Community Engagement Subcommittee DRAFT Guidance

Contents

Guidance for the Reader

Contributors used different formats to submit their sections in this initial drafting phase of work. Some read more like outlines and some more like draft of the final content. Each section will be clearly marked to indicate which style the contributor used.

Draft Format Categories:

Outline of Content = Orange

Proposal of Content = Purple

Draft Content = Green

DRAFT

I.   Introduction (Section written as **draft content**)

There are over 190 Washington State agencies, and the responsibilities and purpose of each of those agencies range greatly, from focusing on health and human services, environment and natural resources, general government, transportation, education, and community and economic development. Within each of those agencies, staff are working diligently on a myriad of projects, and within each agency and project, there are opportunities for meaningful community and public engagement.

Environmental justice and meaningful community engagement are inextricably linked. One of the defining documents of the environmental justice movement is the *17 Principles of Environmental Justice*, which were drafted and adopted by the delegates to the First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit in 1991. Principle #7 explicitly states the need for community engagement in order to achieve environmental justice.

Principle #7: "Environmental Justice demands the right to participate as equal partners at every level of decision-making, including needs assessment, planning, implementation, enforcement and evaluation."[1]

The Community Engagement Subcommittee's Primary Recommendation:

All Washington state agencies should create an agency-specific Community Engagement Plan that contains all relevant resources and information included in this guidance document.

Why Community Engagement is Crucial (Section written as **draft content**)

Meaningful community engagement increases understanding of agency decisions, transparency, and trust in government actions, and builds more sustainable programs and decisions. Community engagement is how state agencies can ensure that all Washington residents have, "equal access to the decision-making process to have a healthy environment in which people live, learn, and work."[2] Without it, as history demonstrates,[3] entire populations can be left out of designing and providing services, adding to existing social and health burdens. Furthermore, many agencies are directed by policy and federal, state, and local laws to implement meaningful community engagement and participation.

The Purpose of this Guidance Document (Section written as **draft content**)

Lists of best practices for community engagement are abundant. For the agency implementer, they often require extensive tailoring to fit the specific nature of an agency or a program.

The Community Engagement Subcommittee recommends that **each agency develop a Community Engagement Plan fitting their specific work**, and outlines elements of a plan to support meaningful engagement. This approach guides an agency to develop their own best practices, informed by

---

[1] https://www.nrdc.org/sites/default/files/ej-principles.pdf
[2] https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice
[3] https://archive.epa.gov/ncer/ej/web/pdf/brender.pdf

3

successful examples, and comprising elements designed to overcome barriers to meaningful engagement that are typical of agency work.

The foundation of meaningful community engagement must be an evaluation of who is impacted and benefitted by any agency decisions meant to benefit the public as a whole, rather than starting with requirements outlined in law or policy. This guidance outlines and helps agencies identify common agency activities that do not typically involve but can significantly impact communities. This is addressed in more detail in our "Determining Obligations" section below.

How to Read this Document (Section written as draft content)

The purpose of this guidance document is to provide you, as state agency staff, with a framework to build out your agency's Community Engagement Plan (Plan). This report has three main sections:

I. Introduction: Why community engagement is crucial & guidance document's purpose
II. Recommended **elements** of an agency community engagement plan
III. Examples, resources, model policies, and evaluation tools to inform measureable goal

Elements of the Plan
- Agency accountability & responsibility
- Determining obligation
- Funding
- Choosing Which Services to Provide & Service Providers
- Demographics
- Addressing timeliness
- Addressing representation & access
- Addressing information
- Addressing ethical data collection
- Defining tribal and Indigenous community engagement vs. formal tribal consultation
- Language Access
- Training
- Identifying a responsible coordinator

Authority (Section written as an **outline**)

This section will describe:

- Federal mandates to adhere to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act for all agencies that receive direct or indirect funding from the federal government, and will point to legal safeguards from select federal agencies that describe what compliance entails.
- Federal and state executive orders to provide reasonable access for people with disabilities and people with limited English proficiency.
- State executive order to use plain talk to communicate government work to the public effectively.

This section will acknowledge the limitations of looking to legal limits as guidance for effective work, and will emphasize the potential in re-interpreting existing laws and regulations with an environmental justice lens. There will also be a statement about individual agencies' use of the word "meaningful" when describing engagement plans and policies.

Who are Washington State Agencies Serving? (Section written as a **proposal**)

This section will guide agencies to better understand the people whom the agency is serving, especially groups of people who are vulnerable to impacts, disproportionately affected, or underserved in some way.

This section will describe how agencies can begin to unpack and understand the communities they are serving, and will help agencies understand the importance of taking the time to understand these elements.

Considerations might include:

- Why communities might engage or not in an agency process.
- How to ensure that all voices are heard, and that the voices of those most impacted by the project are weighted accordingly.
- Why it matters to the agency to know who they are serving and who is affected by the agency's work.

This section will also discuss the importance of using available demographic data as a starting place for community engagement planning (e.g. The Environmental Health Disparities map) and will point to the "Demographics" section of this guidance document will provide resources to state agencies on where to find more information about the specific populations in their service area. Demographic or census data, however, fail to capture and reflect people who identify as immigrants, LGBTQ, along with several other identities and populations. It is essential that agencies consider protected classes and other groups of people who are underserved and marginalized and frequently missed. One of the major advocacy elements of this section is to balance quantitative data with qualitative data that are often gathered through engagement and outreach work before beginning to draw conclusions or draft solutions.

II.   Elements of Your Plan

This section outlines elements of a plan to support meaningful engagement. This approach guides an agency to develop their own best practices, informed by successful examples found in the final section of this document. A future draft of this work will include which common barriers to participation each element addresses.

Agency Accountability & Responsibility (Section written as a **proposal**)

This section will outline some considerations for the responsibility of agencies to comply with community engagement recommendations, but recognizes that at this time there are limitations in how comprehensive the oversight may be. It will also focus on accountability elements, such as agency activities that necessitate the agency to include communities in their decision making processes. This section will explore the work of Results Washington and the future Office of Equity to ensuring that agencies are accountable to communities.

This section will serve as an opportunity for agencies to reexamine what they are already doing in a new light, and provide support and resources to help agencies understand that they may be able to better achieve things they are accountable for by engaging communities in their processes.

It will also consider:

- How are highly subjective words like "meaningful" and "effective" frequently used in the context of community engagement?
- Where are there pre-existing opportunities within an agency's purview to expand community engagement to support the agency's current work and obligations?
- Where is funding is coming from, and are there specific requirements associated with that funding?
- How are agencies demonstrating the process by which they are incorporating and engaging residents in their decision making processes?

Determining Obligation (Section written as a **proposal**)

This section will help agencies identify when to incorporate community engagement in their processes, and help agencies go beyond the bare minimum legal requirement for community engagement. This section will outline existing resources such as the Government Alliance for Racial Equity (GARE) Racial Equity Toolkit, several guides for knowing when and to what extent community engagement is needed, and other resources that agencies can use in determining when it is the right time and how thoroughly to engage communities in agency processes.

This section will use the cross cutting agency activities created by the EJ Task Force's Mapping Subcommittee to provide guidance on how to engage with communities within various agency activities (e.g. policy development, permitting, grantmaking, etc.) and when is the right time to bring communities into the decision making process for each agency activity category. The appendix will also include concrete examples that outline best practices for community engagement for specific agency activities; the "Policy Development" section serves as a preliminary example.

This section will also note that engaging communities all the time and for every process may not be realistic or reasonable, both for the agency and because of community capacity.

Funding (Section written as **draft content** & a **proposal**)

The effectiveness of an agency's community engagement plan relies on agency executive leadership's willingness to appropriately fund community engagement strategies and activities. In addition to a

7

monetary designation, funding should also include other resources such as agency employee time spent on community engagement. The staff hired or assigned to perform community engagement should demonstrate they have the skills, aspiration and experience described in more detail in the "Services and Service Providers" section to work with the diverse communities that exist in our state.

Funding and other agency resources are critical for both agency staff and the communities agencies serve. The section will address funding for the following community engagement efforts:

- Compensation for community time, services, and resources
- Communication about complex topics in an effective and culturally relevant manner, including translating materials and contracting with interpreters
- Hiring community engagement and community organizing experts, and training other agency staff on the necessary skills for meaningful community engagement
- Streamlining a more equitable reimbursement system for community members
- Funding travel in order to engage with communities in every corner of the state
- Having child care, food, and transportation at public meetings
- Supporting for various engagement formats (e.g. public meetings, focus groups, surveys, community festivals, community beautification or artwork, etc.)

Choosing Which Services to Provide & Service Providers (Section written as an **outline**)
This section will describe:

- How to use the information delivered in the "Determining Obligation" section to decide what specific community engagement services to provide.
- The knowledge, skills, and experience that can make an effective community engagement practitioner.
- The irreplaceable knowledge and skills of a community member and opportunities to partner with community members and leaders during outreach.
- The value of basic and advanced training in community engagement and diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- Example desirable qualifications for agencies recruiting staff who will be responsible for community engagement.
- Potential for partnerships with agency communications staff and the distinction between community engagement and conventional communications work.

Demographics (Section written as a **proposal**)
Every level of government provides demographics for areas but the issue lies in that not everyone participates in surveys due to various obstacles or fears and widely-accessible demographic data are inherently limited.

This section will state important considerations to keep in mind as your agency collects and analyzes demographic data, such as equitable approaches to surveying that center communities of color, Indigenous populations, and other groups that are often undercounted, and consequently, are underfunded and underresourced.

This section will include information about using the Washington Tracking Network, in addition to demographics from the following sources:

- 2020 Census
- Washington's Office of Financial Management (OFM)
- Language data developed in partnership between OFM and Washington's Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Social-Economic Conditions from OFM
- Urban Institute: Undercounting the Black Population in the 2020 Census
- Brookings Institute: Counting on the Census

We will also discuss using those data with the acknowledgement that, to understand a community's composition and communication needs, demographic data must be supplemented with personal contact with community members.

Addressing Timeliness (Section written as an **outline**)

Your plan should illustrate a process that builds in adequate time for the various elements of effective community engagement.

This section will describe:

- The value of engaging "early and often"
- Elements of doing so that can impact timing, including:
    - Define outreach and engagement goals
    - Determine outreach budget
    - Define the community/ies you could reach out to and the sub-communities within
    - Consider procurement guidelines if needed
    - Developing culturally appropriate tools, such as surveys and other communication tools
    - Building relationships with community leaders
    - Planning media timelines
    - Seeking management review and approval
    - Messaging and content development
    - Building an appropriate timeline into competitive funding application processes

Addressing Representation and Access (Section written as an **outline**)

This section will address:

- The critical value of representation from community members who are impacted by agency decisions.
- Elements of a community engagement plan designed to address representation and access, including:
    - Understanding your audience
    - Culturally appropriate communication
    - Cultural humility

- o   Internal bias and hiring/staffing practices
- o   Communication standards and tools such as plain talk, translation and interpretation, and informational animations and graphics.

Addressing Information (Section written as a **proposal**)

This section will address the common barrier presented by agencies when they deliver highly technical, discipline-specific information to the general public.

This section will discuss:

- Plain talk
- The value of education when community engagement is requested by an agency, and educational tools
- Culturally appropriate communication
- Opportunities to partner with agency communications departments

Addressing Ethical Data Collection (Section written as a **proposal**)

This section will provide examples and explanations of ethical data collection methods, how the data are being analyzed and used to inform decision making, and how community data should be reported back to communities to ensure that surveyed people/groups will not be harmed by sharing information.

Defining Tribal Community Engagement and Formal Tribal Consultation (Section written as a **proposal**)

This section will discuss appropriate and meaningful ways in which state government can engage with tribal and Indigenous peoples and communities. It will use examples to outline when a state agency should conduct community engagement with tribes and/or Indigenous peoples, and will distinguish such communication from formal tribal consultation.

Language Access (Section written as an **outline**)

This section will:

- Describe the need for effective communication with people in their preferred language when agency decisions impact those populations
- Present legal requirements for such communication under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act
- Direct agencies to guidance for developing language access plans
- Point to resources for implementing language access plans effectively

Training (Section written as **draft content**)

Once a plan has been developed, a training program should be developed to implement the plan. This training program will likely vary between agencies depending on staff available, resources, and level of engagement sought.

A suggested way to develop a training program is:

- Assemble an internal team that has interest and expertise in how your agency does community engagement.
- Have the team conduct an assessment of current practices and needs. The team may benefit from looking at what other agencies do. This could include research, interviews, and/or engaging with customers.
- Identify, document, and apply a set of high-level guiding principles.
- Identify an individual or individuals who will deliver the training(s).
- Have the team develop curriculum, or borrow from existing curricula. This may consist of a presentation, guidance on delivering the presentation, and take-away materials for students. Videos and other recorded materials have the benefit of on-demand availability.
- Set up and deliver trainings.

Identifying a Responsible Coordinator (Section written as **draft content**)

Agency plans should include identifying an agency-wide contact person/coordinator who is able to strategize the agency's diverse engagement needs, introduce and disseminate best practices across the agency, and ensure that the standards identified by the agency are being met.

III. Examples of Community Engagement Best Practices

The final section will include best practices for the community engagement planning process across the public participation spectrum from informing the public to community empowerment and ownership. This section will conclude by sharing multiple examples of what community engagement can look like in common agency activities (e.g. policy development) that often do not include a community engagement component.

Community Engagement Planning & Approaches (Section written as **draft content**)

Planning Stage in Detail:

Purpose: When a project begins, it is important to determine how community engagement fits into the project as a whole, and to identify when various engagement activities will occur so that they are included in the timeline and budget of the project. Planning ahead also allows more time for the appropriate stakeholders to be identified and engaged so that community also provided the time to incorporate the activities into their schedules.

Methods: Outline the following items to start planning:

1. **Project scope.** What is the full project scope? What are the expected project outcomes? (I.e., does the project seek policy input or recommendations? Does it require/affect technical or financial input/impacts? Would it change existing or cause new impacts to partners/communities? Will it provide guidance and for whom? Will it change regulatory standards?)
2. **Community impacts.** Identify points in the project where a) communities may be disproportionately impacted? Or b) where disproportionately impacted communities may provide invaluable input on issues/solutions/cultural or other points of view/unforeseen problems.
3. **Types of community engagement needed.** Based on the expected points of community engagement for the project, why types of engagement would be most appropriate?
4. **Who should be engaged?** For each type of engagement expected for the project, outline an approach to determine who should be engaged and how best to engage them (I.e. do local health jurisdictions have suggestions? Are tribes impacted? Do the DOH disparity mapping tool and/or EPA's EJ Screen tool indicate that the area of focus for the project has additional impacts of concern? What community groups are already active on this topic?)
5. **Projected timeline and budget for each engagement activity.**

Promise

State agencies will commit to including community engagement in project planning so that timelines and budget can appropriately reflect this work, and community groups and individuals can be engaged in a timely and relevant manner.

When to use

Community engagement planning should be conducted during the project planning phase for every activity performed by state agencies. Long term projects may include many community engagement activities of different types.

Planning Stage	
Purpose	Determines when community engagement may be needed during the course of the project
	Includes the estimated types of engagement needed into the project timeline and budget
	Provides for early identification and outreach to appropriate stakeholders

Methods	Define project scope – what is the project and expected outcome?
	Where does project impact or interface with community (how many points of engagement exist within the course of the project)?
	What types of engagement (along the continuum) are needed?
	Who should be engaged and how to reach them.
	Estimate timeline and budget for each engagement action expected for the project.
Promise	We will try to build community engagement needs into the timeline and budget of all projects.
When to use	When planning projects at State agencies.

Community Engagement Approaches

Community engagement include a range of approaches from informing to sharing leadership to supporting resident-led efforts, depending on the degree of community and government involvement, decision-making and control. **See the Community Engagement Continuum below.** Depending on the objectives, some programs may incorporate multiple approaches at once; others may focus on one approach at a certain point in time in the project timeline.

Deeper levels of community engagement should offer opportunities for communities that may benefit and/or be impacted by your project to express their views and have a meaningful role in informing decision-making. Your specific approaches should be tailored to address the specific community needs in a culturally appropriate manner and seek to create an inclusive and accessible process. Effective engagement removes barriers for communities that may have previously prevented them from successfully working with government.

The work is challenging and complex and approaches must be flexible because missteps and re-adjustments are likely. . The rewards of successful community engagement, however, are great, and lead to better results and work products.

	Inform	Consult	Involve	Collaborate	Empower
	• *Led by state* • *State holds power*	• *Led by state* • *State holds power*	• *Led by state* • *State holds power*	• *Co-led* • *Power is shared*	• *Led by community* • *Community holds power*
Purpose	Provide information or outreach One-way communication Address immediate needs or issues Raise awareness	Get and incorporate feedback One-way communication Inform the development of state programs	Ensure needs and interests are considered Two-way communication Advance solutions to complex problems	Partner and share decision-making power Two-way communication Advance solutions to complex problems	Support and follow the community's lead Two-way communication Problems and solutions are defined by the community
Methods	• Town halls • Community meetings/events • Media • Social media • Materials • Web	• Focus groups • Interviews • Surveys • Stakeholder groups • Community advisors	• Forums • Advisory boards • Stakeholder involvement • Coalitions • Workshops	• Co-led advisory boards, coalitions, partnerships, or policy development	• Community-led projects or planning efforts • Community-hosted forums • Community mobilization
Promise	We will use a variety of channels to educate community and keep them informed about a project, plan or policy	We will collect input from community to inform our state-led projects, plans or policies	We will learn about your concerns, needs and priorities and ensure that they shape our state project, plans or policies	We will partner with community to share in decision-making, and plan and co-create solutions together	We will participate and provide support to community-initiated projects or community-directed actions
When to use	There is no alternative because of urgency, regulatory reasons, or legal boundaries You are not seeking feedback	You want to develop, tailor or improve a service, tool or program to meet the audience and your agency's agenda	You need community perspective and buy-in to successfully implement the project	You are committed to building a trusting relationship through mutual learning and capacity building	Community invites you to provide resources, expertise or influence that adds value and supports the community's mission
Pros & Cons	Pros • Quick, broad dissemination • Less costly • Information is controlled Cons • Can be perceived as impersonal • Limited community input	Pros • Community members seen as experts • Improve understanding of community Cons • Risk of not capturing diverse perspectives if scope of engagement is limited	Pros • Likely to improve project outcomes • Builds relationship • Fosters agency accountability Cons • Risk losing community trust if results do not benefit them • More resources needed to engage and report back	Pros • Likely for sustainable solutions • Builds long-lasting relationships • Improves transparency Cons • More labor and resource intensive • Requires adaptability and flexibility in the process	Pros • Supports community empowerment • Breaks down barriers • Builds trust Cons • Relinquish control • Focus is not on meeting agency's goals or agenda

Approaches to Address Common Barriers & Gaps (Section written as **draft content**)

State informs State initiates an effort, provides information through a variety of channels, and raises awareness through outreach.

Washington State Department of Health's (DOH) Shellfish and Beach Closure information and announcements. This program monitors beaches and shellfish harvesting/growing areas for safety. DOH primarily conveys information outwards across the state on beach and shellfish monitoring results and informs stakeholders through their website and e-mail alerts for subscribers. DOH translates the print information into 15 languages. The information helps stakeholders better understand for example how monitoring is performed or how to obtain a commercial shell-fishing license. Stakeholders can reach out to program staff to learn more.

State consults State gathers information from stakeholders and the community to inform state-led efforts.

WA Department of Ecology (Ecology)'s Stakeholder Advisory Groups participate in State-convened meetings with guided conversations designed to provide consultation on a given topic. Examples include Ecology's Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) Stakeholder and Tribal Advisory Group (STAG) and Ecology's Stakeholder groups for their Chemical Action Plans (CAPs). These stakeholder groups are designed by Ecology staff, often in collaboration with the DOH, to review the current status, the options that Ecology may take, and then utilize the stakeholder groups collective expertise to collect recommendations on policy or other actions by Ecology. Stakeholders can include both technical experts as well as leaders of community organizations and their recommendations are considered, but there is no requirement that Ecology accept them. Stakeholders (which can include community leaders/members) are requested by State agencies work with their constituents/communities to provide feedback on specific topics. The structure for these meetings usually includes a group discussion of specific topics or questions provided by Ecology prior to the meeting. Recommendations by the group can include policy recommendations, suggestions for community engagement (anywhere along the continuum), actions that could be taken by the agency, and communication needs for example.

Other possible examples:

- Ecology's Puget Sound Starts Here social marketing campaign may have used focus group testing
- Board of Health's Health Impact Review Program conducts key informant interviews to inform their health impact assessments on proposed policies and legislations.

State involves State engages in dialogue with stakeholders or communities to shape priorities and plans.

POSSIBLE EXAMPLES:

- ??

16

State collaborates State and community work together to share in decision-making and co-create solutions.

The U.S. EPA's Duwamish Superfund Site's seafood consumption institutional controls program uses a Promotor Model to build community capacity and co-create health promotion strategies and tools with impacted fishing communities. Led by Public Health-Seattle & King County (PHSKC) for the EPA, program staff partners with fishing community members who are trained as Community Health Advocates (CHAs). This program addresses multiple historical barriers for Limited English Proficient communities to participate by building community leadership and centering the voices of the CHAs throughout program planning, implementation, and evaluation. The CHAs lead their own community-based outreach to raise community awareness; serve on a Community Steering Committee to develop the program plan and monitor progress; co-design health promotion tools; share in decision-making around priorities and advocate for community recommendations to agencies and stakeholders.

State supports community-led actions State participates and supports community-led efforts.

Farmworkers Tribunals in Washington State are organized by civil society – not by the state – to create space for communities to submit grievances and evidence for consideration in front of a panel of community leaders (judges). This community-led process evaluates the responsibility of states and corporations in committing wide-scale human rights violations. The documentation and findings of the Farmworker Tribunal are shared with relevant state agencies and authorities, as well as reported back to the community and used inform the work of community-based organizations like Community to Community (C2C)[1]. The farmworker community and community based organizations organize a venue for farmworkers and their community to provide testimonials of experiences ([021220.FW Tribunal 2020 Version II_1.pdf](#)). Tribunal judges develop denouncements, recommendations for state agencies, and legislative recommendations based on the testimonies given ([2020 FARMWORKER TRIBUNAL RULING_1_.pdf](#)). Tribunal judges ask questions to clarify and better understand the testimony that is presented. Tribunals are organized by community in a forum that is culturally supportive and focused on articulating and documenting the issues and developing recommendations that will lead to sustainable solutions for farmworker communities. Farmworker communities and tribunal judges work together to provide recommendation to the state. The testimony and judges rulings inform of community needs and advocate for community recommendations to agencies and stakeholders.

[1] https://www.makeshiftproject.com/kzax-blog/2020/2/22/action-alert-sb-6261-and-2020-farmworker-tribunal

Policy Development (Section written as **draft content**)

Policy development is a specific task conducted by all state agencies that presents meaningful opportunities for community engagement. We use this as an example of how to evaluate common agency activities that don't regularly include community engagement.

State agencies have various ways in which they engage in policy development. Two primary ways are developing legislation for consideration in the legislative session, and agency rulemaking processes. Both policy development areas provide opportunities to conduct meaningful community engagement.

Agency actions to engage communities in policy development could include:

- Policy analysis regarding any disproportionate impacts a policy may have on different communities; articulating intended impacts and assessing unintended ones.
- Clarification of objectives regarding environmental justice. Does the agency intend to try reduce disproportionate burdens, or benefit vulnerable populations? Ideally these are defined and clearly articulated at the agency level.
- Identify stakeholders who should be consulted. This should include:
  - Stakeholders or communities that brought the policy idea to the agency, if any
  - Representatives from industries or communities that the policy intends to target
  - Representatives from a wide section of communities that might be impacted disproportionately (local community organizations, environmental justice groups, tribes, unions, interest groups for sections of the population such as consumers, renters, seniors, etc.)
- Consult early with stakeholders at a high level to begin a conversation. Raise awareness about the issue, learn about how it might interact with other topics groups or communities care about, and identify if there is an interest in more detailed consultation.
- Ask the stakeholders you start with who else you should talk to.
- If more policy consultation is requested, agree a process and timeline that works for all parties.
  - Leads: Clarify who are the primary contacts and how to communicate with them
  - Timeline: ensure adequate time is provided (especially for smaller organizations with more limited resources and capacity)
  - Process: could involve remuneration for the time put into policy review.
- Share as much draft language as possible as early in the process as possible. Topics where specific feedback might be most useful include:
  - High level policy objective language
  - Definitions
  - Specific numeric targets impacting certain communities
  - Fiscal impacts – who/where money will come from and who/where it will flow to

> **MORE EXAMPLES TO COME**
>
> We will point to common agency activities that often do not include community engagement, and provide examples for how include communities. These examples will aim to answer the following questions with respect to community engagement:
>
> - What's the intended benefit?
> - What are the impacts?
> - Who does this burden/benefit?
> - Are there disparities? How can we mitigate them?
> - What are the results of the community engagement evaluation (telling us what level to engage and who to engage)?
>
> We will then specify guidance for each agency activity example that adheres to the plan outlined in this document.

- o Oversight mechanisms (e.g. membership of boards or steering committees)
- Thoroughly review and consider the recommendations provided
  - o Ask follow up questions, discuss alternatives where needed
  - o Implement suggested changes where possible (this may at times require new ways of thinking or flexibility on the part of the agency)
  - o If recommendations won't be taken, take time to articulate why, and have follow up discussions.
- Repeat as necessary!