



200290E
City of Gainesville
Procurement Division
200 E University Avenue, Rm 339
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 334-5021(main)

Addendum Publish Date: June 15, 2020

**Downtown Gainesville Strategic Master Plan
RFP #: DOSD-200033-GD
ADDENDUM NO. 3**

Bid Due Date: June 29, 2020, 3:00pm (Local Time)

NOTE: This Addendum has been issued only to the holders of record of the specifications.

The original Specifications remain in full force and effect except as revised by the following changes which shall take precedence over anything to the contrary.

1. **Corrections to Addendum 2** to DOSD-200033-GD
 - a. A copy of the Pre-Bid Discussion/Information Checklist is posted on Addendum 1, and should not have been indicated as being posted on Addendum 2.
 - b. A copy of the updated solicitation schedule is included in Addendum 1, and should not have been indicated as being posted on Addendum 2.
 - c. A copy of the Civic Engagement Toolkit was inadvertently not included in Addendum 2 as indicated, but is attached to this Addendum 3.
2. Please find attached:
 - a. A copy of the Cone of Silence period information (Financial Procedures Manual Section 41-424 Prohibition of lobbying in procurement matters) that was discussed.
 - b. A copy of the Civic Engagement Toolkit

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: Each Proposer shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 3 by his or her signature below, **and a copy of this Addendum to be returned with proposal.**

CERTIFICATION BY PROPOSER

The undersigned acknowledges receipt of this Addendum No. 3 and the Proposal submitted is in accordance with information, instructions, and stipulations set forth herein.

PROPOSER COMPANY NAME: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

LEGIBLY PRINT NAME: _____

DATE: _____



200290E
City of Gainesville
Procurement Division
200 E University Avenue, Rm 339
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 334-5021(main)

**CITY OF GAINESVILLE
FINANCIAL SERVICES
PROCEDURES MANUAL**

41-424 Prohibition of lobbying in procurement matters

Except as expressly set forth in Resolution 170116, Section 9, during the Cone of Silence as defined herein no person may lobby, on behalf of a competing party in a particular procurement process, City Officials or employees, except the Procurement Division or the procurement designated staff contact person. Violation of this provision shall result in disqualification of the party on whose behalf the lobbying occurred.

Cone of Silence period means the period between the issue date which allows for immediate submittals to the City of Gainesville Procurement Division in response to an invitation to bid, or a request for proposal, or qualifications, or information, or an invitation to negotiate, as applicable, and the time that City Officials or the Procurement Division, or City Department awards the contract.

Lobbying means when a person seeks to influence or attempt to influence City Officials or employees with respect to a decision of the City, except as authorized by procurement procedures.



Gainesville.

Citizen centered

People empowered

Engagement Toolkit

10/30/2019

Anne Wolf

With support from the Department of Strategic Initiatives



Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Planning Community Engagement Efforts.....	4
Benefits and Costs of Community Engagement.....	4
Determining the Scope of Engagement	4
Questions to Define the Purpose of an Engagement Effort.....	6
Determining Effective Methods for Participation	8
Quick Tips.....	9
Suggestions for planning engagement.....	9
10 Do's and Don'ts of Planning an Engagement Event.....	9
Building an Engagement Plan	9
Sample Engagement Plan – Creating the Neighborhood Planning Partnership	10
Key Terms	10
Core Values for Community Engagement	12
Values in Action.....	13
Value 1:	13
Value 2:	13
Value 3:	13
Value 4:	14
Value 5:	14
Value 6:	15
Value 7:	15
Value 8:	15

Introduction

The City of Gainesville seeks to foster collaboration with local community members through equitable and inclusive community engagement. Departments throughout the City of Gainesville share a commitment to centering the needs and perspectives of community members in all we do. We can improve our citizen-centered mission by connecting it to a set of core values for engagement. This toolkit offers a shared framework for defining engagement, tips on how and when to engage, and guidelines for promoting mutually beneficial engagement with communities and community partners. It contains resources for the design, planning, review, and revision of community engagement efforts.

Effective engagement has three main outcomes. It fosters trust and relationships, supports stronger communities, and enables inclusive decision-making. Through sustained interaction with community members, city staff are better able to understand the strengths, challenges, and desires of local communities. Historically and presently marginalized community members build social capital through developing stronger connections with one another, while gaining valuable knowledge about the city's operations and decision-making processes. This insight enables community members and staff to work together to make decisions that work better for everyone.

It is important to weigh the costs and benefits of community outreach, or engagement, prior to beginning an engagement effort. Many communities have given extensive feedback about their basic desires. For example, most community members want to live in a safe community with opportunities for employment and access to housing and services they can afford. Keeping this in mind, in certain cases, staff time and resources may better meet the needs of community members by being directly spent on infrastructure, services, and programming, rather than extensive engagement.

In other instances, particularly when a given community has historically been left out of the decision-making process, when city staff are unclear on the needs and preferences of a given community, or when the needs of different communities differ dramatically, we will almost certainly need to devote staff time to engagement. We can maximize the impact of that engagement by asking key questions to define the purpose of engagement, planning the engagement process with community members, and using multiple methods and levels of engagement.

All meaningful engagement is rooted in trust and requires time and resources. With that said, there is a spectrum of engagement ranging from outreach efforts to inform communities, to deep engagement efforts aimed at empowering community members to make decisions. Whereas efforts to simply reach out and inform communities may require limited resources and time, efforts to sustain ongoing processes of community-driven planning and decision-making require significant time and resources.

Effective engagement ensures that communities are better off and perceive that they are better off as a result of the engagement process. This could mean that communities are strengthened with knowledge and power to influence decisions. It could mean that individuals are better equipped with knowledge and/or skills like conflict resolution, facilitation, and a better

understanding of how to serve as a community leader. Or, it could simply mean that community members connected meaningfully with one another in ways that make future collaborations more possible.

This toolkit offers 8 core values for community engagement, definitions of key terms, and some strategies for putting these values into practice. The core values for engagement (adapted from the International Association for Public Participation, IAP2) are as follows:

1. We seek to ensure that individuals and groups most affected by a decision will be involved in the decision-making process.
2. We seek to ensure that the public's contributions will influence the decision.
3. We strive to make sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.
4. We seek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.
5. We seek input from participants in designing how they participate.
6. We will provide participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.
7. We will communicate to participants how their input affected the decision.
8. We will continuously improve our awareness of power and culture so that we can respect the diverse histories, experiences and needs of local residents.

By keeping the above core values in mind, we will increase the impact of the resources and time spent on engagement. We will build stronger relationships with communities. We will support a stronger, more connected, and more equitable community. Most importantly, we will make inclusive decisions that are more likely to be supported by a greater number of people over time.

Planning Community Engagement Efforts

Different engagement efforts will vary in terms of timeline, who is being engaged, how much information community members require in order to effectively participate, and what the desired outcomes of engagement are. During the planning phase of an engagement effort, it is important to consider the benefits and costs of engagement, determine the scope of engagement, define the purpose of engagement, and determine the most effective methods for engagement.

Benefits and Costs of Community Engagement

Before planning an engagement event or process, it is important to consider both the benefits of community engagement and the costs and resources required to see it through. It is also important to consider whether or not to engage.

Benefits of Engagement	Costs of Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspires a sense of ownership over decisions made • Gains support from the outset of decision-making • Fosters equity • Fosters inclusion • Builds social capital • Respects the diversity of perspectives • Builds trust between the City of Gainesville and community members as well as between and among different communities • Ensures representation of multiple socio-cultural perspectives and avoids pitfalls of universalism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not everyone will agree that the right decision has been made • Power sharing requires negotiation between different interests • Process takes longer • Some individuals will feel that they have lost power • Staff experts may need to translate their professional language into lay-terms • Requires more resources
Good Reasons to Engage	Good Reasons Not to Engage
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When we are genuinely curious about community perspectives about an issue • When there is a real opportunity for community perspectives to impact decision-making • When issues to be decided truly matter to communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When there is a lack of clarity about decision-maker needs or intentions • When there is a low probability that community feedback will have an impact on decisions • When there is a risk of adding to public mistrust by over-promising

-Adapted the from the Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue

Determining the Scope of Engagement

There are numerous levels of engagement, ranging from asking community members to choose their preference of two options of park benches, to involving communities in shaping decisions about local development priorities over the span of many months. The International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) offers a “continuum of public participation”. The chart below is an adaptation of the IAP2 continuum. This chart serves as a guideline for the range of potential levels of community engagement.

Public Involvement Continuum					
Giving Information		Getting Information		Engaging	Empowering
Goal	Inform/ Educate	Consult	Discuss/ Debate	Engage/ Participate	Partner/ Collaborate
Context	Bus route is changing. RTS sends out flyers.	RTS wants to know local preferences for route change options.	RTS is considering changes to bus shelters in several locations.	RTS seeks community participation in creating First/Last Mile routes	RTS teaches community members how to do route planning.
Method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach • Tabling • Social Media • Open Houses • flyers • TV 12 • Fact Sheet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys • Polls • Feedback forms • Kiosk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups • Public workshops • Online discussion group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisory board • Facilitated workshop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-led route planning

Efforts to **inform** the community about a particular issue, problem, or challenge, differ from engagement insofar as they do not seek feedback or involvement from community members. This kind of participation is termed outreach. Efforts to conduct outreach seek to educate. These efforts may involve some combination of direct emailing, social media campaigns, flyers, and/or use of the City of Gainesville website.

Efforts to **consult** with the community promise that the public will be informed and included in the city’s understanding of community priorities for making decisions. These kinds of efforts include public comment at commission meetings, surveys and focus groups. Unlike outreach, efforts to consult with community members invite public feedback.

Opportunities for community members to **discuss / debate** in decision-making require staff to commit to understanding and incorporating public concerns and feedback into potential alternative solutions. These efforts involve discussions between community members and city staff. Community members are involved not only in giving feedback, but also in negotiating with one another over the best possible outcomes.

Efforts that **engage / participate** create partnerships between city staff and community members to drive the creation of solutions. Participatory efforts promise to take community preferences into account when the final decision is made. This kind of partnership requires trust, mutual benefit, and a non-hierarchical approach to decision-making.

When the city **partners /collaborates** with communities, community members are able to completely decide the outcome of engagement. This level of empowerment might also include co-designing processes and outcomes. At this level of participation, city staff and community members are equal partners in decision-making.

Questions to Define the Purpose of an Engagement Effort

Engagement efforts with a clear purpose will yield more effective results. Ideally the purpose for the city's engagement should adhere to our core values for engagement. The following questions can serve as a guide to ensure that the purpose of the engagement is clear, and that it will uphold the core values. Keep in mind that depending on the level of engagement you wish to achieve, not every question will be relevant to your particular engagement effort. For example, if you are solely conducting outreach to inform community members about a particular service, you will not need to address questions about how the public will participate in decision-making. If you are conducting more labor-intensive engagement processes, you may benefit from addressing each of the questions below.

Who are the stakeholders we need to engage about the issue/problem/challenge?

- Which communities will be most impacted by the decision we seek public involvement in making?
- Which partner organizations are most closely associated with the issue/problem/challenge we are seeking public participation in addressing?

What are the boundaries around what's on the table for community members to influence?

- Which specific decisions are open for community members to influence?
 - Which decisions have already been made?
 - Which decisions are not open for community members to influence?
- How will we communicate all of the above to participants at the outset of engagement?

How do we understand and explain the needs and interests of all participants involved in the decision we are engaging about?

- What are the needs of each stakeholder group (including staff, community members, and partner organizations)?
 - How are we inviting and sharing the various needs and desires of different community members/stakeholders?

- How are we communicating the needs of staff and practical limitations of any potential outcome?

How are we ensuring that we are being inclusive and equitable in our engagement efforts?

- Have we collected demographic data to ensure that we were able to engage in a way that is equitable and inclusive?
- How will we ensure that we connect with communities who could be adversely affected by the decision at hand?
- Have we sought multiple perspectives on the history of the issue we wish to engage about—particularly from communities that have been historically excluded from decision-making?

How will we seek input from participants in designing the ways they participate?

- Have we asked community members how they can most effectively participate?
 - Are the communities who could be adversely affected by the decision at hand involved in determining what the strategy for engagement will look like? If not, how are we seeking their input in designing engagement?
 - Have the above communities been involved in determining what an effective engagement effort will look like? If not, how are we seeking their input in determining measures of successful engagement?
- Have we created multiple opportunities for participation based on community feedback?

How will we provide participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way?

- What is the specific issue/problem/challenge we are seeking to address?
- How would we define the purpose of engagement in one or two sentences?
- What information do community members need to know in order to contribute their perspectives to decision-making?
- Have we created a way to communicate relevant information in a way that is respectful, clear, and free of jargon or excessive detail?
- Which terminology do we need to explicitly define in order to work together with stakeholders?

How will we ensure that community members who participated are informed of the outcome of their participation?

- How will we maintain communication with participants to inform them of the outcome of their participation?
- Have we achieved measures of successful engagement as defined by both staff and community members?
- How will we ensure that participants are informed of future engagement opportunities?

What is the history of the issue/problem/challenge we seek public feedback about?

- How will different stakeholders understand the history of the issue/problem/challenge about which we are seeking their feedback?

- How has the history of the issue/problem/challenge impacted community perception of the decision we are currently engaging the public in making?
- What history and context do community members need to share with staff in order to effectively collaborate in decision-making around this issue? What history and context does staff need to share with the community in order to support effective engagement?

Inclusion is not merely the absence of exclusion: Radical inclusion requires going further—identifying barriers that exclude and eliminating them; welcoming different people, stories, and experiences to the innovation conversation; creating spaces where everyone can bring their full selves and be equally valued.

– equityXdesign

Determining Effective Methods for Participation

No single method for engagement will work for every situation. Effective participation is participation that effectively includes the perspectives of communities that are most impacted by the decisions being made. We can find the best method by considering our desired outcomes and which communities we seek to engage. Other considerations include participants' level of understanding of the topic, ability to participate over time, and desire for tangible and immediate results. If we are engaging about a complex planning decision, we will need to use multiple methods of engagement over a longer span of time.

Once we know what our desired outcomes are for participation, we can go to the communities we want to engage with and ask them how we can maximize participation in their communities. For some neighborhoods and demographics, the best way to reach out and seek feedback might be via text message. Other neighborhoods and demographics may prefer to meet in person and share their feedback face-to-face. Still other neighborhoods and demographics may prefer to engage solely through digital media. The best way to know how a given neighborhood or demographic will be most likely to participate is to ask.

There are numerous options for digital and in-person engagement. These options include, but are not limited to:

Digital	In-Person
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Digital surveys • Digital forums / discussion groups • Digital voting • Digital card-sort activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys • Focus groups • Single event dialogues • Ongoing collaborative dialogues and decision-making • Councils and Advisory Boards

Quick Tips

Suggestions for planning engagement

- Define specific and measurable goals and desired outcomes for engagement
- Work with community members to plan goals, outcomes and the structure of the meeting
- Make sure to review information gathered from previous engagement efforts to show that you value community feedback
- Use plain language (remove acronyms and technical language unless it's necessary)
- Create visuals when possible
- Plan to record participants' ideas and feedback
- Consider using an outside facilitator if issues are particularly contentious

10 Do's and Don'ts of Planning an Engagement Event

Do	Don't
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with community leaders and organizations to plan your events and ensure that previous feedback is acknowledged • Open with an activity that will get participants talking • Convey that you are keen to center community perspectives decision-making • Seek to find community leaders beyond the leadership you usually work with • Consider questions to define the purpose of an engagement effort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan the event without working with community leaders to collaboratively define the purpose of the event • Start the meeting by talking for more than five minutes • Convey that the community is deficient or in need of change • Assume that the community leaders most likely to engage with the city are the only community leaders • Spend all of your funding on consultants from out of town

Building an Engagement Plan

Engagement plans are made of several core components:

- A defined project scope, purpose, and measures of success
- A statement of which decisions are on the table for deliberation
- A list of stakeholders to be included in the engagement effort
- A list of methods for engagement
- A timeline of engagement events

Sample Engagement Plan – Creating the Neighborhood Planning Partnership

<p>Project Scope</p> <p>The purpose of the Neighborhood Planning Partnership is to increase collaboration between city staff and community members in two ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first way is by deepening staff understanding of community concerns. • The second way is by increasing community knowledge and capacity to participate in decision-making about issues related to the city's development and housing <p>Through this effort we seek to ensure that the Neighborhood Planning Partnership is co-designed based on the needs of community members and city staff. This is a collaborative effort aimed at building relationships and increasing community empowerment. The initial phases of the Partnership will take place over the course of many months and will involve the efforts of multiple staff from at least two different departments.</p>	<p>Stakeholders</p> <p>The primary stakeholders are community members living in communities who are at the greatest risk for displacement due to development pressures.</p> <p>We will be reaching out to community members at five different neighborhood association meetings including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Greater Duval Neighborhood Association • The Porters Community • The Springhill Neighborhood Association • The Lincoln Estates Neighborhood Association • 5h Avenue Neighborhood Association 	<p>Timeline</p> <p>The Neighborhood Planning Partnership will be an iterative process involving many stages of planning, consultation, and revision. For this first stage of the Neighborhood Planning Partnership, we will be planning and designing the core curriculum, based on the interests and needs of specific neighborhoods. We will begin with a planning phase, followed by an information and collaboration phase, and ending in an iterative process of collaborative learning and planning. The process is iterative insofar as it will be revised based on community feedback and shifting development dynamics.</p> <p><u>June & July 2019:</u> Phase I - Plan, Inform and Consult</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff planning • Emails and calls with local community leaders • One-on-one informational conversations with local community leaders
---	--	---

<p>Decisions on the Table for Deliberation</p> <p>Collaborative decisions associated with this effort include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-designing the Neighborhood Planning Partnership • Collaboratively determining staff and community priorities for the Partnership • Deciding what needs to be included in the curriculum, and what kinds of activities are best suited to teach and learn about planning and community development <p>As a secondary goal, the Neighborhood Planning Partnership seeks to increase participation in the Comprehensive Plan engagement process.</p>	<p>Methods for Engagement</p> <p>We are reaching out to the above neighborhood associations to ask if they are willing to invite us to their upcoming neighborhood association meetings. We will share a few pieces of essential information about planning and housing and a little information about the proposed Neighborhood Planning Partnership. If they are interested, we will seek input on what would make the partnership a “success” and what kinds of information different neighborhoods would like to see included.</p>	<p><u>August & September 2019:</u> Phase II - Plan, Inform, Consult & Revise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductory presentation / Invite neighborhood groups to participate in the Neighborhood Planning Partnership / Seek feedback on future meetings and next steps • Review and use feedback to plan Phase III of the process <p><u>October & November 2019:</u> Phase III – Present, Consult & Revise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Return to neighborhoods for a second round of presentations based on community interests and feedback received during Phase II • Seek community feedback on next steps • Revise and work toward the Comprehensive Plan engagement process
--	---	--

Key Terms

In order to develop a shared understanding of what engagement is and how the city seeks to engage with members of the public, it is important to understand several key terms. These terms may not all be directly applicable to each and every engagement opportunity, but each term guides the theory behind our engagement practices.

Community: A group of people who share goals, values, or sense of identity.

Community Engagement: Methods to collaborate with local communities to ensure that decisions represent the interests of diverse stakeholders.

Community Outreach: Methods to inform members of the community about a particular issue through Public Service Announcements, social media, newspapers, flyers, and videos.

Individual Empowerment: When an individual has the knowledge, power and resources necessary to influence and make decisions to achieve their desired outcomes.

Group Empowerment: When a group has the knowledge, power and resources necessary to influence and make decisions to achieve their desired outcomes.

Community Empowerment: When a community has the knowledge, power and resources necessary to influence and make decisions and achieve their desired outcomes.

Subjectivity: The point of view of a single person.

Universalism: The assumption that a single perspective can represent the needs, desires and priorities of everyone.

Intersubjectivity: A process where people with different perspectives come together and discuss their ideas with the goal of finding common ground or mutual understanding.

Participatory Decision-Making: An approach to making decisions that enables stakeholders with multiple perspectives to develop shared-priorities and to offer contributions that influence outcomes.

Social Capital: Economic, social and political benefits people and communities gain from having a strong network of social relationships.

Community Capacity-Building: Processes and actions that build a community's ability to solve problems. This might be the result of increased access to information, networks and social capital, and/or resources.

Core Values for Community Engagement

For an individual or a community to decide to participate in an engagement opportunity, the benefit or value of participation has to outweigh the risk of wasting time and effort. If potential participants see the cost of participation as being higher than its value, they are unlikely to participate. In our efforts to ensure that engagement will have a tangible benefit for participants, the City of Gainesville has adopted core values for community engagement.

Those core values are as follows (adapted from the IAP2):

1. We seek to ensure that individuals and groups most affected by a decision will be involved in the decision-making process.
2. We seek to ensure that the public's contributions will influence the decision.
3. We strive to make sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers who belong to our community.
4. We seek out and facilitate the inclusion and involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.
5. We seek input from participants in designing how they participate.
6. We will provide participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.
7. We will communicate to participants how their input affected the decision.
8. We will continuously improve our awareness of power, history and culture so that we can respect the diverse histories, experiences and needs of local residents.

The above core principles and consideration for how they will be accomplished should be done prior to every engagement effort. Consideration of these principles is particularly important when conducting engagement around contentious issues.

Values in Action

Value 1:

We seek to ensure that individuals and groups most affected by a decision will be involved in the decision-making process.

Example: Youth Council—Local young people often feel that they are neither consulted nor informed about the services and programs that impact their daily lives. This same group of individuals is the most likely to be affected by many of the decisions made by the city. This year, young people will work with city staff and community partners to define the purpose, potential, and scope of the council, and to design youth-led events and campaigns.

Outcome: The desired outcome of the council is ultimately to put more decision-making power into the hands of local youth, so that they can co-design priorities for the programming and services that impact their lives.

Activities: Focus groups: iterative processes of meeting, discussing, and setting priorities. Campaigns: digital campaigns via social media to inform local youth and communities about the work of the youth council. Events: youth-designed events held in public spaces to bring young people together to raise awareness and address specific issues.

Value 2:

We seek to ensure that the public's contributions will influence the decision.

Example: Clarence R. Kelly (CRK) redesign—The Clarence R. Kelly Center is a building with historical significance located in the Duval community. Wild Spaces Public Places funds were allocated to improving the building and surrounding amenities. Staff worked closely with local community members to ensure that their input and desires were centered in the CRK redesign. Community input was sought and implemented into the plans for the update.

Outcome: The desired outcome of this engagement process is to center community contributions to the vision and actual design of the redesigned center.

Activities: Public meetings: meetings held to seek public input on things like architectural style, park amenities, and potential programming. Community-driven engagement: members of the Greater Duval Neighborhood Association worked together to gather input and set community priorities and then shared this information with city staff. Youth focus group: staff asked a series of questions to young people who use the Clarence R. Kelly center in order to ensure that youth perspectives are included in the project redesign.

Value 3:

We strive to make sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers who belong to our community.

Example: Understanding our Community Collaborative Design Project—The city has partnered with faculty from the University of Florida. We seek to learn more about marginalized community members' needs, interests, definitions and preferences for engagement. In this way, we will be better equipped to make decisions and communicate with local residents in ways that reflect their needs and desires.

Outcome: The desired outcome of this engagement effort is increased ability to listen and share information with community members in ways that facilitate collaboration and a sense of shared ownership and belonging to the Gainesville community.

Activities: Tabling: We will meet local residents at well-attended events like football games, track meets, and advisory boards and explain what we are doing and why. Extended interviews: we will connect with some residents several times over the span of a couple of months to work together to answer a series of questions. Co-design: We will work with community members to collaboratively create definitions for key terms and processes for effective engagement.

Value 4:

We seek out and facilitate the inclusion and involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.

Example: Comprehensive Plan Engagement—The comprehensive planning process has historically involved very limited public engagement. Everyone living in the City of Gainesville will be affected by amendments to the comprehensive plan. Staff has taken steps to ensure that anyone involved in designing the engagement process is willing and able to overcome barriers to inclusive engagement.

Outcome: The desired outcome is for community members' ideas and perspectives to be included in the creation of the upcoming comprehensive plan amendments. When participants in the comprehensive plan engagement process review the updates, they will see their perspectives reflected in the comprehensive plan.

Activities: Fact sheets: Facts about the implications of the comprehensive plan will be shared with the public. Public Meetings: Staff will hold meetings to share information and invite feedback on local priorities. Feedback on community input: Community members who are interested can sign up to receive a draft of the comprehensive plan updates to offer their feedback prior to the final updates being made.

Value 5:

We seek input from participants in designing how they participate.

Example: Neighborhood notification process--Developers are required to notify local residents of proposed new developments. Local community members have expressed frustration that the notification does not arrive in time for them to contribute their concerns in ways that matter. Staff is working with local communities to co-design a new process for notification.

Outcome: The desired outcome of this engagement effort is to enable historically marginalized community members to participate in the development process in a way that works better for their communities.

Activities: Meetings with individuals and neighborhood associations: staff will meet with local neighborhood associations to discuss concerns with the existing notification process as well as desires for a more effective process. Surveys: surveys will be created to ensure that we have effectively implemented community feedback into the new process.

Value 6:

We will provide participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.

Example: Neighborhood Planning Partnership—Community members wish to play a greater role in the development of their neighborhoods. Effective participation in neighborhood planning requires significant knowledge of processes and procedures. The neighborhood planning project will offer ongoing learning opportunities for staff and community members. Through the partnership, we will share information and build historical knowledge.

Outcome: Community members—particularly those community members most likely to see changes in their neighborhoods—will be equipped with the information they need in order to participate in the planning and development of their neighborhoods.

Activities: Presentations: staff will present information to community groups. Facilitated discussions: a facilitator will support small group discussion about priorities and desired outcomes. Participatory Planning: Community members will work with staff to create shared priorities for the Neighborhood Planning Partnership.

Value 7:

We will communicate to participants how their input affected the decision.

Example: Food System Coalition – Many community members in our area are concerned about issues of food access, sustainability and justice within our local food system. In February of 2019, a Community Conversation Workshop was facilitated to engage diverse stakeholders in a process of identifying barriers within our local food system and exploring solutions. The feedback collected during this workshop and previous engagement activities was used to create a Food System Coalition and guide their efforts in collaboratively developing projects and programs that improve our local food system.

Outcome: An inclusive, diverse coalition of stakeholders committed to working collaboratively to design and implement solutions to improve access, sustainability and justice in our local food system.

Activities: Four working groups affiliated with the Food System Coalition – Economic Development, Policy, Education & Community Empowerment, and Food Access: will work with community members to develop projects and programs that meet the needs identified at the Community Conversation Workshop.

Value 8:

We will continuously improve our awareness of power, history and culture so that we can respect the diverse histories, experiences and needs of local residents.

“The... legitimacy of a democratic decision depends upon the degree to which those affected by it have been included in the decision-making processes and have had the opportunity to influence the outcomes”

—Dr. Iris Marion Young

Example: Government Alliance for Racial Equity Training—Staff will be embarking upon a series of trainings and working groups to make our processes more equitable. Effective community engagement requires that staff have a deep understanding of local context. Learning more about equity, power, culture, and inclusion will help us to continually develop our capacity for listening and responding to local communities.

Outcome: City staff will be more aware of the role of culture and power in our work in Gainesville.

Activities: Trainings and info sessions: staff will participate in facilitated learning opportunities. Learning teams: staff will work in teams to increase our knowledge.