

From: [Marianne Fitzgerald](#)
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Cc: [Montoya, Michael](#); [Kristin Johnson](#); [Adams, Sam](#); [Miller, Tom](#); [Meyer, Katie](#); [Lyons, Adam](#); [Torres, Kellie](#); [Schoene, Jillian](#)
Subject: City Council Agenda Items 890 and 891, Office of Community and Civic Life
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 8:21:51 PM

Please vote NO on City Council Agenda Items 890 and 891. These projects are not emergencies. Commissioner Hardesty and the Office of Community and Civic Life must provide the public with more information about the actual language of the intergovernmental agreements, including the scopes of work and expected outcomes, and accept public input on these projects before proceeding with these IGAs.

890: *Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland State University to design and execute a summit in early 2023 on equitable civic engagement and co-governance for amount not to exceed \$108,850 (Emergency Ordinance)

There is no Intergovernmental Agreement language included with this staff report which establishes an agreement between the City of Portland Office of Community and Civic Life, the Oregon Kitchen Table and the Center for Public Service at Portland State University.

- The "Financial and Budgetary Impacts" section mentions existing contracts with the consulting group PreGame (\$149,000) and the Centre for Public Impact (\$70,000). Who is doing what work? Oregon's Kitchen Table, the Center for Public Service, PreGame or the Center for Public Impact all seem to be involved in this project. What are the expected outcomes of this summit? Who is the audience for this summit?
- Finding #2 implies that this will update the citywide engagement framework so it appears that other City bureaus--Transportation, Parks, Housing, Planning, etc etc--will be expected to comply with whatever Civic Life recommends. Is City Council OK with this? I'm not.
- Finding #3 suggests the audience will be "social scientists, public engagement experts and community builders to present their unique concepts" but it still doesn't state who is the intended audience for whatever the outcome of this project is. Is this Civic Life's thinly veiled second attempt to amend or repeal City Code 3.96 in the same manner as their proposal to repeal Code 3.96 before City Council in November 2019 (1999 City Council Agenda Item 1053) that provided no opportunity for public comment and no notice to any neighborhood associations or district coalition offices before it went to City Council?
- The "Community Impacts and Community Involvement" does not mention that any community members have been involved in planning the summit to date. Why not? Why does the community involvement write-up suggest four venues if Civic Life doesn't state who is expected to attend? "Learnings from the summit" (last sentence) in the passive voice begs the question, who is doing the learning and what are they learning about?

Agenda Item 890 should not be considered an emergency to begin planning a summit on October 26, 2022 when there are issues on the November 8, 2022 ballot that could affect the future of the Office of Community and Civic Life. I recommend that this item wait until January 2023 so that the will of the voters can inform Civic Life's strategic planning process.

I asked Mr. Montoya about Civic Life's strategic planning efforts on February 15, 2022 when it was presented in Civic Life's FY 2022-23 Requested Budget (see email below for my questions and his reply). I still don't know who he has had informal conversations with but it certainly wasn't me. It's not an emergency and it's not ready for prime time.

Please vote No on City Council Item 890 to allow more time for public input on the IGA, the summit, and whatever Civic Life means by "equitable civic engagement and co-governance" before authorizing this Intergovernmental Agreement. There are too many questions about this scope of work and outcomes to move forward at this time.

891: [*Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland State University to expand and improve the Neighborhood Profiles project for amount not to exceed \\$61,250](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Again, there is no Intergovernmental Agreement language included in this staff report, although Finding #3 refers to IGA 30007751 so there must be one on file.

- On July 26, 2022 the Office of Community and Civic Life sent an email to undisclosed recipients that it was unveiling Neighborhood Profiles on its website. It appears PSU's Population Research Center needs additional funds to respond to the comments received this summer without stating the scope of work.
- It is not clear how this demographic research applies to civic engagement nor why City Council should authorize the Director of the Office of Community and Civic Life to execute and amend an IGA that is not part of the city council record.
- The Impact Statement hints that this effort may be designed to amend or repeal City Code 3.96, the Code which establishes the Office of Community and Civic Life and sets standards for neighborhood associations and district coalitions. There is no indication that there has been any community input into this project to date outside of the survey Civic Life conducted July 26 through September 30, 2022.
- The financial and budgetary impacts list PSU (\$108,850) as well as consultants PreGame (\$149,000) and Center for Public Impact (\$70,000) to "facilitate the launch of a cohort training program for our engagement practitioner network across all bureaus". What does this mean? Who does what, toward what outcome? It appears that all city bureaus will be expected to comply with whatever civic engagement model Civic Life recommends.

Please vote No on City Council Item 891 to allow more time for public input on the IGA, the neighborhood profiles, and Civic Life's strategic planning process and the future of civic engagement in Portland before authorizing this intergovernmental agreement. There are too many questions about this scope of work and outcomes to move forward at this time.

Commissioner Hardesty (as Commissioner-in-Charge, and Commissioner Eudaly before her) and the Office of Community and Civic Life dismissed public input on past proposals to repeal Code 3.96 in November 2019 and to defund the Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc. district coalition in December 2020 and March 2021. Please don't blindly approve these IGAs without an open, public conversation about intended audiences and outcomes of these projects.

Vote No on City Council Agenda Items 890 and 891.

Sincerely,
Marianne Fitzgerald
10537 SW 64th Drive
Portland OR 97219

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject:RE: Civic Life Strategic Plan and SWNI concerns

Date:Wed, 16 Feb 2022 00:22:53 +0000

From:Montoya, Michael <Michael.Montoya@portlandoregon.gov>

To:Fitzgerald, Marianne <fitzgerald.marianne@gmail.com>

CC:Birge, Pollyanne <Pollyanne.F.Birge@portlandoregon.gov>, Montoya, Michael <Michael.Montoya@portlandoregon.gov>, McArdle-Jaimes, Daniel <Daniel.McArdle-Jaimes@portlandoregon.gov>, Johnson, Kristin <Kristin.M.Johnson@portlandoregon.gov>, Arifdjanov, Shuk <Shuk.Arifdjanov@portlandoregon.gov>

Dear Marianne,

Thank you for reaching out to express your concerns about services to Southwest Neighborhoods and asking about our strategic planning process. You ask 3 questions and here is a quick answer followed by a longer one.

We are still planning what our engagement methods will be for our strategic planning process. The budget proposal states that our planning process was launched and will entail engagement with a broad segment of Portlanders but that has not formally occurred yet. My contact has been informal with individuals like you and with Neighborhood Associations or their leaders, DCOs, and other volunteers involved in NAs or boards and commissions. So, no you haven't missed any meetings. Thanks for asking about it. My calendar is public record so you can see who I have had scheduled meetings with since May of 2021 if you are interested.

We have not contracted with PSU to help us with the strategic planning effort per se but the neighborhood mapping project they are helping us with certainly will inform it. We are still securing firms to help with our strategic planning process. Please ask again in a month when I hope to have more details.

Now a longer answer to your earlier email about SWNI and about the path forward.

I certainly recognize that the ordinance that defunded SWNI left a complex set of issues regarding ONI Standards and our DCO contracts. The claim that we have changed the standards without following the standards is one such issue. To clarify, we did not change the ONI Standards nor did we change the structures of the DCO and Neighborhood Association framework. Council voted to defund a contractor and directed Civic Life to provide services. We have not added a new DCO nor created a city-run Coalition. We are providing services as directed by Council and as such, ONI Standards were not modified.

As to the forensic audit that led to the defunding decision by Council, I am required to take a conservative approach to protect public funding when such findings are revealed. What my communication of Feb 8 attempted to do was convey the least-worst path forward until a more permanent solution can be found.

Such solutions will take time however. Since I am charged with making proposals to my Commissioner on how to improve our engagement purposed bureau, I am first informing myself about the past, present and possibilities for equitable engagement infrastructures. This first involves gathering and mapping good demographic and other data on each neighborhood as well as collecting the stories of each Neighborhood Association's accomplishments. We have also launched a strategic planning process that will entail months of consultations with a broad and diverse swath of Portlanders. I hope you will accept the invitation to participate when it comes to you. This process is in the planning phase and no formal launch has begun. I anticipate the public gathering information phase to be announced and begin later this year.

Next, based on the input we receive, a series of iterative proposals from the City to the public and from the public to the City will be made available for input and reconciliation where possible. There will be large and small proposals for creating this improved engagement infrastructure and it will be built on what works best from cities around the globe and what works best from our local experience. My commitment is to be as transparent as possible, as inclusive as possible and as thoughtful as possible at every step of the way. At some point, we will have a plan that may or may not involve modifying the ONI Standards significantly or modestly. I cannot know at this point what we will learn from this process.

To reiterate, this will take time. Thank you in advance for lending your experience to renew our engagement infrastructure for today and for the next generation of Portlanders.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Montoya

Interim Director

Office of Community & Civic Life

1120 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 114

Portland, OR 97204

503-865-6104 (mobile)

michael.montoya@portlandoregon.gov

<http://www.portlandoregon.gov/civic>

Pronouns: he/his

From: Marianne Fitzgerald <fitzgerald.marianne@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2022 2:51 PM

To: Montoya, Michael <Michael.Montoya@portlandoregon.gov>

Cc: Birge, Pollyanne <Pollyanne.F.Birge@portlandoregon.gov>

Subject: Civic Life Strategic Plan

Mr. Montoya:

I'm reviewing Civic Life's FY 2022-23 Requested Budget and interested in learning more about Civic Life's Strategic Plan that was initiated in FY 2021-22.

1. What is your plan for public outreach and dialogue regarding this plan?
2. Can you please email me the contract with Portland State University that you commissioned to support this effort?

Your February 3, 2022 message said you have had countless conversations with neighborhood and organizational leaders, and the draft budget claims that you have engaged a broad segment of Portlanders, so I'm curious who you have engaged with, when and how? Have I missed any public meetings on this topic?

Thanks for helping me understand this effort.

Sincerely,
Marianne Fitzgerald

From: [Linda Nettekoven](#)
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: NO on Item # 890
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2022 6:40:24 AM
Attachments: [NO on Item 890.docx](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)

RE: Item 890 — Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland State University to design and execute a summit in early 2023 on equitable civic engagement and co-governance for amount not to exceed \$108,850

Dear Mayor Wheeler, Commissioner Hardesty, Commissioner Mapps, Commissioner Ryan, and Commissioner Rubio:

Please Vote NO or postpone your decision on Item 890. This doesn't have to be an Emergency item. Section 1, Item # 3, below, mentions a 3-day Summit to be held early in 2023. However, the Summit has been described elsewhere as scheduled for the spring of 2023, so there appears to be some flexibility as to timing. **My concerns are not about the quality of the consultant team that has been selected, but rather the lack of clarity and transparency in the process of setting the scope of work, target audiences, expected outcomes, etc.**

Come January 2023, Portlanders may be working to implement a new form of government, which could call for a very different conversation than if we are to continue with our current system of governance or search for yet another alternative. It could mean thinking through new channels of communication, both internally and externally as we work to implement new ways to solve problems and create opportunities together. How will the Summit enhance such efforts?

Section 1, Item #1, below, taken from your packet, states a condition that is evident to most Portlanders — the City needs to do a better job of engaging with the community. Item #2 indicates that Civic Life is already working on updating the citywide engagement framework. Despite requests for additional information, even before the request for \$648,000 was presented during a March 2022 Council Budget Work Session, there have been many questions, but no widely available opportunities to provide ideas and suggestions or to ask questions about what was being proposed. When information and opportunities for dialogue are not provided, then rumors and misunderstandings fill in the gaps, often slowing down the process and leading to further mistrust.

Also from your agenda packet: “The purpose of the City’s numerous apparatuses for civic engagement is to ensure that ALL Portlanders are engaged in the decisions that most impact their lives. However, the framework is poorly understood and its underlying approaches are unclear. This results in uneven community engagement within and between bureaus and often times deficient community engagement and discord between residents and their City.” The conditions that are described in this paragraph are once again being replicated by Civic Life in the way this contract before you is being described and moved through the system.

Although the 4 locations for the Summit are specified, the target audience and the expected outcomes are vague and incomplete. Outside expertise is welcome, but outside experts need to understand the history and culture of Portland to offer relevant contributions. Please give community members an opportunity to learn more about this next phase of the Public Engagement Project so questions and comments can be addressed by Civic Life before contracts are signed.

A recent Council agenda included a request from BPS for additional funding to improve public engagement. That raises the question of how other bureaus that require ongoing public

engagement to do their work (Planning, BDS, Transportation, Parks & Urban Forestry, Housing, etc.) might contribute to or benefit from the Summit. I'm not advocating a centralized public engagement strategy but an exploration of what bureaus have learned and where they still struggle to engage the community in a meaningful way. Such learning could be critical in designing the Summit.

Portland is experiencing a time of great divisiveness as our community struggles to address many unmet needs and function in a post pandemic environment. It is imperative for us to work together, and a 3-day Summit is a rare opportunity to begin to forge a new path. We must do everything possible to maximize the opportunity being presented.

Thank you.

Linda Nettekoven

2018 SE Ladd Ave Portland, OR 97214

The City of Portland ordains:

Section 1. The Council finds:

1. The City of Portland (City) recognizes that in order for our City government to be connected and responsive to all Portlanders, we need to improve how we engage with community.
2. The Office of Community & Civic Life (Civic Life) is currently working on updating the citywide engagement framework that will allow Portlanders to work with City government to create solutions for common concerns.
3. This IGA will fund Oregon Kitchen Table and Center for Public Service at Portland State University to help design, implement and support a three-day Summit in early 2023. This public summit will convene social scientists, public engagement experts, and community builders to present their unique concepts to Portlanders.

From: [Claire Coleman-Evans](#)
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Cc: [Claire Coleman-Evans](#)
Subject: Re: Vote NO on 924 and 925
Date: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 9:17:35 PM

Please use this email for my testimony as my testimony before had the wrong agenda items.

On Nov 1, 2022, at 9:08 PM, Claire Coleman-Evans
<clairecolemanevansbna@gmail.com> wrote:

City council members,

Please Vote NO on 924 and 925! Until after the election because Civic Life didn't post on their website that people could testify last week nor did they send out an emails notifying NA/s and other community members that 890 and 891 which was originally an "emergency" ordinance was asking for public input. Civic Life doesn't need a contract to send an email out to the community notifying them to please comment.

Bridlemile NA never received an email about last week opportunity to testify. Please see website below I have printed out this website to see if I could find where this information about testifying was located . NOTHING about asking our opinions or community input.

Quote for website "Most Importantly - You: Each one of these activities will rely upon your insight and participation. Please visit this page often to find out how you can contribute and engage." **Bingo where are the dates to testify last week on this website ?**

Tomorrow is the 2nd reading and no testimony is allowed. Please look at this website <https://www.portland.gov/civic/portland-engagement-project>

This is civic life page on the engagement project BUT no where on here is there a place for IMPORTANT DATES for public comments. Hence why no one shows up to testify last week, instead Hardesty comment was out of 96 NA's only one person showed up to testify.

Not very transparent especially when they had it originally as an EMERGENCY ORDINANCE. Hence we all agree that the trust level is VERY LOW yet nothing on the civic life website site—WHY?

Who are the 50 engagement Practitioners?

"Citywide Equitable Engagement Group: A group of 50 engagement practitioners throughout the City have been working with Civic Life to

strengthen the Portland Engagement Project and existing engagement efforts throughout the City. An important piece of this work is an intensive three-month learning project where they will collaborate with local community partners to learn about government legitimacy and trust. This intensive learning network will begin with a series of trainings and project designs facilitated by The Centre for Public Impact.

The Centre for Public Impact: The Centre for Public Impact is a nonprofit consulting group who has worked with multiple cities across the world to help them implement engagement best practices.

Most Importantly - You: Each one of these activities will rely upon your insight and participation. Please visit this page often to find out how you can contribute and engage. [Bingo where are the dates to testify on this website ?](#)

Civic Life had no intention of notifying NA'S, no emails were sent out before last wednesday and no emails were sent out AFTER last wednesday city council meeting. So much for being MOST IMPORTANTLY -YOU Why were we not informed that we could testify last week? This is why we don't TRUST Civic Life. Even on something like this isn't communicated to community WHY?

PLEASE VOTE NO ON 924 and 925 Civic life needs to do better with communications. Just is earned

Claire Coleman-Evans
Bridlemile Neighborhood Association
503-740-7460
BridlemileNALandUse@swni.org
Bridlemile Neighborhood Association
BNA Facebook Page

From: [Rick Freimark](#)
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#); dan@portlandoregon.gov; [Commissioner Mapps](#); [Commissioner Rubio](#)
Subject: REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS 924 and 925 Testimony - Time Sensitive
Date: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 9:27:37 PM

Dear City leadership

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS 924 and 925

Vote NO! on both items 924 and 925.

The Bridlemile Neighborhood Association has not received a single communication from Civic life about these two agenda items. If these items were really time-sensitive or important someone could have mentioned them in any of their recent emails.

However, I just watched a video of last week's council meeting, and I was taken aback. I heard Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty and Bureau Commissioner of Office of Community & Civic Life, say something to the effect...."If there was opposition, then why did only one person speak out against them." No one spoke out against her two requests. Why? The answer to her question was not apathy or agreement. The Neighborhoods simply were not contacted about the ordinances the vote, or the proposed process.

This evening, I reviewed every email, from Civic Life, going back through September, and there were no emails even hinting at these two ordinances. "Nature abhors of vacuum," and government cannot function in a vacuum. The lack of communication with the neighborhoods in this matter has created a deafening sound that makes any vote in the affirmative on these matters, from any member of the council, is a clear violation of the communities' trust. The facts have been manipulated, and the lack of attendance is not to be construed as agreement.

Just because numbers are in the budget, you still have a fiduciary responsibility to the people of Portland on this vote. It is dead wrong to approve a half-baked idea with little community input at a minimum cost of \$170,100 not including Civic Life Management time. A Vote of NO is the correct vote, the winds of a recession are blowing, and now is the best time to be responsible and a bit frugal, vote NO today. We can wait until a plan forward has buy-in for all stakeholders and interested parties.

Thank you, in advance for your NO vote on REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS 924 and 925

Respectfully submitted
Richard Freimark
Portland, OR 97221

924 [Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland State University to design and execute a summit in early 2023 on equitable civic engagement and co-governance for amount not to exceed \\$108,850](#) (Ordinance)

925 [Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland State University to expand and improve the Neighborhood Profiles project for amount not to exceed \\$61,250](#) (Ordinance)

City Council Meeting - Wednesday October 26, 2022 9:30 a.m.

Agenda No.	First Name	Last Name
890-01	Marianne	Fitzgerald