

May 16 Homework Prompt:

After our conversation, please think about which process we should follow and then answer the questions below. Based on your feedback, we will make a decision on the approach and begin to execute. In both options we will have online survey and online information provided.

Option A: Big, Big, Big

Round 1 - Community Consultation #1 is one large meeting where we affirm the vision and goals, and work on the "Areas of Change/Stability" map. Goal of the meeting: walk away with one vision, several goals, and a final "Areas of Change/Stability" map.

Round 2 - Community Consultation #2 is one large meeting where we review all the recommendations that the Working Groups have been developing. Goal of the meeting: walk away with a set of recommendations that are acceptable to all and a prioritization of key recommendations.

Round 3 - Community Consultation #3 is one large meeting where we review the Draft Richmond 300 Plan. Goal of the meeting: walk away with comments on the draft document.

Option B: Small, Big, Small

Round 1 - Community Consultation #1 is spread out over two weeks during which we host several open houses (3 north of the river and 3 south of the river) where we affirm the vision and goals, and work on the "Areas of Change/Stability" map. Goal of the meeting: walk away with one vision, several goals, and a final "Areas of Change/Stability" map.

Round 2 - Community Consultation #2 is one large meeting where we review all the recommendations that the Working Groups have been developing. Goal of the meeting: walk away with a set of recommendations that are acceptable to all and a prioritization of key recommendations.

Round 3 - Community Consultation #3 is spread out over two weeks during which we host several open houses (3 north of the river and 3 south of the river) where we review the Draft Richmond 300 Plan. Goal of the meeting: walk away with comments on the draft document.

Advisory Council Responses

Response 1

Choice: Small, Big, Big [editorial edit: "Small, Big, Small"]

While your bullet point for Option B says Small, Big, Big the way I read it is Small, Big, Small. I believe the method I recommend offers the best of both. Using the Small meeting concept for the first meeting can give us the opportunity to introduce the process to the community as a whole in smaller groups, hopefully engaging more people and helping to give members of diverse communities the comfort necessary to feel the basis for actually participating in a larger group meeting. The Big meeting concept for the next two meetings is important to include ALL of the community, or at least as many as we can encourage to participate, in the same room. I share Burt's dream of all of our citizens sitting together to plan our future community in the Big meetings but I think the first Small meeting can help to educate and motivate our friends and colleagues in our local areas to join in the conversation.

Response 2

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

I think we need to establish comfortability and build some framework for city-wide discussion before we bring the city together. Smaller settings allow us to gather ideas, generate confidence in communities and better facilitate the larger conversation once we bring everyone together. I think bringing such divergent interests together without an understanding of those divergent interests is a recipe for counterproductivity. We need a better understanding of the public's concerns before we can hope to shape a fruitful discussion.

Response 3

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

Starting with the small meetings will allow people to make sure their opinion/need is heard and understood. This will, potentially, make sure that the community understands that the process respects their contribution instead of feeling lost in a large crowd.

Response 4

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

Someone made a point that maybe the first CC should be done in a way where residents feel comfortable speaking freely. I agree with that. I think any number of big meetings is a huge undertaking and should be totally worth the time and effort, meaning that the content should be rich and meaningful. I don't see that happening with three meetings. Let's do one big meeting when it makes the most sense and do the rest of the outreach at the neighborhood/district level.

Response 5

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

Option B allows us to gain some experience and learn lessons from our engagement strategy in a smaller group setting, which will inform our approach and allow for greater confidence in successfully managing a much larger meeting. I am persuaded that single large meetings may not be ideal for those who do not feel comfortable participating in such a potentially intimidating setting. Allowing a mix of approaches offers the benefits of convening residents and stakeholders from different backgrounds in a variety of contexts to help foster a diversity of feedback and participation.

Response 6

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

I agree with Burt's grant vision but I don't think you will be able to attract all of the people necessary for an authentic engagement without having smaller meetings first.

Response 7

Choice: Small / Big, Big, Small

I think that we definitely need a big community meeting early in the process. However, I am extremely concerned with how the big meeting is being described in Option A: "one large

meeting where we AFFIRM the vision and goals." If we already have a draft vision and goals before our first community consultation then we will be giving the appearance of token participation, i.e. that we already know what the plan will look like and are just going through the motions of soliciting community input. I don't think that is the intent of anyone at the City, but we have to be very careful about giving that appearance. My understanding from the beginning was that the first community consultation (big or small) would be used to develop a draft vision and goals, as is described in the "Communications, Engagement, and Consensus Plan" document from April 6. I noticed in the course of our last meeting that the terminology started to shift, and Maritza began talking about using the community consultations to "affirm" the vision and goals. This bothered me at the time, but we ran out of time before I could bring it up. I'm not suggesting any ill intent on Maritza's part, but I'm bothered by how we're starting to use the word "affirm." I believe it is extremely important that we come to the first community consultation meeting(s) with nothing but examples of how other communities have presented their Vision and Goals, and use those initial meetings to flesh out the concepts and values that the community wants to see captured in the new Master Plan. Ideally this process would begin with a few of the small open houses and/or other types of public input, which would give us a bit of a starting point for a first Big Meeting in which we come up with ideas for a draft Vision and Goals. The Advisory Council could then be charged with putting together the language of the draft Vision and Goals, based on all of that input, which would then be subject to further review.

Response 8

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

I really like Big, Big, Big for the tone and message that the first One Richmond meetup would set. After more thought though, I don't think we are currently positioned to do it in a meaningful way. We'd have about 3 months to raise awareness of the meetup, do so with Ambassadors that have not been selected and trained yet, and cross-pollinate other media outlets (City's social media, Mayor's social media, Council members' newsletters, RPS social media, etc) to increase awareness/understanding of Richmond 300. We're better positioned to engage first with smaller meetings and build engagement toward a big review of work groups' recommendations and prioritize those.

Response 9

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

I feel strongly that we should make every effort to reach out to communities that aren't typically civically involved. I believe this can be done by hosting smaller meetings in targeted neighborhoods. I also think we need to provide options. Giving people opportunities to attend a meeting that is convenient for them is important. Lastly, I think that smaller more targeted meetings might allow for a certain comfort level with people who typically don't speak up.

Response 10

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

Forgive me, because it seems that I missed some important deliberation on this and I am not sure if I am seeing it in the materials from the last meeting. My inclination is that smaller meetings and groups lead to more intimacy and the ability for people to have honest and candid discussions. I am not sure how this would occur if everything is done at a macro level. I think

bigger discussions can most certainly lead to an energy that is motivating, but there are issues that may get lost or muddled if we use the Big, Big, Big approach. I am really sorry that I missed the presentation on the history of Richmond. Did the presenters touch on how planning processes in Richmond have occurred in the past? I am curious about this because of some of the issues that are coming up regarding the new Pulse system that will start soon. There are some residents who feel as if they were not included in the initial discusses of the new system, and now it is essentially a plan that is going to be carried out whether they approve of it or not. If my gut instinct is correct, then this is probably a plan that was carried out a macro level with few opportunities for candid and detail-focused discussions throughout the city. Perhaps, it would be wise to learn from processes in the past (in which the citizenry did not feel involved) and maybe take a different approach. I think that the “Small, Big, Small” concept would be a more productive and inclusive process.

Response 11

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

I believe it will have the greatest engagement

Response 12

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

I have participated in several community meetings (charrettes) involving housing development, repairs to a school, etc., and small group discussions are more effective than large groups. Option B, Round 1 is a better approach to assisting us in affirming the vision and goals.

Response 13

Choice: Big, small, small

I agree with Burt that this is a unique opportunity to bring the entire city together to kick-off the visioning, but think smaller meetings after the first initial meeting would be more productive. Having a big first meeting will require a lot of coordination and engagement to get people to come out, but I think there's a lot of engagement and advocacy the ambassadors and advisory council can do to get people excited to come out.

Response 14

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

While I appreciate Burt's dream, I feel like we can still accomplish bringing everyone together in Round 2. I believe that work is accomplished best in smaller groups whether it is in the corporate or non profit world. I also feel that people would be more comfortable expressing their opinions in a smaller, familiar setting. In the end, we want honest feedback. Opinion 2, in my opinion, will be the best way to achieve this.

Response 15

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

I think we should start with smaller meetings to allow more opportunity for education and feedback which might otherwise be chilled in a larger setting by community members who could

be overwhelmed by the bigness of it. I think the second meeting should be big and then I could go either way with the third - either big or small.

Response 16

Choice: Big, small, Big

Tell as many people what we're going to do. Do it with small groups. Come back and tell as many people what we did. That's the short version. I took an anonymous informal poll of a cross section of contacts and asked if they would be willing to try the BIG meeting. All said yes (lots of questions about logistics). One contact mentioned the VCU Vision 2020 as a positive model. I didn't attend that but it's worth reviewing.

Response 17

Choice: Option A: Big, Big, Big

I really do like the idea of Richmond "under one roof". It is something that has never been done to my understanding and think it will be impactful. I think it is advantageous to the approach we are trying to take in regards to community engagement. It's important that we not just engage with the community, but that Richmond communities engage with one another; these will be opportunities for that to happen. One of my concerns, however, will be access for all persons to get to the Big, Big, Big Community Consultations. I think we'll have to think beyond public transportation and possibly partner with other transportation services to provide shuttle services help make it convenient for people who have greater challenges with transportation or even offer car pooling services, just throwing out idea. I definitely think it should be televised on local news for our home-bound residents or those will not be able to make it due to work commitments, etc. so that they will know other methods for how to give their inputs about what's being discussed at the community consultations. That's all I have for now. I apologize for my late submission.

Response 18

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

It's important to start small and then work towards a bigger group to make sure all concerns are shared and heard.

Response 19

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

I think it's very important to include one big meeting to engage all of Richmond under one roof. This option provides for that and also gives less daunting, spread-out, community-driven options for conversation within the smaller meetings.

Response 20

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

I think it has the greatest potential to achieve consensus while letting everyone's voice be heard

Response 21

Choice: Option B: Small, Big, Small

I think that the small meetings, especially the first one, is crucial in making sure that the communities are heard, and giving them a chance to listen and come to the second meeting with questions, ideas, suggestions, etc. I think it would be helpful and important to try and have the dates and locations of all six meetings announced at the same time, just in case someone misses a meeting and would like to attend another. I do think that this option would be more successful in helping us listen and engage the communities and include them in the process more directly.

PDR Staff Reponses

Response 22

Choice: Option A: Big, Big, Big

It think the first meeting needs to be big with lots of energy and excitement. I'm not sure if it would be beneficial to have small meetings with either the second or third round in order to get the most helpful feedback. If they are both big meetings broken down into smaller focus groups then I think that would be fine.

Response 23

Choice: Either

As mentioned at the last advisory group meeting, it's important to have meetings where those that are not used to the formality of public meetings feel comfortable to come out and voice their concerns/opinions/questions/etc. so in what ever way we can reach as many people as possible gets my vote. It will be up to the facilitators to ensure that the meetings do not get out of hand and that they end with a product - this is really about making sure we have strong facilitators, not that there may be too many opinions/voices cooks in the kitchen. This process needs to be accessible to everyone, not just those that are constantly at public meetings and we need to focus on those that we've never heard from, i.e. we probably know how people from the FDA, Museum District, etc. feel about things but not a lot of folks along the Jefferson Davis corridor or people living in challenging circumstances, we'll need to make a concerted effort to get their input. I'm for whichever format will make this happen. end ramble!

Response 24

Choice: Big, Small, Small

One large initial meeting to really set the tone for what we are looking to accomplish and get the city together as a whole prior to groups segregating themselves. Then because of logistics with space, transportation, scheduling etc. have the second and third meetings be small.

Response 25

Choice: Option A: Big, Big, Big

I think it is important to make the process feel like a significant event. It will also be a lot easier logistically.

Response 26

Choice: Option A: Big, Big, Big

Even with ambassadors we do not have the staff capacity to hold 6 meetings over a two week period. It is also extremely important to get people from different parts of the city in the same room discussing the same issues. The small meetings keeps people segregated in the neighborhoods and surrounding areas.

Response 27

Choice: Option A: Big, Big, Big

A mass meeting to initiate the process is required to set the tone for all other meetings to follow. Administration must establish that no one community stands above or apart from the whole and that well planned/executed strategies, whether City wide or community based are for the benefit of the entire community. Recommendations may not be completed before current politicians and/or administration leadership leave, therefore the residents/stakeholders will have to keep those ideas alive and push them across the finish line. Strategies viewed as benefitting a select community may die in the process even though it may benefit the entire community. A major responsibility of the technical team and ambassadors during this process will be to ensure that residents and stakeholders understand how community improvements connects/relates to other city wide initiatives and benefits the whole.