City of

PORTLAND, OREGON
Portland Permitting & Development

Process Improvement and Technology Subcommittee
Meeting Notes
August 21, 2025

Process Improvement and Technology Subcommittee Members Present:
Sean Green, Chair
Kimberly Freeman
Brian Cho
Hilary Olson
Jill Cropp
Wilfred Pinfold

City staff present:
David Kuhnhausen, PP&D
Lisa Perrin, PP&D
Lila Piggot, PP&D
Anna Navarro, PP&D
Taylor Barnes, PP&D
Colleen Poole, PP&D

Committee History & Purpose (Sean Green)

- **Origins:** Began in Dec 2018 as POPS customer advisory group.
- **Transition:** Shifted under DRAC in July 2019 → became PITSC with a charter and defined purpose.
- **Role:** Provided advice on technology + process improvement, emphasizing customer experience and continuous improvement.
- **Activities:**
    - Gave feedback on digital services (database upgrades, inspector app, DevHub, ProjectDox).
    - Contributed to specific projects (e.g., Single PDF process, Portland Maps, FIR, STARS, planning & zoning).
    - Offered input on organizational changes and customer-facing services.
    - Acted as a feedback loop for frontline staff and external stakeholders.

Evolution of PITSC

- David Kuhnhausen, PP&D Interim Director
    - PITSC has been valuable, but bureau capacity is stretched (staff reduced by 100+ since 2023).
    - City reevaluating all committees due to administrative burden.
    - David emphasized the goal of reaching out to a wider audience beyond the committee for feedback, to homeowners for example

    - Proposed dissolving PITSC as a standing committee but not ending collaboration or feedback gathering.
- Lisa Perrin, PP&D Digital Services Division Manager
    - PP&D recently created a new Digital Services Division and hired a Digital Services Manager to bring human centered design best practices to the bureau
    - Digital Services has been developing strategy and a roadmap with the PIT and PACI teams to align technology, process, policy, and metrics.
    - Lisa emphasized the need for ongoing engagement but evolving away from a committee format towards more modern feedback mechanisms like individual interviews and usability tests based on the product or feature in focus.

Committee Perspectives

Three committee members gave their perspectives on the proposal to dissolve the PITSC charter. *(Committee member names have been removed for purposes of meeting notes.)*

Member 1

- PITSC was unique in testing and providing deep feedback compared to DRAC.
- Worried about losing continuity of conversations around customer experience, policy alignment, and cross-bureau coordination.
- Stressed value of peer-to-peer group dynamic and institutional knowledge.
- Acknowledged that perhaps DRAC could take up topics like use of AI, for example
- Raised idea of a hiatus and reconvening in 6 months to reduce admin burden or move to quarterly cadence

Member 2

- History with the 2005–2006 tech oversight committee and the ITAP project showed the problems with complex processes and the need for real engagement with the customer
- There is need for engagement on technology side and process side, it's a mistake to separate them. Large part of city services are technology based.
- Whatever the next evolution of this work, need to retain a strong engagement with the people who use the digital tools every day.

Member 3

- Sees most value in giving feedback on a particular ask; giving really specific information on a certain feature or topic
- Sees PITSC as a sounding board, not necessarily requiring regular meetings.
- Acknowledged PITSC provided valuable, detailed feedback.
- Suggested alternative structures may work without regular committee meetings.

Next Steps

- Jill Cropp will bring the dissolution, hiatus options to September DRAC agenda setting meeting for discussion.
- Further reflection on balancing admin burden with maintaining valuable stakeholder engagement.