

**Participatory Budget Steering Committee Meeting #3
August 12th – Virtual Only (Teams)**

GR Participatory Budget Team				
First Name	Last Name	Email	Ward	Topic / Breakout room
Doug	Booth	dbooth@healthnetwm.org	2nd Ward	Goals, Outcomes and Guiding Principles
Dotti	Clune	dotticlune@gmail.com	2nd Ward	Project and Participant Eligibility
Kristian	Grant	kristiangrant@12oakes.com	3rd Ward	Goals, Outcomes and Guiding Principles
Kenneth	Hoskins	kwoskins@comcast.net	3rd Ward	Governance, Roles and Responsibilities
Lisa	Knight	lisaknight@dvapplelogistics.com	2nd Ward	Goals, Outcomes and Guiding Principles
Mallory	Patterson	heartsideneighborhood@gmail.com	1st Ward	Unable to attend, family issue
Michael	Scholten	michael.scholten@gmail.com	1st Ward	Governance, Roles and Responsibilities
LaKiya	Thompson	lakiya@lincrev.org	3rd Ward	Project and Participant Eligibility
Adnoris (Bo)	Torres	a.b.g.torres.wm@gmail.com	1st ward	Project and Participant Eligibility
Asante	Cain	acain@grcity.us	City Staff	{out of office}
Lou	Canfield	lcandfield@grcity.us	City Staff	Goals, Outcomes and Guiding Principles
Gricelda	Estrada	gestrada@grcity.us	City Staff	{out of office}
Doug	Matthews	dmatthews@grcity.us	City Staff	Project and Participant Eligibility
Laura	Olson	leolson@grcity.us	City Staff	Hall Monitor
Sharra	Poncil	sponcil@grcity.us	City Staff	Governance, Roles and Responsibilities

+ David Green

Governance, Roles and Responsibilities: 1st Ward, 3rd Ward (Sharra)

Project and Participant Eligibility: 1st Ward, 2nd Ward, 3rd Ward (Doug)

Goals, Outcomes and Guiding Principles – 2nd Ward, 2nd Ward, 3rd Ward (Lou)

Pre-Breakout Room Notes:

- Feedback on the last session:
 - o Bo – Affirmation of some of the things and processes that we had been talking and thinking about. Good to see them put together agreements about the process.
 - o Reverend Hoskins – Good, but my issues is that we needed more clarity on what to do as we went into the breakout groups.
 - o Michael Scholten – Discussion has been very high level and visionary, and I’m very practical, so us not writing anything down is making me anxious. Think we need to break things down into teams for making the rule book. Don’t want to invent anything new, feels that an example like New York is a good starting point that we can take pieces of and modify it.

- Doug M. – Want to make sure that we are making good use of your time, and you'll be glad to know that in the digital space, we are taking notes and summarizing.
- Doug M's Remarks
 - ARPA Framework Emphasis
 - Questions:
 - Bo – I wanted to go back to something that we talked about during the first meeting. While we do identify the five buckets of work, how deeply can we push against the established framework?
 - Doug M. – Do we want to have the discussion now or in the workgroups?
 - Bo – I just wanted to elevate it to the group.
 - Doug M. – This is ARPA money, and it has to fit into the ARPA framework. But some of the lanes are broad. Some of the lanes in the original presentation don't exist, the alternative response models for intervention doesn't fit based on the guidelines, but violence prevention does.
 - Michael – Bo, your idea about being proactive, there needs to be a mechanism for if we reject the project because it doesn't fit in a category, we should be reporting those that are valid projects to the Commission to help advance the goals.

Post-Breakout Room

- Governance, Roles and Responsibilities:

[[subcommittee notes begin]]

Breakout Group #1: Governance, Roles and Responsibilities

1) PB Oversight Committee

- Appoints steering committee, helps with outreach and event planning, provides background information for participants and connections to relevant City staff, oversees work of the PBP.

Note: This role (for the pilot) has effectively been filled by City Commission and staff assigned to support the initiative.

2) Steering Committee

Design the process,

Be the decision maker about PB operations,

Help plan and conduct process

Communicate the plan to local orgs and the city commission/staff, receive feedback from Commission.

Develop plan/process to receive feedback from community.

Develop an equitable voting process- not necessarily just most votes wins?

Coordinate outreach and voting strategies to encourage accessibility **use local organizations for outreach/voting with \$\$\$**

monitor implementation of funded projects transition ownership to neighborhood organizations/local orgs take this part over with Project Management \$\$\$.

3) Budget Delegates

Concerns about the workload and getting the right people with the right expertise to participate. Maybe this is a place to reach out to our local partners/orgs?

- Before submitted ideas are sent to budget delegates, projects should be evaluated for:
 - **Made by ward subcommittee** rather than the entire Steering Committee.
 - Eligibility per ARRA guidelines
 - Evaluated against a predefined initial evaluation matrix/template
 - SC needs to define the categories, weighting, etc.
 - Transparency and Information - Results of this phase will be made public.
 - City Staff will be part of this decision-making process.
 - Ineligible projects should be shared with relevant local groups/orgs by the ward subcommittee.
- Research the ideas presented by community and meet in committees to develop project proposals.
 - SC develops a common project template.
 - Develop a list of outside experts/support to help with all proposals that impact that area
 - Parks person, street person, etc.
 - City staff if appropriate
 - Conflict of interest?
 - Goal - Mature the proposals to ensure the City Staff can make a cost estimate.

4) City Departments/Staff

Give feedback on project eligibility and cost, and support budget delegates in providing strong, feasible proposals.

5) Community

Volunteer at engagement events, assist with outreach, volunteer as budget delegates, and other responsibilities as determined by the Steering Committee/**Ward Subcommittees.**

Is there \$\$\$ available for local orgs to perform these functions?

How should the Steering Committee make decisions?

Background:

Make decisions by a vote.

Select a Chair, Vice-Chair or Secretary to work with staff on creating meeting agendas, facilitating meetings and taking notes.

Delegation of some decision making/budget decisions to subcommittees by the Steering Committee.

Steering committee member should lead the subcommittee, depending on the skillsets of the group, we will need to recruit community members/city staff to support the group.

What work groups should the Steering Committee form?

- Outreach and Engagement and Event Planning
 - Community Orgs?
 - Key objectives:
 - Draft the vision/parameters for how we are going to engage our neighbors equitably regardless of income/language/accessibility/etc.
 - Recruit the local orgs to help execute the plan.
 - Attend engagement events and report back to the Steering Committee.
 - Engagement with City is responsibility of Steering Committee.
- Communications
 - Community Orgs?
 - 3rd party contracts – WMCAT, GRPS, etc.
 - Key objectives
 - Work with news media, city staff, rapid growth, PR.
 - Draft newsletter articles.
 - Provide content for community orgs to use- translated, etc.
- Measurement and Accountability
 - Should be a group of people who aren't in the steering committee.
 - Key objectives
 - Provide feedback on the plan.
 - Evaluate each step against the plan and the goals the team has established.
 - Evaluate progress against our goals.

Plan needs:

- Conflict of Interest Policy?
 - Need to be specific in the phases of the plan where conflicts may occur and will need to be disclosed to whom?

[[end of subcommittee notes]]

- Doug – Is there anything on here that is a deal breaker or anxiety (no responses)

Breakout Room #2: Project and Participant Eligibility:

(no typed notes, summary provided below from group's comments):

- Types of Projects:
 - We feel there should be refinements to the list of eligible categories. For those that fall outside allowable uses, we feel it's important to be able to communicate why it fell out of

the category, but also to enable communities to have access to the information on those that did (and did not) fall into the allowable uses. If things are ineligible perhaps other organizations will want to help.

- We want to communicate to the community all that proposals that are submitted, not just what is eligible for transparency. This will assist if there are viable options that could have alternative pathways through the scope(s) of other projects.
- Question:
 - Michael – In terms of governance, is the steering committee responsible for that or is it the ward subcommittee? Where does that best fall?
 - Bo – In a ward subcommittee structure if we see those connections occurring. We would hope that community members at large would see the connections as they happen.
- Who is eligible to propose ideas:
 - Ideas will be prioritized from the residents of the ward. Residents of the ward should be prioritized in assisting with the proposals. Age limitation of 13+.
 - Pastor Hoskins – What is the thinking on proposals coming from outside the ward?
 - LaKiya – Definitely talked about prioritizing the engagement inside the specific ward, but there might be allies or folks who are dedicated to the community who might have a good proposal.
- Who can vote on ideas:
 - Voting for ward residents only, 13 years or older.
- Question:
 - Kristian – So, to clarify, if I am from the 1st ward and I have a proposal for the 3rd ward, did you give any details on the team who I'd do this proposal with? Do I need to include people from within the ward on my team?
 - Doug M. – There are two different steps in the process - idea generation which is any open forum, and then idea refinement and development of the proposals. The idea is that there may be ideas from non-ward residents - need to create spaces for all of these ideas to take light, but when we get to proposal development, there needs to be representation from the ward to develop the idea.
 - Michael – The project development phase we think is the vast majority of the work here. Do we really want to limit it to only members of the ward? We want the champion to be from the ward, but can we expand the people who are supporting the development.
 - Bo – That is something we talked about regarding City staff – historically, many times decisions are taken out of the hands of residents. So when we look at the equity stance and we want to go back to the actual ward resident who at the end of the day will be making the decision. Utilize staff members and best practices in coaching, training, and expertise, but it should be the resident that does the decision making and ideating at the highest level.

- Michael – Agreed, but if we limit the process, and these are all volunteers, what if we cannot find a volunteer and the process is hindered? Agreed that the priority should be ward specific, but I don't know if we should lock ourselves into things.
- LaKiya – If the process is effective, we should be able to reach participants and volunteers. If it is not, we need to relook at what we are doing.

Breakout Group #3: Goals, Outcomes and Guiding Principles

[[beginning of subcommittee notes]]

What are the main goals and guiding principles for PB in Grand Rapids?

Through participatory budgeting, we will empower the people of Grand Rapids to make timely, informed decisions that lead to visible and lasting improvements within their neighborhoods.

Our work will be guided by the value of equity, with an intentional, transparent process designed to include marginalized voices, people with lived experience, and diverse groups. This process will be structured to remove barriers and build community capacity.

Background:

Examples of goals from other participating communities include:

- 1) **Greensboro, NC:** Community Benefit, Access, Empowerment, Evaluation, Transparency, Process Integrity
- 2) **NYC:** Open up Government, Expand Civic Engagement, Develop New Community Leaders, Build Community, Make Public Spending More Equitable

One example of guiding principles (from NYC) included empowerment, transparency, inclusion, equality and community. These were considered the “guideposts” for their decision-making and operational decisions.

Deliberation

Using the deliberation and feedback from the last meeting, what do we hope to achieve through this process (goals) and what principles will guide our work toward achieving those goals (principles)?

What will success look like?

Representative participation by diverse groups:

- Racial/ethnic
- LGBTQIA+
- Gender identity
- Other abled

- Age groups
- Length of residency (including under-documented persons)

At least ## ideas submitted for consideration.

Participation by at least ##% of ward residents.

Project benefits at least ##% of ward residents.

(left blank for now, but want to be able to quantify)

Background:

It's important to set goals for participation and outcomes as part of the process. This may include the # of projects, # of votes, % of participation by eligible population, etc.

Deliberation

What metrics are most important? Should they include goals or projections, i.e.:

- Number of ideas submitted
- # of volunteers/community members participating and/or supporting the process
- # or % of votes

What are the non-numerical success measures, based on your goals?

Did you feel your voice was heard?

Did you learn, build capacity?

Does the project enhance your community?

Background:

It's likely that many (if not most) of your goals aren't based on numbers or percentages, but rather community or individual sentiment...how people feel about the process and outcomes, how their knowledge may have developed through the process, etc. We want to think about what success measures we should be looking at from this respect as well.

Deliberation

What are the non-numerical measures that would indicate that the PB process was successful?

[[end of subcommittee notes]]

- Questions:
 - Michael – Where in the process, and how are we going to measure and capture the metrics and ensure that the goals are met?

- Doug M. – All good questions, but right now we're doing the *what* so we can get to the *how*.
- Kristian – Our group was definitely feeling the pressure of setting up the what before the how. We were trying to take something that was abstract and looking at what our goals should be - trying to identify success. Don't have all the pieces but trying to set up the parameters.
- Doug M. – That may be from a structure standpoint, that falls into the measurement and accountability subgroup, to establish the how. You as a steering committee say what it is that you want to measure, and then they come back and say here is how they want to do it.
- Michael – I feel like you all did a great job.
- Doug M. – Some of the examples that you are looking had specifically articulated discrete values that were designed to be guideposts for all of the steering committee's decisions. Was that a part of what you all talked about.
- Doug B. – I will say, yes that is. Within the statement, you'll see equity is first and foremost, then transparency, and the inclusion of marginalized voices. Ultimately, we'll be removing barriers and building the capacity. But not necessarily a list.
- Doug M. – Makes sense, does everyone feel okay with being held accountable being held to this statement as we move to the process (nodding heads). Ultimately if there is a question of should we / shouldn't we, this is what you all agreed that you would look back upon. (nods) Going back to what Michael raised at the beginning of the conversation, I want to make sure that we get started with the conversation about that - all of this needs to get worked into the rule book. I don't want to dictate how that gets done but we do need to get started in earnest.
- Dottie – I know that myself, I do not have the capacity to take that on right now.
- Michael – I am happy to try and synthesize something to put out for people to comment on, but if others want to be a part of it I am happy to work with anyone. I think we should own the process, not city staff, not that I don't think they will do a good job, but I think that we need to do it ourself. Does anyone want to assist?
- Pastor Hoskins – I am interested in reviewing.
- Michael – Everyone will need to review it. I will draft everything and then if there is a review tool we can use, or maybe Google Docs?
- Bo – Do we have the notes from the previous meeting also? Want to make sure that we capture those ideas.
- Doug M. – We can also make notes from the video from the last meeting (Gricelda will do). Google docs might be the easiest for reviewing.
- David – Considering everyone is in the Teams environment, should we use the wiki function?
- Doug M. – I will have to leave that to Michael.
- Michael – I will draft it in Word and then I will figure out how to share it to get comments.
- Doug M. – You can reach out to anyone of us to test it.

- Dottie – Thank you Michael.
- Michael – I just think we need to get a draft down and then we can get everyone’s input.

Unable to get to David’s piece of the meeting

Timeline:

- Doug M. – Given everything that has be shared today, it sounds like we do want to engage the budget delegate process, but what we need to consider that the budget delegate process is the longest. Question becomes, what is a reasonable timeline? When I go back to the City Commission to give an update I’d like to include the timeline that you all decided on. (slide 12) What do we think is reasonable to take back to the Commission.
- Question: What was the other timeline for cities around the country?
- Doug M. – 6 months to a year. To be fair, it can take less time, just depends on how we design the process?
- Question: Can we wait a week or two until we are more confident in the process before we can commit to a timeline?
- Doug M. – They are expecting me to bring some update on the 24th.
- Pastor Hoskins – Does that update have to include a specific timeline? Or can it say that it depends on the process, and we don’t have the process all the way mapped out? How are we going to engage with the public? How we engage them (Zoom, in person, both?) will weigh in on the timeline.
- Doug M. – I think they will press me of an idea of when it will be done.
- Answer: Sometime during 2022.
- Pastor Hoskins – Therein lies some of the issue – I don’t want to rush through the process and not have the input of the residents. When we rush the process, and the Commission wants a timeline, that is unfair to the residents as we don’t have a process yet. The Commissioners who represent the community need to have some understanding.
- Bo – I think some of this, when responding to these items, and doing the pre-work and engaging in getting the messaging out and getting the ideation started in the community, then the time frame wouldn’t be rushed, per se, but residents would have an idea of the framework for the ideation. If we can get the pre-work done, then that would make the process more calculated.
- Doug M. – That was why I was hopeful we could get to the communication and engagement piece today. That is something that we will need to table for next time around. But I agree, getting the information out the door and establishing a presence is the singular most important thing right now because it is not started until it is started, and we are right here at the gate. We can come back around on that and I’ll add timeline – the goals for next week:
 - Review and agree on draft rule book
 - Talk about communications strategy
 - Further discussion of timeline
 - Discussion on how you wish to be represented moving forward

- I would also like to see at least one or two of you present and presenting when called to the Commission meeting.
- We'll hear from Michael between now and next week, and we'll see you all on Thursday.
- Michael – If you all can join the Facebook group, I'll probably post the areas that I need input on that I have no clue about on there. Please join the group and give me your ideas. Thank you!