

Comments and Questions on Proposed Resolution

November 12, 2019

Prepared by: Lizzy Caston, Allen Field, Pete Forsyth, Leslie Hammond, Linda Nettekoven, Stan Penkin, Sabina Urdes

The resolution and timeline as presented is confusing, lacks clarity and appears to have been hastily written. We respectfully offer herewith comments and questions in an effort to help draft a more meaningful and productive document:

1. The Multi-bureau work group described in process #1 must be an **open and transparent process subject to open meetings rules** which require public meetings, agendas and minutes to avoid the problems with the former process where people felt they were kept out of the loop on the 3.96 process. This group should draw upon each of its own prior work to develop best public engagement practices as part of PIAC, Community Connect etc. Adequate funding must be provided to support the work of this or any subsequent work group or committee assigned to improve and broaden community engagement until the defined work is completed.
2. Process #1 needs to **clarify what the problems are to be solved and fixed**. There are no defined goals or deliverables.
 - a. The work group will "provide recommendations for City bureau's practices and methods ... to equitably provide City services to all Portlanders." What does this mean? To what end, what is the problem to be solved? Is this a meta-examination of trying to align the public involvement processes of all the bureaus (as Winta explained to us on 11/4) - is this to re-examine the [City's Public Involvement Principles](#), or is this focused on re-writing Code sections that refer to 3.96?
 - b. "review cross-referenced responsibilities for public involvement in bureau functioning, including a determination of the scope of public involvement for which each bureau is responsible" -- what does this mean? Does the latter phrase refer to the scope of responsibility each bureau will be responsible for in re-writing 3.96? Scope of public involvement for what, for participating in rewriting 3.96?
 - c. Since Exhibit B clarifies that "cross-referenced responsibilities" refers to other code sections that mention 3.96 (and thus NAs), this appears to be about rewriting how other bureaus refer to 3.96 and treat NAs in their code sections.
 - d. What is this plan to evaluate and explore other DCO (District Coalitions) models mentioned in the Timeline? This is the first we've heard of a project to explore other DCO models. Is this what the code change project will be called from 2020-23? Commissioner Eudaly in the [Mercury](#) said code-update won't happen until 2023 -- this isn't clear at all from the Resolution, but the timeline seems to allude to that.

- e. If the purpose of the multi-bureau work group is to help develop a Coordinated Stakeholder Engagement Plan and a Community Engagement Plan for a code-update phase in 2020-23 -- is it? -- then simply spell that out.
 - f. The process must start by clearly defining the problem, and must include the participation of community groups, neighborhood associations, faith based groups and other relevant parties. Early involvement is a cornerstone of the public involvement principles adopted by City Council.
3. The resolution lists specific bureaus to be included in process #1. To be a truly inclusive citywide initiative, **all relevant bureaus must be included in the process**. Why are the Office of Equity, Police Bureau, Fire Bureau, BES and others not included?
 4. A bureau with extensive public engagement experience and adequate resources such as **BPS or BDS should oversee and manage the multi-bureau workgroup**. Since the presence of NAs in the Code is most prevalent in BPS' Chapter 33, it is so tied in with state land use law, and public outreach is a central part/requirement of Comp Plan Chapter 2 and what BPS does, BPS is best suited to oversee this process. Plus, it would really help to allay the public distrust engendered during the recent code review process.
 5. **Add WHEREAS statements to recognize NAs and their concerns** - the Resolution is totally lacking any praise or recognition of NAs. For example, it would really help to appease NA concerns, soothe hurt feelings, and lead to a more productive, trustworthy process if the following were added:
 - a. WHEREAS Portland's System of Neighborhood Associations is nationally and internationally recognized, where neighborhood associations have provided an important and valued means of participatory, localized democracy, allowing Portlanders to engage with city government and to improve livability throughout Portland on a neighborhood level;
 - b. WHEREAS Community Connect and the 2016 Auditor's Report recommended strengthening and expanding the Neighborhood Association System and expanding the Code to **add formal recognition of other types of groups**, such as Community Based Organizations
 - c. WHEREAS it is not the intent of Civic Life or the City of Portland to eliminate neighborhood associations or the Neighborhood Association System, but to **extend the benefits and recognition they have to other types of groups**.

6. The fourth whereas fails to **recognize the work that neighborhood associations, coalitions, faith based groups and others have done to promote and support equity and inclusion** e.g. Diversity and Civic Leadership partners, the Disability Program, the New Portlander Program, and the Youth Development/Multnomah Youth Commission Program, to name a few.
7. The coalitions appreciate the offer of a three-year extension, but there should be consideration of a **five-year extension** that includes the DCL partners. Five years has historically been the contract period. Given that the ordinance does not include a timeline for the review of 3.96, there must be an adequate period to provide for an effective transition and continuity of programming and staffing once that code is amended. This should be at the traditional funding level equivalent to the prior fiscal year amount plus current Budget Office citywide directives.
8. The resolution is unclear about the establishment of a **newly constituted stakeholder committee** at the end of Process #1 (or at some other time) to build on the work of the first committee. Will such a committee be created and how would the timeline of such committee's work coincide with the three-year timeline of Process #2? Such a committee must be openly and fairly constituted so that it truly represents the diverse voices of communities citywide. The stakeholder groups should work with the City in drafting the Community Engagement Plan for the code-update process. There should be a draft phase, a review and comment phase leading to a final plan so that stakeholder groups can have meaningful input.
9. Lastly, with charter review coming up in the near future, we ask City Council to consider whether the activities outlined in this resolution should be considered within the larger context of charter review and our form of government.