

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PLAN (PEP)

for the Pittsburgh Public Engagement Guide (PEG)

Prepared by the Department of City Planning for the Pittsburgh Planning Commission
Hearing on December 3, 2019

Section I: Project Description & Background

Introduction

The City of Pittsburgh Public Engagement Guide outlines a framework for how the City conducts engagement efforts throughout long-range planning processes. It establishes principles and guidelines for improving the City's approach to engagement more broadly. The Public Engagement Guide is a component of the City's Comprehensive Planning project. The Guide sets expectations and best practices for the public, community groups, consultants, and staff engaging in long-range planning and policy work.

Project Area & Demographics

Project Area

As a document with City-wide application, the Public Engagement Guide will affect every neighborhood in the City of Pittsburgh.

Demographics

The 2010 US Census identified that there are approximately 305,000 people residing in Pittsburgh. Of those residents, 66% are White, 25.8% are Black or African American, 0.2% are American Indian, 4.4% are Asian, 2.3% identified as Mixed, and 0.3% identified as Other. 2.3% of Pittsburgh's population was of Hispanic or Latino origin of any race. For every 100 females there are 90.7 males, and for every 100 females over age 18 there were 87.8 males. The median age is 36 years with 19.9% under 18 years, 28.6% from 18-24 years, 20.3% from 45-64 years, and 16.4% older than 65 years. The median income for a household in the City is \$28,588, and the median income for a family is \$38,795. About 15% of families and 20.4% of the general population lives below the poverty line.

Considerations

This project was largely informed by the work of the Public Engagement Working Group (PEWG), a group of City residents, stakeholders, advocates and professionals interested in improved engagement who applied their collective experiences to develop forward-looking participatory guidelines. While efforts were made to ensure that the PEWG was as inclusive and representative as possible, with only 36 members, it could not be fully representative of every group and population that resides within the City of Pittsburgh. The City utilized the knowledge and networks of PEWG members to reach broader audiences and collect additional information from communities that are harder to reach through traditional methods.

Project Goals & Outcomes

Goals

- To renew the approach to public engagement in the City's long-range planning process
- To encourage and achieve active participation across a broad and diverse cross-section of the Pittsburgh community
- To establish City-wide principles for public engagement across Departments and Authorities
- To provide City staff with a diverse palette of tools and resources that they can easily employ as they undertake engagement
- To set clear expectations among residents regarding public engagement efforts
- To acknowledge local expertise, and to look to the expertise of our residents to inform the development of these standards

Outcomes

- Define public engagement and understand its values, risks and benefits
- Understand how to integrate public engagement into decision-making
- Set expectations for public engagement for projects of a specific size and/or issue within the City of Pittsburgh
- Provide a roadmap to design, deliver and evaluate effective public engagement planning
- Provide appropriate techniques that align with the City's public engagement objectives

Project Resources

This project required significant resources in terms of staff capacity. In order to facilitate work flow, two staff were assigned to this project and a consultant was brought on to provide additional capacity and expertise. The Department of City Planning funded the consulting services and covered the costs of food and materials at all community meetings related to this project.

Public Engagement Consultant	\$22,800
Panel on Public Engagement	\$2,500
<u>Public Engagement Working Group (materials)</u>	<u>\$750</u>
Total cost	\$26,050

Two City staff were assigned to this project for Phases 1 and 2. One City staff person was assigned to Phase 3. Phases are explained in Section 2 of this document (page 5). The two staff members were:

1. Sophia Robison, Neighborhood Planner, Department of City Planning (Phases 1-3)
2. Andrew McCray, Housing Specialist, Department of City Planning (Phases 1-2)

Project Timeline

<u>July 2018 – Aug. 2018</u>	Application for Public Engagement Working Group opens. Visit the project website or email comments to the Project Manager (sophia.robison@pittsburghpa.gov).		NOTIFY
<u>Sept. 2018</u>	Panel on Public Engagement with experts from around the country.		NOTIFY EDUCATE
<u>Oct. 2018 – Feb. 2019</u>	Public Engagement Working Group meets once per month. PEWG members meet with their respective communities to relay feedback via Meeting-In-A-Box and other tools.		LISTEN
<u>Feb. 2019 – Sept. 2019</u>	Development of draft Guide per feedback from the Working Group and DCP staff	Presentations at Pittsburgh Community Redevelopment Group, Inclusive Innovation Summit, and feedback loop with PEWG.	EDUCATE LISTEN
		Dialogue meetings with staff & city departments, including the Mayor's Office of Equity.	
<u>Oct. 2019 – Nov. 2019</u>	Solicit feedback from community groups and stakeholders.	Formal online public comment period.	NOTIFY LISTEN
<u>Nov. 2019</u>	Planning Commission Briefing		LISTEN
<u>Dec. 2019</u>	Planning Commission Hearing		LISTEN
	Public input summarized and transmitted on website and to the Mayor. Public Engagement Guide accepted and becomes policy for all relevant DCP projects.		FOLLOW THROUGH

Previous/Concurrent Efforts & Coordination

DCP staff communicated constantly with staff in other departments to facilitate coordination. These staff were included in internal review meetings and given time for substantive review and comment. These departments included:

- Department of City Planning's Neighborhood Plan Guide
- Mayor's Office Roadmap to Inclusive Innovation
- Urban Redevelopment Authority Equity Working Group
- Mayor's Office of Equity
- Department of Mobility & Infrastructure
- Office of Community Affairs

Decision Making Process

DCP staff served as the Project Managers for this project, and will ultimately create and implement the final product. In creating it, they will consult with other City Departments and work extensively with the public. The Public Engagement Working Group is structured to involve affected communities in decision-making throughout the development of the draft Guide. After engagement phases 1 (PREPARE) and 2 (CREATE), the Public Engagement Guide will be presented to the City Planning Commission to vote on acceptance. The public can attend the November 19, 2019 briefing and December 3, 2019 hearing before Planning Commission to hear discussion, and at the hearing they can contribute their opinions through the standard public hearing format or via letters of opinion. Affected communities and stakeholders will be informed of final decisions through social media, the City website, press releases, newsletters, and updates at regular community meetings.

Section II: Public Engagement Process

Stakeholders & Issues Assessment

Key Audiences are described below by issues and stakeholders. For this Public Engagement Plan, the stakeholders for each issue are the same.

Issues	Stakeholder Group	Geographic Frame of Reference	Contacts
1. City-wide Comprehensive Planning 2. Neighborhood, Corridor, Art and Mobility/ Transportation Plans 3. Public facility/asset siting, design, planning, and other significant changes to public assets 4. Major policy decisions and issues of significant public interest 5. Development Review	Registered Community Organizations	Variety of single neighborhoods	Stephanie Joy Everett Neighborhood Planner, Project Manager for RCO Program
	DCP Staff	City-wide	Andrew Dash Acting Director, Department of City Planning
	Other City of Pittsburgh Departments/Authorities	City-wide, topic specific	Multiple, including (but not limited to): Lindsay Powell , Assistant Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office of Equity Dara Braitman , Principal Planner, Dept. of Mobility & Infrastructure Julie Edwards , Urban Redevelopment Authority Molly Onufer , Manager, Office of Community Affairs
	City Residents	City-wide	Contact through community groups, Neighborhood Planners, and Office of Community Affairs. Representatives from various groups participate via Public Engagement Working Group.
	Consultants working on City Projects	N/A	Representatives from more than eight different consultants who have worked with the City of Pittsburgh and/or with other cities on public participation in the past were engaged through the Public Engagement Working Group and other focus groups.

Project Team & Steering Committee(s)

Project Team

- Sophia Robison, Project Manager
- Andrew McCray, Former Housing Specialist for DCP
- Andrew Dash, Acting Director, Department of City Planning
- Ivette Mongalo-Winston, Consultant from MonWin Consulting

Steering Committee

The Public Engagement Working Group (PEWG) provides a cross-section of City residents the platform to collaborate with City staff on the product. The PEWG was advertised through a public application listed on the City website. In total, there were approximately 70 applicants and 36 were asked to participate, 29 of whom participated in any of the associated engagements. In order to submit an application, applicants were required to confirm they were able to attend all of the Working Group meeting (the dates of all meetings were provided in the application). Members were selected in order to ensure diverse representation of ethnic and racial backgrounds, residential locations, ages, genders, and experiences in public engagement). The Working Group members are listed below:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
1. Zeba Ahmed	Fineview & Perry Hilltop Citizen's Council
2. Karen Brean	Brean Associates
3. Rashod X. Brown	Arlington Resident, Garden of Peace Project
4. Brian Burley	Young Black PGH
5. Geoff Campbell	Greenfield Community Association
6. Rachel Canning	Perry South Resident
7. Robert Cavalier	Deliberative Democracy Forum - CMU
8. Keyva Clark	Mayor's LGBTQIA+ Advisory Council Representative
9. Patrick Clark	Jackson/Clark Partners
10. Phyllis Comer	Crafton Heights Resident, HOPE Project
11. Kristen Compitello	Crafton Heights Resident, PHLF, CDC
12. Martell Covington	Lincoln-Lemington Resident, Community Empowerment Association, Homewood Community Sports
13. Tim Dawson	Deliberative Democracy Forum - CMU
14. Krista DiPietro	Hazelwood Initiative, Resident

15. Carol Hardeman	Upper Hill Resident, Bedford Hill Choice Neighborhood Board
16. Christina Howell	Bloomfield Development Corporation
17. Shannon Hughes	Lower Lawrenceville Resident, PA Health & Wellness
18. Donna Jackson	Lincoln-Lemington-Belmar Resident, Larimer Consensus Group
19. Natalie Jellison	Brookline Resident
20. C. Denise Johnson	Crawford-Roberts Resident
21. Joshua Kivuva	Stanton Heights Resident, PhD in engagement for democracy
22. Kevin McNair	1Nation Mentoring
23. Christine Mondor	Pittsburgh Planning Commission
24. Aweys Mwaliya	Somali Bantu Community Association of Pittsburgh
25. Grace Oxley	Highland Park Resident, Homewood Children's Village
26. Chase Patterson	Urban Academy of Greater Pittsburgh
27. Renee Robinson	Garfield Resident, Carnegie Library Engagement Coordinator
28. Sarah Steers	Brighton Heights Resident, Disability Community
29. Guillermo Velasquez	Pittsburgh Hispanic Development Corporation

Public Engagement Overview & Tools

Overview

The engagement for this process was broken down into three phases which are described in greater detail below. The phases were: (1) Prepare, (2) Create, (3) Follow Through. *This content is adapted from the Engagement Process Table shown in the PEG.*

The overarching theme in this process was to recognize areas where there is potential for improvements to engagement between City processes and the public. This is particularly important due to historic legacies of disenfranchisement and policies that resulted in a lack of trust and goodwill towards public processes. To address the diverse cultural differences among the Pittsburgh community, care was taken to ensure equitable representation on the Public Engagement Working Group and to identify underrepresented groups for further correspondence.

As we reached the end of the Create phase, there was a need to address the lack of consistency and varying success rates of public engagements undertaken by the many different City departments, all of whom come to engagements with different standards and goals. To address the varying needs of City Departments, we took several months near the end of the Create phase to conduct internal reviews of the draft that the Working Group developed and to ensure the product can be used by all relevant Departments. Departments for collaboration were identified by the Mayor's Office of Equity.

The first two phases of public engagement (Prepare and Create) were extended in order to ensure appropriate review of each established standard. The goal was to confirm that each standard is realistically attainable by those who will have to implement them and those who will be affected by them. The engagement process was iterative for this purpose.

For each phase of this project, a different level on the IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation was used. To make this determination, various worksheets were completed, shown in the Appendix on page 15.

- Phase 1: PREPARE (INFORM, CONSULT)

With the general public, we did *INFORM* with a Symposium and a website. The symposium was broadly advertised to reach a broad audience. This was supported by timely updates to DCP's website. We also formed a Public Engagement Working Group (PEWG) intended to be representative of the general public, including at least two residents of each council district, and seeking to be as representative as possible of the demographic breakdown of the City.

- Phase 2: CREATE (INFORM, INVOLVE, CONSULT, COLLABORATE)

In this phase, the PEWG met four times from October 2018 through February 2019. The January meeting was rescheduled due to inclement weather. In this phase, we *COLLABORATED* with the PEWG using various tools to help create the draft of the final product. The breakdown of each PEWG meeting is shown in the Engagement Log on pages 18-21. All PEWG members also received a Meeting-in-a-Box to take to their communities to conduct *CONSULT* meetings, the results of which were reviewed by DCP. All PEWG members who did not attend the first two meetings were contacted about scheduling one-on-one meetings at their convenience in order to involve them if they were not able to attend the regular PEWG meetings. Additionally, some community members/groups interested in the PEWG but unable to participate in a formal capacity asked the Project Team for one-on-one meetings to provide input and identify involvement opportunities.

After a draft of the Public Engagement Guide was completed, the Department of City Planning worked to *INFORM* and *CONSULT* with broad audiences before it was presented for a vote to the Planning Commission. Externally, the Guide was presented at the Inclusive Innovation Summit and the Pittsburgh Community Revitalization Group Summit to seek additional feedback from involved community members. Further, the Project Team met with two university classes to hear student perspectives, as these were identified as an underrepresented group in the engagement process. Internally, the Project Team circulated the document for thorough review by various City Departments and DCP staff. It was decided that racial equity, and general equity issues in engagement, were not adequately addressed and so several additional months were taken to work with the new Office of Equity to incorporate their work and best practices identified through the Government Alliance on Racial Equity into this Guide. The Project Team also invited all Planning Commissioners for a series of briefings to review the draft document. The Project Team met with three Planning Commissioners through that process.

- Phase 3: FOLLOW THROUGH (INFORM, CONSULT)

After the Review stage, the Public Engagement Guide will be presented to the City Planning Commission for a vote of acceptance. The final CONSULT opportunity was a 30-day public comment period that lasted from October 11th to November 10th, 2019. The public were notified that the review period opened via social media and a press release, and were directed to the DCP website to submit comments. Further, the PEWG was notified twice via email of the public comment period and given information about how to engage in the final review beyond completing the survey. Staff then worked to incorporate public comments prior to the Planning Commission briefing on November 19th, 2019. Members of the public are welcome to attend the public hearing on December 3, 2019 during the Planning Commission meeting to contribute if desired. Leading up to and afterwards, the public will be *INFORMED* of updates through digital media via the City's website, press releases, and social media. The final accepted document will be made available online and in hard copy through the Carnegie libraries. Versions of the Public Engagement Guide will be made available in Spanish and Braille as requested. The PDF of the document will be readable for accessibility purposes.

Tools

DCP worked with a broad audience to co-create the Public Engagement Guide to build trust and ensure the product is effective for a diversity of residents and users. Engagement associated with the creation of the Public Engagement Guide intended to: (1) increase awareness of the Public Engagement Guide, (2) confirm that the Guide reflects relevant public values, and (3) ensure the Guide is easy to use for intended users. There were three components of public engagement for this project: preparation, review, and follow through. In each phase, the following tools were used:

Phase 1: Prepare <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisory Group • Symposium • Digital Media • Website 	Phase 2: Create <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisory Group • Focused Conversations • Visioning Exercise • Storytelling Exercises • Meeting In A Box • Revolving Conversation • Digital Media • Focus Groups • One-on-one meetings • Conference workshops • Digital Media • Website 	Phase 3: Follow Through <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Hearing • Digital Media • Website
---	--	---

Communications Strategy

Plan Identity & Name

The name of the project is the Public Engagement Guide & Toolkit. We worked with a consultant who created graphics that were used over the course of the project. Additional graphics were made in-house. All photos were taken by DCP staff. The website for this work is:

www.pittsburghpa.gov/dcp/EngagePGH.

Communications

To effectively reach all stakeholders, a variety of engagement tools were chosen to accommodate various language and literacy needs and commitment/interest levels. Because a lot of engagement occurs over social media, any public meetings were heavily advertised through the City's social media sites and involved community members were asked to share information via social media platforms; additionally, special attention was given at the end of the process to distributing the product via social media. The logistics of community engagement were critical to sustaining turnout and community interest. Paying attention to logistical issues enhanced participation and improved the overall effort. The following occurred for each engagement:

- **Venue:** We selected venues for meetings that were centrally located, and ensured there was parking and/or easy access to public transportation. Food or snacks were provided at all meetings.
- **Staffing:** DCP staff and the consultant helped to set up and facilitate all meetings. DCP interns also supported these efforts.
- **Budget:** The budget illustrated previously was used to support staffing, communications, and materials for meetings, and food.
- **Accessibility:** All of our locations were wheelchair accessible and up to code. The final PDF is provided as a readable text document for those who might be visually impaired. Language translators, including ASL, were provided upon request at all meetings.
- **Time:** All meetings with the public were held at after work hours and childcare was provided when requested.

The Communications Strategy is included in the Appendix on pages 16-17 and addresses communications strategies for:

- Application for the Public Engagement Working Group
- Panel on Public Engagement
- Public Engagement Working Group Meetings
- Public Comment

The general communication tools used in each of these elements of the planning process are shown below:

COMMUNICATION TOOL		Application for the PEWG	Panel on Public Engagement	PEWG Meetings	Public Comment
Hard Copy	Local Distribution	x	x		x
	Mailing				
Electronic	Email	x	x	x	x
	Project Website	x	x	x	x
	Social Media	x	x		x

Public Engagement Principles

1. **Maximize participation.** By working to ensure broad representation among the PEWG and supplementing it with additional targeted engagements, this process maximized participation within the timeframe and constraints presented.
2. **Value relationships.** The PEWG allowed the Project Team to develop relationships with involved community members through repeated and consistent engagements. The Project Team valued time and participation by preparing well and thoughtfully for each meeting and listening to feedback given at all times on how to improve the next meeting and the next engagement.
3. **Build a foundation of trust.** The Panel on Public Engagement helped the Project Team understand that in order to talk about the future of engagement, we also needed to talk about its past. Through creative storytelling workshops with the PEWG and in more informal interactions, the Project Team was able to identify how trust is built to create better standards so it's maintained and can continue to grow into the future.
4. **Center equity and fairness.** Representation was really important to this process and something the Project Team sought out at every turn. Engagement is an especially important topic, however, specifically within a context of racial inequities. After the first draft of the PEG was reviewed by the PEWG, it was decided that racial equity, and general equity issues in engagement, were not adequately addressed. Several additional months were taken to work with the new Office of Equity to incorporate their work and best practices identified through the Government Alliance on Racial Equity into this Guide.
5. **Transparency and open communication.** Core to this process was the idea that all information would be available online, especially since the PEWG meetings themselves were not traditional public meetings. Within two weeks of each PEWG meeting, minutes, presentations, and activity results were uploaded to the project website. Additionally, the Panel on Public Engagement was broadcast on City TV and posted to the City YouTube for future review, and the results of the exit survey were uploaded in raw data form and in a two page summary form. By having all past presentations and PEWG minutes online during the final public comment period, members of the public submitting comments could see how the Guide has developed overtime and clearly understand the process to get there.

Section III: Accountability & Evaluation

Public Involvement Feedback Loop

At the end of the engagement process, meeting notes were uploaded to the City website. For all surveys and worksheets, one- to two- page reports and exact responses (anonymized) were provided. This has facilitated bringing new, interested parties into the process and helping stakeholders engage in the public comment period.

The contributions of community members are acknowledged at the very beginning of the PEG on pages 4-5. Further, they are acknowledged in this Public Engagement Plan where we have documented all of those engagements and demonstrated how the feedback was used.

The Engagement Log can be found in the Appendix. Because the Engagement Report was developed near the end of this process, we do not have Engagement Reports for all engagements. We have retroactively created one for the Panel on Public Engagement and one for the public comment period on the PEG.

Evaluation & Monitoring of Success

After each engagement, the Project Manager internally evaluated the process using the following questions:

- Were you able to successfully reach the intended audience?
- Did people receive the necessary information they needed to make a relevant response?
- Did you choose the right type or level of engagement to match the purpose?
- Was feedback from the PEWG positive or negative?
- Did the PEWG feel like they received proper feedback on the results of the engagement?
- Did they indicate they want to be part of a similar process again? If not, why not?
- What would you do differently to make the process better, more inclusive, and more impactful?

Appendix

ASSESSING THE PUBLIC IMPACT WORKSHEET

Scale:

- 1-2 Indicates very low to low; Spectrum recommendation: at least INFORM
 2-3 Indicates low to moderate; Spectrum recommendation: at least CONSULT
 3-4 Indicates moderate to high; Spectrum recommendation: probably INVOLVE
 4-5 Indicates high to very high; Spectrum recommendation: minimum INVOLVE, consider opportunities to COLLABORATE or EMPOWER

Assessing the Public Impact	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
1. What is the anticipated level of conflict, controversy, opportunity or concern on this or related issues?					x
2. How significant are the potential impacts to the public?				x	
3. How much do the major stakeholders care about this issue, project or program?				x	
4. What degree of involvement does the public appear to desire?				x	
5. What is the potential for public impact on the potential decision or project?				x	
6. How significant are the possible benefits of involving the public?					x
7. How serious are the potential ramifications of NOT involving the public?					x
8. What level of public participation does the Mayor and/or City Council desire or expect?				x	
9. What is the possibility that the media will become interested?		x			
10. What is the probable level of difficulty in solving the problem or advancing the project?				x	
Count the number of checks in each column		1		6	3
Multiply number of checks by the weight	x 1	x 2	x 3	x 4	x 5
Enter column score		2		24	15
Add total of all five column scores	41				
Divide total score by the number of questions	/10				
PUBLIC IMPACT SCORE (number is out of five)	4.1				

COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

WHAT?	KEY MESSAGES / PURPOSES	STAKEHOLDER GROUPS	TEAM MEMBER	WHEN?	HOW?	SUCCESS IS:
Application for PEWG	Invite the public to participate in a group that will meet for a discrete number of months to identify standards the City should ascribe to for better engagement.	RCOs and community organizers, City residents	Sophia Robison Andrew McCray	July-August 2018	Create a public application that is online for two weeks for any Pittsburgh resident to submit. Reach out to local universities, city government, schools, faith-based, non-profit and community organizations to notify of application process. Post flyers for the application in tandem with advertisements for the Panel on Public Engagement on the City's social media outlets, and in community spaces such as Carnegie libraries, coffee shops, museums, bookstores, bars, etc.	A diverse and broad range of experts in public engagement. The PEWG is chosen in a transparent and fair way. Extensive advertising means involving new faces in this City process.
Panel on Public Engagement	Educate the public on best practices in engagement. Begin engagement of the PEWG in a fun way.	RCOs and community organizers, DCP Staff, other City of Pittsburgh Departments / Authorities, City residents, consultants who might work with the City	Andrew McCray Sophia Robison	September 13, 2018 at the Pittsburgh Children's Museum	Bring in five expert panelists from around the country to present at a formal panel on lessons learned from their respective Cities' or practices. Advertise as broadly as possible: social media, web, press release, flyers in common community spaces, coffee shops, bars, bus stops. DCP reaches out to regular community contacts to inform	Excitement is built around improving engagement. PEWG members hear concern of the public relative to engagement practices. Conversation starts around

					of upcoming event. Follow up includes recording event for City YouTube and posting the results of the exit survey.	what good engagement means.
PEWG Meetings	Engage in conversation about the success of various engagement processes and how they can be improved. Co-create the PEG.	RCOs and community organizers, DCP Staff, other City of Pittsburgh Departments / Authorities, City residents, consultants who might work with the City	Sophia Robison Andrew McCray	October 2018-February 2019	At each meeting, co-create: values all engagements should consider, standards by which to achieve those values, and contextualized tools for Pittsburgh engagement scenarios. Carefully review and edit the PEG in coordination with the PEWG. Since these meetings are not open to the public, communications will remain within PEWG members, and will require regular follow up and follow through on deliverables and consistent preparation for meetings.	Consistent attendance and strong conversation at all PEWG meetings. PEWG members feel ownership of the final product. PEWG members feel they can see how the City and residents will use the PEG to improve engagements.
Public Comment	Educate the public on the Guide and seek feedback. Promote the Planning Commission dates/times.	RCOs and community organizers, DCP Staff, other City of Pittsburgh Departments / Authorities, City residents, consultants who might work with the City	Sophia Robison	September-November 2019	Provide different types of public comment opportunities by bringing short educational presentations to existing meetings to collect immediate feedback.	Demonstrated understanding of PEG and how residents will use it. Significant interaction with the draft via formal survey or via informational presentations / discussions.

ENGAGEMENT LOG

Date Advertised	Date of Event	Tool	Event Name	Key Audiences	Approximate Attendance	Staff	Comments
8/11/18	Application closes on 8/26/18	OCA Newsletter, City NextDoor, mailing list, announcements at existing community meetings, flyers in coordination with Panel (see below) also advertising PEWG, project website	Application for PEWG	All Pittsburghers	70+ applicants	Andrew McCray Sophia Robison	Staff reached out to 20 Pittsburghers with experience in prior engagement techniques and asked them to consider applying.
8/11/18	9/13/18	OCA Newsletter, City NextDoor, flyers in community spaces, posted in all Carnegie Libraries, project website, social media	Panel on Public Engagement	All Pittsburghers and those in the region with interest in engagement practices	99	Sophia Robison Andrew McCray	Interns were used to advertise as widely as possible with physical flyers and postcards. Two interns spent multiple weeks visiting coffee shops, museums and libraries to distribute flyers.
August 2018	Entire fall semester	Various. Contact with Professor seeking client for class on Urban Studies.	UPitt Urban Studies Class	Undergraduate students	15	Sophia Robison	Students were asked to study other Cities in the US (or internationally) and identify best practices in engagement. Their research was used to inform the PEWG process. Students also received extra credit for attendance at any two public meetings in the

							City during the semester. Many students chose the Panel, which was great as there was no student representation on the PEWG itself.
8/11/18	10/10/18	Storytelling exercise, values exercise, group discussion	PEWG #1	PEWG members	25	Sophia Robison Andrew McCray	The dates and times of all PEWG meetings were announced via the application so applicants could be sure they were able to participate. Minutes and presentation available on the DCP website one week after the meeting.
8/11/18	11/7/18	Group discussion, card storming, focused conversation	PEWG #2	PEWG members	21	Sophia Robison Andrew McCray	Minutes and presentation available on the DCP website one week after the meeting.
11/7/18	PEWG members asked to submit before end of 2018.	Meeting-In-A-Box: included storytelling workshop and community asset mapping.	Meeting-In-A-Box (MIAB)	General Pittsburgh community. PEWG members were tasked with completing the M.I.A.B. with their community groups or with a group they felt has been underrepresented	8 boxes completed. 30 distributed. 40 created.	Sophia Robison	The M.I.A.B. was created as a direct result of PEWG request. They were distributed at PEWG #2 and the majority of returned boxes were submitted in February of 2019. While not many boxes were returned, the quality of content was great and feedback was heavily used.

				ed in this process.			Group requested a fourth meeting be added to allow more time for conversation before reviewing a draft.
8/11/18	12/5/18	Card storming, focused conversation	PEWG #3	PEWG members	18	Sophia Robison Andrew McCray	Minutes and presentation available on the DCP website one week after the meeting.
12/5/19	1/30/19 Rescheduled to 2/12/19 due to inclement weather	Group discussion, presentation of draft	PEWG #4	PEWG members	20	Sophia Robison Andrew McCray	Minutes and presentation available on the DCP website one week after the meeting.
Advertised by Summit widely in two months prior.	3/30/19	Dot activity, presentation, values exercise, revolving conversation	Inclusive Innovation Summit	General public, attendees of Inclusive Innovation Summit	9	Sophia Robison Andrew McCray 3 interns: Annie Gould, Natalie Tse, Liz Allen	PEWG notified two weeks ahead of time of upcoming engagement.
Advertised by Summit widely in two months prior.	5/9/19	Presentation, values exercise	PCRG Summit	General public, attendees of PCRG Summit	40	Sophia Robison, Ivette Mongalo-Winston, Renee Robinson	PEWG notified three weeks ahead of time of upcoming engagement.

						(PEWG member)	
July 2019	November 2019	Office of Community Affairs announcements at existing community meetings, City social media campaign, emails to PEWG members to distribute to networks	Existing Community Meetings, Notifying public of upcoming Planning Commission	All Pittsburghers	Broad. All PEWG members, over 40 engagements per social media post (2/week over 6 weeks). Many during OCA announcements	Sophia Robison Alex Holmes (DCP comm. Specialist)	
8/19/19	10/3/19	Presentation, group discussion	Copowerment Series	Copowerment Series participants	~25	Sophia Robison	Discussed Neighborhood Planning more broadly and conducted some detailed discussion around the PEG.
August 2019	11/12/19	Presentation, facilitated discussion, values exercise	Duquesne University Urban Communications Class	Undergraduate and graduate students	10	Sophia Robison Martina Battistone (DCP Planner)	Engaged students around the PEG, but also introduced some of the broader work DCP does and explained how student can get involved in planning processes!

NOTE: Engagement reports were developed through this process and so were not kept throughout. Two engagement reports have been produced below to show how they will be used.

ENGAGEMENT REPORT: Panel on Public Engagement

Logistics	Stakeholders
Event: Panel on Public Engagement	All Pittsburghers and those in the region with interest in engagement practices. Attendees included: students, professors, community activists, foundation representatives, elected officials, consultants, community members, interested professionals
Location: Children's Museum of Pittsburgh	
Date: 9/13/18	
Time: 6:30-9pm	
Staff person(s): Andrew McCray, Sophia Robison	Approx. Number of Attendees: 99

How did the meeting inform the community about the project/program? What was the intended engagement level for this event?

Ex. Community engagement to-date, location and history of the project/program, action items/next steps, how to get involved, upcoming events.

Discussed lessons learned and opportunities for incorporating meaningful and equitable public engagement in the Comprehensive Planning process with national experts. Director Gastil presented on how this was the beginning of an engagement process around developing the Public Engagement Guide, and eventually the Comprehensive Plan. Introduced PEWG members in audience and instructed interested individuals to sign in and leave contact information for further follow up.

The intended engagement level was: INFORM (panel), CONSULT (q&a).

Input and Responses

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
<i>Because this was the very first engagement in this process we did not keep track of audience posed questions, so instead we have provided the key takeaways in the next column.</i>	Narrative-based and people-based City Planning
	Intentional and sustained engagement throughout processes
	Engage and gain trust of disenfranchised communities
	Increase transparency around planning processes and engagements
	Humanize planning through fun and creative engagements that emphasize storytelling

Comments:

[Flyer](#)

[Exit Survey Results: Major Themes](#), [Exit Survey Results \(Excel file\)](#)

[Watch the Panel](#)

Planning Completing Report: Sophia Robison

NOTE: Engagement reports were developed through this process and so were not kept throughout. Two engagement reports have been produced below to show how they will be used.

ENGAGEMENT REPORT: Public Comment Period

Logistics	Stakeholders
Event: Public Comment Period	All Pittsburghers and those in the region with interest in engagement practices.
Location: SurveyMonkey	
Date: 10/11/19-11/10/19	
Time: n/a	
Staff person(s): Sophia Robison, Alex Holmes (Comms. Specialist)	Approx. Number of Participants: 9 (three via email to Project Manager)

How did the meeting inform the community about the project/program? What was the intended engagement level for this event?

Ex. Community engagement to-date, location and history of the project/program, action items/next steps, how to get involved, upcoming events.

The SurveyMonkey was provided via the DCP website for the Public Engagement Guide and encouraged users to visit the website and familiarize themselves with the Guide, the Toolkit, and the engagements that occurred through this process. The website also directs users to the upcoming Planning Commission dates and how to participate.

The intended engagement level was: INFORM (provide information about upcoming PC dates), CONSULT (survey).

Input and Responses

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Project Team
Many respondents learn about planning projects via social media and email. None indicated they used direct mail or community posters.	This emphasizes the need for engagements to use digital media options to advertise events. The communications strategy should prompt Project Teams to think about this more critically.
However, many respondents still wanted to receive information about City plans via posters in the community and direct mail.	Advertising should vary by the demographics of relevant populations. A question was added to page 60 of the PEG to prompt Project Teams to ask the community how they would like to be communicated with.
All respondents felt the PEG would help with communication with City residents at least a moderate amount. Four of the six survey respondents said it would help a lot or a great deal.	This emphasizes that often great engagements will not succeed if good communication is not used. This is a result of feedback from the PEWG that the PEG needed to think more critically about the Communications Strategy.
Respondents ranked all the Principles of Public Engagement fairly evenly, though Transparency and Open Communication, and Build a Foundation of Trust stood out as high priorities.	The order of the Principles of Public Engagement has been changed to reflect the rankings of respondents.
"I did want to congratulate you on this effort and the summary of it..."	Thanks

ENGAGEMENT REPORT: Public Comment Period, continued

<p>“Consider breaking the PEP into three phases, aligning with the Sections. Public engagement strategies and metrics can’t be accurately determined until demographics are identified.”</p>	<p>The Public Engagement Plan is already broken into three phases. The entire document must be completed in a draft form in the “Review” stage outlined on page 51. Demographics have been identified explicitly as needed background in Section 1 of the PEP under “Project Area”. By adding this to Section 1, Project Teams aren’t determining strategies or metrics prior to considering demographics.</p>
<p><i>Respondent asked for their comments not to be quoted.</i></p> <p>Respondent expressed concern over the capacity for small community groups to use this document.</p>	<p>The intention is that Section 4 (Developing a Public Engagement Plan, pages 46-51) is short enough and direct enough that groups could simply print off this section and create a PEP. On the project website, once the document is taken through Planning Commission, we will ensure this is clear in how the document is shared with small community groups.</p>
<p>“Why is the graphics and content so different from neighborhood plan guide? Where the people in the photos of this public document, did they sign photo release waivers? Is there an hour training series to educate people about this guide?”</p>	<p>The graphics are different from the NPG because the NPG has not yet been edited by a graphic designer. The NPG was carefully created in coordination with the PEG and so the content should not be in conflict. For example, the NPG calls for all Neighborhood Plans to create PEPs following the PEG requirements.</p> <p>The people in the photos of this document were all participants in the PEWG or the Panel on Public Engagement. By attending a public meeting, adults have consented to having photos taken unless otherwise stated to event hosts. There are no pictures of children. All photos were taken by DCP staff.</p> <p>DCP is working on creating a Planning Education Series for the public about our processes more generally and we are developing content for that program to include training on the PEG.</p>
<p>Pg 7. This page feels like it could be more streamlined – sections, pages, chapters – hard to understand the organizational logic, and I get lost in the wordiness.</p>	<p>Ok</p>
<p>Pg. 22. This is important, and in many ways should precede any project-based engagement process.</p>	<p>The Equity Statement is included at this point to follow the educational materials in the section on reaching the hard to reach and equity strategies in public engagements.</p>
<p>Pg 23. “Disproportionate adverse outcomes for minorities” change to “disproportionately, or delete”</p>	<p>Ok</p>

ENGAGEMENT REPORT: Public Comment Period, continued

Pg 23. “affected when they do not have the ability to provide input and consultation” change to “and event when they do have the ability to provide input”	Ok
Pg. 23. “city projects impact some of our most vulnerable residents” change to “again, they will anyway, but negative impacts can be mitigated”	Ok
Pg. 23. “...actively seek input from all community members...” questions “Who must actively seek input?”	Change to “the Project Team must...”
Pg 24. “These should not be restricted to a single project timeline, but should be an ongoing practice for project managers as they interface with communities.” This is critical.	Thanks
Pg. 24. “A thoughtful approach was used to gain insight into the experience of underserved and under-represented communities.” How is this determined?	The application of an equity lens requires an answer to the question “How does this project impact people of color?” at every stage. The answer will be different for every project and so that cannot be determined ahead of time by this Guide.
Pg. 24. “...allow for <u>the</u> diversity of thought” Delete the.	Ok
Pg. 25. “Steps were taken to prepare staff to work with communities of color and/or low-income communities”, comment: “Presumed a white, relatively affluent staff, which may be likely but is not great. What steps? How do you know if they were successful?”	Trainings are an important part of working with communities and color and low-income communities. The City recently had all planners, in addition to many other staff, trained through the Government Alliance on Racial Equity, for example. This is relevant for all staff, regardless of their own background or race. A line will be added to the section to clarify that success means that the Project Team answer the question “How will this project impact people of color and/or low-income communities?”
Pg. 25. “This starts with consistent dialogue with community members throughout the public engagement process.” Comment: “Before, even!”	Noted.
Pg. 25. “Determinant of Success” under Build Partnerships with the Community. Comment: “Could also add ‘staff diversity reflects the communities they are seeking to engage’ (says the white guy, I know)”	Noted.
Pg 26. Two typos. Under maximize accessibility, change to “particular challenges”. End of this paragraph “no kids or single-parent families).”	Ok

ENGAGEMENT REPORT: Public Comment Period, continued

Pg 27. First sentence: “Confusing sentence, either erase “to attract all those potentially affected” or delete “, or those for whom” and make two sentences.	Ok
Pg 33. Principles of Public Engagement: “Feels somewhat out of place, could come earlier? Also feels like this and the sustainable decision-making section are a bit repetitive”	Ok
Pg 36. Last sentence: “Meaning the steps?”	Will clarify.
Pg 39. Last bullet is misplaced.	Ok
Pg 47. Under Project Overview “...you should already have a good idea of your project...” Comment: “I’m questioning this assertion”	Will clarify.
Pg 47. Last sentence has excess comma.	Ok
Pg 51. “[PEP] must be presented to the Planning Commission once every six months until adoption” Comment: “Seems pretty intensive, not necessarily opposed”	Thanks
Pg 64. Sample Project Website. Comment: “May be worth pointing out that the website should be more visual and enticing than represented here. (plus, consider accessibility needs for those with visual impairments, other languages, etc.)	Good idea. We will add that graphics and visuals can help communicate complex ideas, and outline some considerations for ADA accessibility and language accessibility.
Pg 70. Sample Sign In Sheet. Comment: “Consider providing phone option”	Ok
Toolkit pg 4. “Could be useful to also include which part of the engagement spectrum on this table”	Too difficult on one page, especially since many tools fall under more than one category. This is essentially a table of contents and users can refer to the tool page for the spectrum levels.
Toolkit pg 10. “Probably don’t need to call out platforms – people know them and they may change”	It’s helpful to the people who will be using the Guide to see them broken out and listed as they exist now, but if they change we can always update/edit the Guide to reflect those societal changes.
Toolkit pg 14. Information Kiosks. Comment: “For more in-depth tools like this, would be great to show an example or two”	DCP will continue to add examples this toolkit is used.
Toolkit pg 17. “Fix capaCity, extra bullet”	Ok
Toolkit pg 23. Open House. Comment: “Might be worth mentioning – we’ve gotten pushback about this style of meeting from community members who want to hear what their neighbors have to say – sometimes feel that we’re “hiding something” with this format	The toolkit does not make value judgements on any of the other tools in the document. By following the suggestions of the PEG, Open Houses should only be used when appropriate.
Toolkit pg 25. Line cut off at bottom.	Ok

ENGAGEMENT REPORT: Public Comment Period, continued

Toolkit pg 27. Problem Tree Analysis. Comment: “Example(s) would be helpful.	DCP will continue to add examples as this toolkit is used.
Toolkit pg 28. Again, examples would be great	DCP will continue to add examples as this toolkit is used.
Toolkit pg 29. [First sentence] “or. Also other grammar issues in this paragraph – passive voice and confusion in “Specific challenges sentence”	Ok
Toolkit pg 30. “The goal of this engagement...” Comment: “Challenges and opportunities that the community faces.	Ok
Toolkit pg 33. Typo. First sentence “generate” needs s.	Ok
Toolkit pg 37. “Telling your story in two minutes, and” Comment: “Don’t need ‘, and”	Ok
Toolkit pg 43. Flip charts listed in description but not in resources needed.	Fixed
Toolkit pg 49. Appreciative Inquiry Process. “feels vast, more explanation or examples?”	DCP will continue to add examples as this toolkit is used.
Toolkit pg 50. “The ideal size for this type of form...” Comment “form – forum”	Ok
General comment about accessibility. Issues with font and colors.	Fonts standardized and contrast increased on blue pages.

Comments:

Planning Completing Report: Sophia Robison