

**From:** Elaine McDonald [mailto:[ecmcd1@hotmail.com](mailto:ecmcd1@hotmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 07, 2016 3:35 PM  
**To:** Planning and Sustainability Commission <[psc@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:psc@portlandoregon.gov)>  
**Cc:** Elaine McDonald <[ecmcd1@hotmail.com](mailto:ecmcd1@hotmail.com)>  
**Subject:** "Community Involvement Program Testimony"

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Community Involvement Program.

The draft appears to be "process and project oriented". There is little in it that seems proactive in the sense of allowing underserved communities to establish their own goals and objectives or of identifying communities and inviting them to develop ways and means for implementing "involvement" on land use issues. From what I read on-line, that appears to be the mission of the Office of Neighborhood Involvement. So, clearly this proposed land use input process is not intended to be "community organization," it is project specific and essentially reactionary. It strikes me as potentially patronizing.

The draft calls for identifying who will make decisions at the earliest stage in each project. It also describes the proposed approach to citizen involvement as "a partnership with the City." If community goals and objectives for a project differ from the City's or if opposition to a project is the primary community input, the idea of a partnership approach becomes more than challenging. Indeed it may be hypocritical. Is the desired level of community involvement simply window-dressing?

The Office of Neighborhood Involvement identifies a number of goals related to under-served/under-represented communities. Why not work within this framework to achieve the desired involvement with communities related to land use? The draft proposal appears redundant, at best, and perhaps an effort to avoid working with organized or organizing communities. The draft emphasizes community over individual and yet the proposed process appears to seek a group of individuals rather than any organized, self-identified community groups. In addition, the cost of implementing this proposed community involvement effort appears significant. Could not that budget be more effectively used by ONI to support their efforts for community involvement, input, and organization?

In mixed neighborhoods, will you invite participation in involvement of all citizens within an impacted area? or will you focus on under-represented groups? Under-representation can as easily be economic as racial, linguistic, or cultural. How can you decide who "deserves: to be invited if it is not all citizens?

Any and all mailings or alerts related to community involvement (as well as the project specific community involvement process) should be posted publicly and notices should be mailed to Neighborhood Associations, Community Groups and organizations, ONI, interested individuals, etc. Transparency begins with totally open communication.

The objectives of each project, the potential for input that would alter the project, and the underlying agenda/goals should be made crystal clear at project inception, in all communications. This is also fundamental to transparency.

Thank you -

Elaine McDonald  
8031 SW 37th Ave  
Portland, OR 97219