Draft Public Participation Policy and Guidelines for Raleigh Parks and Recreation
   b) Public Participation Policy Draft 2010
   c) Department Operation Instructions (DOI) Draft January 2010
   d) Public Participation Guidelines Draft February 2010
   e) Public Comment Form

2) List of participants who attended the March 25th meeting.

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy Sawyer</td>
<td>Horseshoe Farm Master Plan Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Deans</td>
<td>Horseshoe Farm Master Plan Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Stephenson</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Geary</td>
<td>The Independent Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Huberman</td>
<td>Pullen Amusement Center Master Plan Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Bickel</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Talbot</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Little</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Deans</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Ashcraft</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Pender</td>
<td>Parks Recreation Greenway Advisory Board (PRGAB) - current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Presnell-Jennette</td>
<td>PRGAB - former</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Ramsey</td>
<td>PRGAB - former</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Sauer</td>
<td>City of Raleigh Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Bailey</td>
<td>City of Raleigh Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Schindler</td>
<td>City of Raleigh Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic Lebsock</td>
<td>City of Raleigh Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Shouse</td>
<td>City of Raleigh Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Bentley</td>
<td>City of Raleigh Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Bradsher</td>
<td>City of Raleigh Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Spadorcia</td>
<td>City of Raleigh Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Ander</td>
<td>City of Raleigh Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mary Lou Addor  |  Natural Resources Leadership Institute  
Steve Smutko  |  Natural Resources Leadership Institute (former); University of Wyoming  

**PURPOSE**

Introduce and discuss a draft comprehensive policy for public participation in parks planning, that includes four pathways for public participation (broader than master planning).

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION**

Diane Sauer, Director of Parks and Recreation, opened the meeting with staff introductions and welcomed citizens in attendance. She stated that she was looking forward to hearing the questions and comments about the comprehensive Public Participation Documents.

Russ Stephenson, City Council member, also welcomed the group and thanked everyone for attending. He expressed his appreciation to the Parks, Recreation and Greenway Advisory Board (PRGAB), the Natural Resources Leadership Institute (NRLI), and the Parks and Recreation staff for their hard work. He is looking forward to seeing the finished documents.

Dr. Steve Smutko, the consultant, was present remotely via Skype. Dr. Smutko recently left NRLI and is now at the University of Wyoming. Given his leadership, knowledge, and history with the project, he will continue to work on the project.

Mary Lou Addor, with NRLI, facilitated the meeting.

**ORIENTATION TO AGENDA AND MEETING PROCESS**

Mary Lou Addor explained the agenda for the meeting. The first portion of the meeting would focus on orienting the participants to the agenda and meeting process, followed with a presentation to provide context and help frame the discussion. An open discussion about the proposed public participation documents would encompass the remainder of the meeting. Comments and questions that have been received to date will be added to the March 25 meeting summary. In addition to the comments and questions received at the March 25 meeting, the public will have until April 12, 2010 to provide additional comments.
The following ground rules were proposed and accepted at the meeting.

1) One Speaker at a Time
2) Work the Problem not the Person
3) Stay to Task and Topic
4) Test Assumptions with Questions
5) Create Space for Others to Engage

Mary Lou Addor offered a debrief format for the discussion portion of the meeting.

1) Questions of Clarification?
2) Reactions to what was presented? To what you read?
3) Implications for decision-making? Public participation?
4) Suggestions/Next steps?

David Shouse acknowledged that a number of planning projects undertaken between 1999 and 2001 created a level of frustration. The intent of City administration was to have an efficient process to engage the bond funds and get something on the ground as quickly as possible. The frustration prompted the PRGAB in 2002 to develop a resolution. The intent of the Community Meetings process was to get as many people involved as possible. Staff is committed to having an involved, effective, and efficient public participation process.

Steve Smutko, made a presentation via Skype entitled: Involving the Public in Park Planning: A Presentation of a Draft Public Participation Policy and Guidelines for Raleigh Parks and Recreation

The presentation provided a review of the initial 2008 study: Involving the Public in Park Planning: An Evaluation of Raleigh’s Master Planning Process

A brief overview and rationale, followed for each document of the proposed public participation.
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION POLICY DOCUMENT – Comments, Questions, and Responses

Comment: First sentence on page 1 under Purpose is missing text - responsibility of citizens.
Response: Will correct.

Comment: Use familiar and current public involvement language throughout the three documents. There is a steep learning curve with the current documents. Difficult to hold accountable.

Question: Is there a charter for the Parks, Recreation and Greenway Advisory Board (PRGAB)? [No]. I think this would be a good idea for the PRGAB. I’m surprised that only one current PRGAB member is present this evening. This seems like a good educational opportunity.
Response: It is the responsibility of each board member to attend and seek educational opportunities. Having served on Cary’s Parks and Recreation Board there is a huge learning curve so getting involved helps, reducing the learning curve. Having a charter for PRGAB would be a good idea.

Question: Is there a way to spell out the roles and responsibilities of the PRGAB since they act as representatives of the citizens? There needs to be a training and orientation with clear expectations and mechanisms to be able to meet the responsibilities of the role as well as an evaluation mechanism.
Response: Your recommendation would be useful to any Parks Board.

Comment: Currently the section on Process Selection and Design, which is a critical step, contains poor requirements for the public for making these choices as well as conflicting language about roles. Citizens need to be able to weigh in on the complete process.
Response: Although it is indirect, the answer is contained on page 4 of the Policy document. Policy design is a staff function but approval is required from the Parks and Recreation Department Director and the City Manager. City Council has recommended that Parks & Recreation use a facilitator to coach the City through this updated process a couple of times including an evaluation at the end and making changes based upon lessons learned. Although the policy is vague regarding notification the Department Operating Instruction (DOI) is very specific. There are inherent challenges within the Master Planning documents. For example with Leesville Community Park, the committee meetings were more frequent than the required 30 day notice. A workable and common sense solution is needed.
Comment: The language contained within the Public Participation Policy is too broad. Combining the resolution with the Public Participation Policy would provide user-friendly guidance.

Comment: Regarding item 5, *People Affected by the Policy*, in its broadest sense, all Raleigh citizens will be affected. So as not to exclude anyone, perhaps re-titling this *Focus (or Special Interest) Groups Affected by the Policy*. Also, does any consideration need to be given to residents of Wake County or other adjacent municipalities? They are likely to be affected when parks are on the perimeter of the city’s boundaries.

### DEPARTMENT OPERATING INSTRUCTIONS (DOI) – Comments, Questions, and Responses

**Question:** There is a Department emphasis on level of accountability. What methods will be used to document accountability?

**Response:** We hope the policy document itself is a means to hold the department accountable.

**Comment:** *Process Selection and Design* should involve the public. There should be access to the completed process document.

**Comment:** Classification of parks needs to be clear early on.

### PUBLIC PARTICIPATION GUIDELINES - Comments, Questions, and Responses

**Question:** Regarding the language of the consulting process and bringing people into the process, some of the language doesn’t match up with the *Involving the Public* report. When it says feedback and consultation process, are you referring to a community meeting process? Is that a master plan committee process? Are other types of forums included?

**Response:** Yes, a community meeting process is a consultation process but not all consultation processes are community meeting processes. We’re hoping there may be other ways of using feedback from consultation. It depends on how you define it and run it. We should probably give it more clarity.

**Comment:** Confusion on “who” is planning and making decisions (decision space).
**GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MARCH 25 MEETING**

**Question:** An evaluation process is needed by an unbiased third party so that participants can learn from the process. What are the evaluation mechanisms?

**Response:** Two part response to this question: We are planning on creating a template or two that can be used as part of the evaluation process. We would like to test out the template, perhaps with PRGAB or other members in the community. In addition, the plan is to involve an evaluator/coach using the new comprehensive policy on the public participation process with a park planning project. That review and coaching could also involve PRGAB members and other community members. The evaluation processes will have implications for decision-making and moving forward.

**Comment:** The language in the documents is too academic; PRGAB/committee members will find them too difficult to understand. The principles do not rise to the top. A simpler explanation is needed.

**Response:** A citizen guide is intended for development.

**Question:** How can the type of public meeting process be chosen before knowing if the project is controversial?

**Response:** This can be done using a situation assessment, asking people at the onset if there are areas of contention. “Red Flags” are usually apparent from the outset. Horseshoe Farm had signs including the number of individuals and organizations that were interested in maintaining the land as a nature area. Additionally, members of the public did not support the park classification for Horseshoe Farm and this became the first area of controversy. This can be handled in the future by stating what the park classification is at the beginning of the process, explaining what this classification means, and managing expectations by providing all information possible up front. And, this can be handled in the CIP, by involving citizens in determining potential classification of parks.

**Comment:** Selection of committee members is critical. Sometimes participants have specific interests that they are pushing which can make consensus very difficult to reach. Currently we are unsure how to incorporate this step into the process. How can we build successful representation?

**Response:** Advocates are necessary but expectations must be laid out. People must know that the purpose of the process is to achieve consensus by satisfying interests rather than positions. Ideally you find citizens who
can be both advocates and open to other ideas. Building in citizens with a knowledge base is also helpful.

**Question:** Could committee representation be determined by City Council?

**Response:** Allowing Council to add committee members during the public process would be detrimental to the process. They may choose someone who is not interested in the process or there may be the perception that that member has greater authority than other members based upon how they were selected.

**Question:** Is there guidance within these documents to choose the right process?

**Response:** Yes, there is a screening document.

**Question:** Can you provide step-by-step clarity about the master planning process for citizens to better understand what the procedures will be? For example, maybe give a flow chart that outlines every step and who’s responsible for all of the pathways you describe in the guidelines. Example, for a consensus seeking process, develop a Gantt chart that from start to finish shows each step.

**Question:** How can a balance between consistency and flexibility be achieved throughout the three documents including evaluation of the process while avoiding redundancy? Perhaps a Gantt Chart?

**Response:** Feedback on consistency is helpful. Unfortunately there is no easy answer. These documents are a first draft with the goal being to lay out a clear process that allows for flexibility. Flexibility is necessary because each project is different. Laying out a step-by-step process would chain the city to one process that requires City Council approval for any changes. Citizens need to know how they are involved. Flow charts can be helpful as would a Citizen’s Guide.

**Comment:** General policy document has advantages for flexibility but if there are trust issues then the details matter. If trust is there then the details don’t matter.

**Question:** Which of the three documents is feedback being accepted until April 12? The information on the NRLI and the City of Raleigh websites gives the impression that feedback is being accepted only on the Policy for Public Participation.

**Response:** Feedback is being accepted on all three. We will go back and ensure this is clear.
Question: What kind of notice is required for process design? There is conflicting information on process design between the three documents.

Question: Major renovations and redevelopment seem to be treated differently in these documents. When do they trigger involvement by the public? Currently this is up to the Parks & Recreation Director’s discretion.

Response: This has not yet been determined. Minor capital projects need to include thresholds. The amount of impact could determine participation. For the meantime we’ll continue with the former resolution process.

Comment: The public is concerned that renovations at older parks will occur without citizen participation. This occurred at Pullen with the catalyst being a parking lot. Staff went ahead with the project thinking that it was a simple update but it created a lot of controversy that appeared to lead to the Master Plan.

Response: Staff was never under the perception that major renovations would go forward at Pullen without the public. Staff wanted to get the public involved but was unable to get to that point.

Comment: I am hopeful listening to Dr. Smutko and Mr. Shouse. I have a passion for involvement but have been discouraged. It was worth coming to this meeting to feel that spark again. I am hopeful that the master plan processes will be run like this meeting.

Response: This initiative, for more informed decision-making through public participation, is being driven by the current Parks & Recreation staff and several citizens.

Comment: Create clear mechanisms to link the PRGAB within the three documents.

Comment: What is the role of the PRGAB in the public involvement phase? What is the specific role for the Parks Board in master planning committees or the core team format? Do they serve as chairs anymore?

Comments: The amount of information is overwhelming.

Comments: Some sections of the documents are vague.

Comment: How to deal with the issue of mistrust between citizens and Parks?

Response: Methods for Building Trust

- Structure processes so that they are transparent.
- Provide training for Park staff/group leaders/facilitators
- Manage expectations - What is on/off the table for discussion?
- Follow up after meetings with meeting summaries
• Provide a clear decision space
• Clearly outline process and substance nature of discussions
• Test assumptions of past histories and circumstances with questions, not statements as if one perspective should supersede another perspective. Everyone has a perspective about what has occurred (or not occurred) - moving forward and regaining trust, is everyone's responsible.
• Reference the following article: Building Trust - When Knowledge from Here, Meets Knowledge from Away.

Question: How do we hold the process accountable?
• Conduct an evaluation after every planning process
• Encourage a neutral observer at a planning process for feedback and perspectives
• Review public participation processes every three years and make needed improvements
• Define: what is process accountability? Is it an efficient process? Does it use staff time and expertise wisely? Does everyone understand the process? ....

Closing Summary and What’s Next

Mary Lou Addor reminded the participants that if they had remaining comments or questions, to please fill out a comment forms and hand them in, to Emily Ander or Janice Spadorcia. A meeting summary will be available online after March 30, 2010. The meeting summary will provide an overview of the agenda; links to the handouts distributed at the community meeting, and present the discussion that resulted during the meeting. The three documents will be revised, taking into account the comments received:

1) To date at parksfeedback@gmail.com,
2) At the March 25 meeting, and
3) Through April 12th at parksfeedback@gmail.com.

The timeline for these revisions has not been determined.

Diane Sauer ended the meeting by thanking everyone for attending and engaging in the discussion about the draft comprehensive policy for public participation.
Question: How can park elements be decoupled from the Master Planning process? Don’t all parties need to know what elements are in the plan before they can act, vote, comment, or recommend approval of the plan?

Comment: Please improve user-friendliness. Right now it does not seem to be a working document for park planning. I’d like to stay informed about where this effort goes from here.

Comment: The meeting (and focus of the three documents) is about "public participation" in the Parks and Recreation Department, not just the master planning process.

Comment: Renovations and other CIP projects should be at recommendation for Director to choose when and type of public participation to use (of course after screening with the new tool to help staff choose)

Comment: The roles and responsibilities should be the same in the three documents and need to be addressed in the draft.

Comment: Procedure 5.1 and 5.2 – is this included in CIP? Is “CIP” a broad term to cover all types of improvements?

What is “process design” in 5.3.1 and 5.3.2? Is it “design process”?

Comment: Public notice guidelines are stated clearly in the DOI.

Comment: PRGAB needs more training when put in leadership positions; however their roles are in their bi-laws.

Comment: Provide presentation to the PRGAB, it would be beneficial.

Comment: The three documents are very comprehensive and will serve as an excellent foundation for future planning. Hopefully these will be seen as "living documents" subject to revision, in particular the specific processes, as experience is gained.

Comment: Public Participation Guidelines – pg 22, top paragraph, change the reference for the scale to pg. 25-26
Comment: Some participants brought up information, based on their assumptions and portrayal of past situations [as if it was correct].

Comment: Having participated as a PRGAB member in the development of several parks, I’ve learned it is very important for Parks and Recreation Departments to clearly state from the start what the department needs in the area where the new park is being developed. Unfortunately, that has not always been the case and meetings became very ugly, when the needs were listed at a subsequent meeting, after the public had been told at the first meeting, that the park was a blank slate, for them to design as they saw fit. This creates expectations that become very hard to change.

For example, if Parks and Rec. needs another Little League baseball field in a park that should be stated at the first meeting including options as to where in the park this field will be located. No discussion for or against. The Parks and Rec. administration can document with enrollment numbers the need for this facility. Be clear about what is needed in the new park!!

Comment: Definitely still some past experience still haunting the public participation process.

Comment: The only problem I see with Res 2003-735 is the attitude with which it is being applied. As I read between the lines and try to interpret the new document, I see a confusing, overly flexible process that appears to dilute the public process and the authority of their elected representatives. That puts the balance of power heavily with staff.

Comment: Scoring, identifying and recommending the process to follow should be a staff completed task with the recommendation going to the Director/City Manager. If there is a difference of opinion on the process to use it should be reviewed by PRGAB.

Comment: Very excited about several ideas mentioned in the public participation documents, and actually excited about the documents. Several sections seem to address my concerns but I’m concerned about the Parks and Recreation Department side-stepping them. This is what I saw in the planning meeting I attended.

Comment: Involving the public into the decisions early on is a good idea. In addition, having a good representation of the local public to the park is important. As part of a Park’s committee, I found the process of developing a park in
committee very informative and by itself very workable. The most important thing that went wrong with the process of development was due to those implementing the process. If the majority of committee members are working for or with the parks department – there is a perception that their vote is “in the bag.”

Comment: The Facilitator has to be impartial. Roberts Rules were totally ignored and the meetings were manipulated by the person’s running the meeting and the consultants. They would personally attack anybody who did not agree with their opinions. In your process you mention how important it is to have persons who live close to the parks on the committee. When “the locals” would bring up concerns in the meetings, the facilitators and the consultants would ignore many of the ideas by saying that we were NIMBY’s (Not In My Back Yard). This is a term I had never heard before.

Comment: Surprised at the confusion of new material. I counted 7 different documents - over 300 pages of material - related to this policy. I feel that you took a 14 page resolution (2003)-735 - and generated enough additional material to muddle it beyond recognition. As a member of the public I am very disappointed - it doesn't appear that you even kept your initial report or the public in mind when doing this.

Comments: Section on Public Participation Policy for Park Planning. (PPPFPP)
Revisit title; alliteration seems odd for such an important policy. (Say it three times fast.) Even the abbreviation is odd.

Purpose: The last sentence "This policy document should be accompanied by... Operating Guidelines..." does not make sense. If this document is to be accompanied by another - shouldn't they be combined and adopted together?

Question: Also, is the third document - Department Operating Instructions? Is this the document that the staff will follow or is PPPFPP? Why is the staff subject to different guidelines than the ones being proposed?

Comment: Policy Statement:
a) Should this major decision be left up to only one person’s opinion?
Does the public have any knowledge of these decisions, or opportunity to object to these decisions?
(e) What is "early and thorough notification"?
(f) How is this done? example?
(g) This is unclear - what do the second and third reasons mean? Can you add "to include but not limited to" to make this clear?
Comment: Title: "Core" Public Participation Principles?

Principles - process design:
(a) "Strive"? Can this be measured, and if so how?
(c) How is this done?
(d) What does this mean? It makes no sense to me.

Process management:
(e) ...what they will do with it? Why is this a consideration for information needs of the public?
(f) Doesn't this also affect elected officials - City Council?

Roles and responsibilities:
(g) Do citizens not have a role or responsibilities?

Responsibilities of the PGRAB:
(h) PGRAB members are often political appointees with little park planning experience. They should have limited influence on public processes, process designs, and planning outcomes. From personal experience with the Raleigh PGRAB, they blatantly disregarded clear public sentiment and input in favor of personal and political agendas. They also appear to be prone to making decisions based on park staff pressure and manipulation. Reference the following example:
www.indyweek.com/gyrobase/Content?oid=oid:34762

(i) The Council is elected, the manager is hired - they have different roles. They each should have clear roles and responsibilities.

Notification:
(j) What are examples or definitions of formats, media, and time frames? This is vague
(k) What happens to this comment? How is it incorporated?

Exemptions:
(l) Again this is vague, open-ended, and suspicious looking from the public perspective

Hope this policy is going to be refined before being sent to City Council for adoption. Observation of existing policies in action may help because this does not seem to be a realistic working document, and from my experience I think it would only make the process more prone to confusion and manipulation.
Comment: While I generally like the Public Participation Policy and Guidelines and think they're a good idea, I do not think they are sufficient to ensure accountability and transparency in park master planning or comprehensive park system planning. The policy is a broad policy document, not specific enough to accomplish building legitimacy, quality and capacity. The crafting of these policies needs to take into consideration the continuing sense of distrust that exists on the part of the public. I applaud the Parks Dept. for their new commitment to meaningful public participation, but this claim should not allow them the latitude that these documents provide, given our recent history -- let this latitude come later, when they have built a track record, the processes are evaluated, and the public understands by experience that things are different and trust is built.

When the charge came from the Public Works Committee and City Council, my understanding was that the recommendations of the Involving the Public report would be incorporated into what we already have, Resolution 2003-735, not that this policy would be thrown out entirely. Based on Councilor Stephenson's comments last night, it appears that he was under the same impression. The report said that this was a good policy and process and that it was the management and implementation of it that was the problem, not the policy itself. It makes more sense to start with this existing, well understood policy for park master planning, build in the core team format/feedback and consultation process, and reference it all back to the policy and guidelines -- instead of creating the DOI that tries to separate planning instructions from public involvement instructions. The documents are very confusing as is and it is counter-productive to remove so much of what made park master planning successful in terms of promoting transparency and accountability.

I understand you're recommending more flexibility than was possible under the Resolution process, for example to allow a Community Meeting format to be used in certain circumstances or for a facilitator to have the flexibility to run a meeting in a way suited to the task at hand. The park master planning policy, however, should remain prescriptive when it comes to standard operating procedures such as information accessibility, process selection and design steps, parts of the process that promote transparency, etc.

Concerning park classifications being stated up front, this is a good idea but there should be some mechanism for a consensus seeking committee or advisory group to be able to report back to City Council if new
information appears to point to a need to question an originally proposed classification. This is important and was not allowed during the Horseshoe Farm process. Having Council weigh in on the confirmation or change of a park classification given new relevant information would help reduce controversy and contentiousness as the process proceeds.

City Council should formally adopt any and all public participation policies to encourage better following of them as well as accountability.

There are major inconsistencies between these documents in critical points in the process of master planning that need to be corrected. Generally, it is disturbing how City Council’s functions are being removed as this is where accountability is ensured. Here is a summary of some of these for the record:

1. **Master Planning Committee Selection/Appointment Responsibility.** It is unclear how a master planning committee will be chosen; e.g. under existing policy, master planning committee membership is developed at the staff/PRGAB level and recommended to City Council for appointment. Council appointment of this committee causes State Open Meetings Laws to apply, which helps ensure transparency and accountability.

   **Current Policy:** City Council  
   Department Operating Instructions: Parks and Rec Director and City Manager  
   **Public Participation Policy:** Parks and Rec Director  
   **Public Participation Guidelines:** “seek concurrence of City Council and PRGAB”

2. **Park Master Plan Approval Responsibility.** Again, the three new documents all give conflicting guidance about who can approve or reject a proposed master plan.

   **Current Policy:** City Council  
   Department Operating Instructions: City Council  
   **Public Participation Policy:** Parks and Rec Director  
   **Public Participation Guidelines:** Parks, Recreation and Greenway Advisory Board (see Appendix B)

3. **Process Selection and Design Responsibility.** It is unclear how the public will participate in planning process selection and design. These are new, critical steps in the process, yet there is conflicting guidance about this aspect and very little direction about how the public should be
informed it is going on and have an opportunity to comment. The roles of citizens and citizen master planning/consensus seeking committees are not outlined well compared to roles of staff and consultants, nor are arrangements made for citizens to have review and comment ability. The draft documents propose inconsistent guidance, and none of them are clear how the public will have access to information and the ability to provide input:

Current Policy: City Council approves process selection
Department Operating Instructions: Parks & Rec Director develops, City Manager approves (no public knowledge necessary)
Public Participation Policy: “processes should be designed collaboratively by the Dept. and those participating in them” (p. 2); this directly conflicts with “PRGAB reviews and advises on proposed public participation process designs” (p. 5) and Parks & Rec Director (with staff assistance) is responsible for process design and City Manager is responsible for approval of process (p. 4)
Public Participation Guidelines: “seek concurrence of City Council and PRGAB” (p. 17)

Questions: Why did you remove the requirement for environmental stewardship recommendations to be included in final proposed master plan? This is extremely important and should be required in all draft and final master plans.

Is “feedback and consultation” the same as a core team format and community meeting process? Is "consensus seeking" the same as a park master planning committee?

One of the criticisms of the Community Meeting process was that it wasn’t transparent. How have you corrected for this in the policy in a way that really creates accountability?

Shouldn’t the process of reaching consensus on these documents model the core principles you’re advocating? If so, where does developing a public involvement policy fall under section 4 on page 3 of the policy? Can you more specifically include it in this list? And how will you model this as we go forward – will there be a consensus seeking committee?

People really benefit from knowing their role in the parks planning process. The public isn’t included under the Roles and Responsibilities section of the Policy. Would you please include the public in this section so they understand their part and know what to expect?
When do “major renovations and redevelopment” trigger public involvement and how would the public learn about these things and have an opportunity to comment on them? This should be in the documents.

What are the specific requirements for notifying the public about proposals that are being made re: process selection and design – and how can the public have access to the completed process selection guide and comment on this? Where is this written in the documents?

Is the Parks Dept. definitely committed to following the policies developed through this process once they are finalized?

It’s important for accountability purposes to have City Council adopt all public participation policies and park master plans, because they are the policy decision makers for the City. Can these documents be changed to reflect that?

On page 1 of the policy, item 2 (d), what document are you referring to? It’s unclear if this is referring to the guidelines or the operating instructions. It’s a hybrid title. This lack of clarity doesn’t help accountability.

A large section of the Resolution was removed and revised and placed in the back of the guidelines as a sample group charter (Appendix B.) This means this can be changed at the will of the staff and committee, but these are important items that should apply to ALL processes (such as what a master plan should include and who approves a proposed master plan). Can all of this be returned to the policy and just referenced in this Appendix?

Who chairs a consensus seeking committee?

Would the public be able to attend a feedback and consultation core team meeting? How can this be built into the documents to promote better transparency?