

APPENDIX

While the main report focuses on the takeaways within each theme that were identified as top priorities, the following includes the full list of all takeaways that were outlined by workshop participants, along with examples (if applicable) from other cities.

THEME 1

Historical Reckoning & Trust Building

Establish a process that acknowledges and reckons with the impacts of Chicago's past inequitable planning and implementation processes by serving as a form of mediation and builds from this awareness to center on fostering and maintaining trust.

- Acknowledge and reckon with the impacts of Chicago's history, including intentional residential segregation, health equity, and climate justice. This includes stolen land, past exploitation, who has had influence, white supremacy, ableism, etc.
 - » **Minneapolis:** Mapping prejudice project: uncovering history of segregation and mapping overlays to indicate how past is implicated in current realities
 - [Truth and Reconciliation Resolution and Process](#)
 - » **Seattle:** Technical mapping analysis of city overlaid with neighborhood demographics and history of red lining
 - Construct a citywide plan as a process of trauma mediation due to the city's history of inequity, violence, suppression and segregation, as well as ongoing impacts of the pandemic. This trauma is significant in communities of color, and they should be prioritized.
 - Recognize how the principles and values of white supremacy have shown up—and still show up—in city plans and actions, and consider what antidotes are needed to be applied.
 - Center process on trust. Every step of the way must help to build trust in the process and the City. Consider a decentralized structure to run the planning process led by an outside independent organization to address a lack of trust residents and communities feel about not only DPD but also other parts of city government.
 - Commit to a decolonization process to understand how genocide continues to play out in policies and procedures.
- ## THEME 2
- ### Centering & Embedding Equity as a Value and Principle
- Ensure that equity is front and center throughout the planning process by leading with vision and values, building cultural awareness among city staff, and establishing a transparent set of indicators to measure progress and outcomes.*
- Define equity, emphasize an equity lens from the start, and establish a shared set of indicators to measure progress and outcomes.
 - » **Denver:** Neighborhood dashboards based on equity (13 different data points), storymap of Equity Concepts, Equity factors in plan
 - » **Seattle:** Equity analysis process
 - Build cultural awareness among city staff by bringing in third-party trainers for trainings on equity and on understanding and analyzing systemic racism.
 - » **Denver:** Trainer brought in for equity review of draft plan, race equity impact assessment / health assessments part of process
 - Ensure equity is front and center in the planning process, including embedded into any structures, committees, and working groups that are created.
 - » **Denver:** Equity Subcommittee
 - » **Minneapolis:** Equity and Inclusion Manager on Government Steering Committee
 - The plan should lead with vision and values, and implementation should be anchored to real policy change and funding.
 - » **Boston:** Defined values and 77% of capital funding aligned with plan
 - » **Minneapolis:** Defined six values to guide process and realigned budget, capital projects and policy to align with plan; 14 plan goals to serve as north star

THEME 3

Community Engagement

Create an accessible, robust, and meaningful engagement process to ensure diverse, deep, and broad participation and to provide community organizations and residents with the tools and resources required for them to help lead and participate in the process.

- Establish pathways to bring nontraditional voices and groups that have been historically marginalized to the table. Determine how to move beyond consulting to achieve power-sharing on what gets included in the plan and how the process is run.
 - » **Minneapolis:** Civic Engagement Plan to target stakeholders, communication methods, evaluation of methods, phases; Clearly indicated to stakeholders how their feedback was used and informed decisions
 - *This is what we heard, here's what was synthesized, here is another question*
 - Form partnerships with BIPOC organizations and organizers to ensure they are co-creators of the plan and direct beneficiaries of plan outcomes.
 - » **Denver:** Registered Neighborhood Organizations (do not directly address inclusion of BIPOC)
 - » **Milwaukee:** Registered Neighborhood Organizations (do not directly address inclusion of BIPOC)
 - Create a governance structure that allows community members and residents to define their roles in the planning and implementation process and provide them with the financial resources to participate and lead.
 - » **Minneapolis:** Budgeted for engagement and compensated community members to host conversations in communities
 - » **Milwaukee:** Formalized contract with community organizations, organizations are compensated
 - Design a fun, accessible, consistent, and meaningful engagement process that meets people where they are geographically—public spaces, schools, and places of worship—as well as through languages, communication tools, and a consideration for accessibility needs for individuals with disabilities.
 - » **Denver:** Online Board Game, Plan Van, Meetings in a Box; Deep and Broad engagement, including:
 - *Digital surveys, community meetings, paper surveys, street team events, presentations, task forces/ think tanks, emailed draft feedback, office hours*
 - » **Minneapolis:** Meetings in a box, community meetings were “fair-like”, local artists designed engagement tools, Improv TV game
 - » **Boston:** Marketing campaign - ads on buses, texts, interviews, postcards out with water and sewer bills; integrated all city departments; Toolkits for meetings
 - » **Nashville:** Youth engagement with school curriculum tied to planning process; speaker series for general education and planning best practices; Meetings in a box
- Design an intentional, inclusive, robust community engagement effort that works to establish trust between community and government.
- Engage meaningfully and thoughtfully with community residents and organizations, with respect for time/resources.
- Begin engagement early in the process and be intentional about how and why.
- Structure the process with a bottom-up approach that centers the neighborhoods and includes power-sharing in decision-making.
- Strive for a process and infrastructure in place that allows communities to identify and prioritize actions they want to work on; define their next steps; monitor and evaluate the strategies and the plan that becomes the result of the process.
- Educate the public about what planning is and the benefits of citywide planning.
 - » **Nashville:** Speaker series with folks outside of Nashville
- Do not rush the process. Provide enough time for deep engagement.
 - » Most plans took two to three years and included community engagement in each step
- Make the engagement process fun, easy, and accessible through a diversity of online, in-person, and analogue techniques.

- Determine a way to measure the impact of the community engagement process that goes beyond the quantitative and measures things like outcomes and trust-building.
 - » **Nashville:** Standardized engagement and tracked demographic metrics on participation (did not track qualitative)
- Engage but do not exhaust people. Strike a balance between engaging a lot of people, but also finding a way to make sure everyone's voice is heard.

THEME 4

Accountability

Structure a transparent, equitable process that results in a plan with clearly-defined metrics, recommendations paired with identified budgets and resources, review cycles, and the ability to implement in tandem with neighborhood-specific plans.

- Provide the plan with legal “teeth” so it is enforceable; gets implemented through policy change, staffing, budgeting, etc.; is not just another document; and can withstand political changes and pressure.
 - » Multiple cities legislatively require citywide and comprehensive plans
- Create regular and ongoing mechanisms to ensure equity and accountability to the community through co-created metrics in both the planning process and implementation. Metrics should be co-created by government, civic, business, and community partners.
 - » **Denver:** Metrics and scorecards embedded in StoryMap to make information accessible; Dashboard with numeric goals
- Establish a defined scope, resources, timeline, and implementation outcomes for the full plan. Identify specific projects/ goals and define appropriate scope, resources, and timeline at the project-level to recognize that some projects, for example, will need more time than others.
 - » **Nashville:** Scope defined into phases with two months between each phase to allow time for review
 - » **Milwaukee:** Plans have implementation matrix; status reviewed every six months
 - » **Minneapolis:** Multiple draft cycles for plan
- Create a standard that allows neighborhood plans and the citywide plan to work in tandem for implementation, while allowing for flexibility for neighborhood-specific goals.
 - » **Milwaukee:** Community/area plans incorporated into comp plan and elevated to city policy
 - » **Denver:** Adopted neighborhood plans that aligned; Created a process for neighborhood/area plan updates aligned with comp plan
 - » **Seattle:** Embeds neighborhood plans within document with their own separate goals and policies
- Use the plan to codify and make changes to land use and zoning structures and procedures.
 - » **Nashville:** Using plans to update policies related to zoning, land use, street guidelines, etc.
- » **Denver:** Policies are updated based on the plan, especially zoning regulation
- Create strategies that incorporate community perspectives in capital investment decision making processes.
- Structure the plan as a living and public document that allows for growth, flexibility, and change over time. Build-in regular feedback loops for continuous engagement with communities and stakeholders.
- Define keywords (engagement, equity, diversity, accountability), and identify goals and metrics.
- Align budgets and resources to support plan goals in a performance-based and transparent way that leads to accountability and sustained engagement. Plan becomes a filter for the City's budgeting process.
 - » **Los Angeles:** Grants of 20 to 30 million dollars for transformative projects tied to environmental justice and public health plan priorities/goals
 - » **Nashville:** Projects are scored based on alignment with plan allowing for performance based budgeting
 - » **Seattle:** Equitable Development Initiative Fund created for Community Capacity Development and Project Development; tied to plan
- Establish a transparent process framework with metrics, timelines, and review cycles. Make this clear and accountable to stakeholders.
 - » **Most Cities:** Process timelines established and published online for most cities, so that input and review cycles are visible to wider public

- » **Milwaukee:** Plans have implementation matrix, status reviewed every six months
- » **Denver:** Implementation Matrix - updated annually with tracking across seven different metrics
- Structure the plan so that it brings together various types of plans under one umbrella. Local plans should align with the citywide plan.
 - » **Boston:** Created individual department-level strategic plans aligned with citywide plan
- Create the type of budget and timeline that is required to accomplish community engagement needs.
- Embed sustainability within departments/plan focus areas, and ensure the plan is driven by science-based metrics and guiding principles that advance climate justice and green jobs initiatives.
 - » **Los Angeles:** Sustainability metrics with Chief Sustainability Officer in all LA Departments
- Hold implementation partners accountable through a transparent process and sustained community engagement.
- Build-in contingencies and flexibility to the plan to account for potential changes (political, demographic, etc.)

THEME 5

Interagency and Cross-Collaboration

Create a sustained structure for city departmental and agency collaboration throughout the planning and implementation process and ensure that stakeholders across sectors, geographies, and topical areas are engaged from the beginning to establish collaboration, data sharing, and sustained involvement in the creation and implementation of the plan.

- Create a cross-departmental and whole government approach for sustained collaboration and data sharing.
 - » **Boston:** Performance Management Team
 - *Determine city goals and metrics*
 - *Regular check-ins to discuss goal implementation*
 - *Metrics Dashboard for each department (scorecards)*
- Created individual department-level strategic plans aligned with citywide plan.
 - » **Los Angeles:** Chief Sustainability and Equity Officers in each department that coordinate on plan goals
 - » **Seattle:** Multi-departmental effort, four to six planners with interdepartmental team of about 35 staff
 - » **Minneapolis:** Government Steering Committee for Plan

- Be inclusive in engaging different stakeholders across sectors (government, community, civic, philanthropic, academic). Ensure small businesses and minority-owned businesses are engaged, as well as businesses that are distributed geographically across the city.
 - » **Milwaukee:** Focus groups that include residents, business districts, advocacy groups, and technical experts
 - » **Minneapolis:** 14 different research groups on topical areas with mix of subject experts and partner agencies represented; included public health official on each group and elected officials
 - » **Denver:** Mayor-appointed Task Force that included a mix of people and organizations
- Create cross-community and cross-sectoral topics to engage communities to discuss the multiple topics and solutions to challenges they all face.
- Engage topic-specific research groups to ensure policies are put into action.
 - » **Minneapolis:** 14 different research groups on topical areas with mix of subject experts and partner agencies represented; included public health official on each group and elected officials