

**RENAME OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD INVOLVEMENT TO
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY & CIVIC LIFE & CONVENE CODE CHANGE COMMITTEE**

IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK TO CITY COUNCIL, **PRINT** YOUR NAME, ADDRESS, AND EMAIL.

NAME (PRINT)	ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE (Optional)	Email (Optional)
✓ CIARAN CONNELLY		president@northwestdistrictassociation.org
✓ Phil Selinger	2466 NW Thurman St., P46 97210-2523	selingerp@gmail.com
✓ Robert Schmitz	P.O. Box 66783 Portland 97240 Lents	RES2010@yahoo.com
✓ John Hollister		
✓ MARK VELKY	1000 SW VISTA AVE. APT. #717 PORTLAND, OR. 97205-1137	DME_LOTUS@YAHOO.COM
✓ Laura Campos	3419 SW First Ave.	midewiwin@juno.com
✓ Kal Toth	1132 SW 19th Ave	kalmanctoth@gmail.com
✓ Nic Clark	1228 SW 19 th Ave	nicolaspclark1@gmail.com
✓ Roger Leachman	742 SW Vista Ave #36	rogerleachman@hotmail.com
✓ Charles Bridgecrane Johnson		

RENAME OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD INVOLVEMENT TO
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY & CIVIC LIFE & CONVENE CODE CHANGE COMMITTEE

IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK TO CITY COUNCIL, **PRINT** YOUR NAME, ADDRESS, AND EMAIL.

NAME (PRINT)

ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE *(Optional)*

Email *(Optional)*

NAME (PRINT)	ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE <i>(Optional)</i>	Email <i>(Optional)</i>
✓ Kora Kresin	1880 SW 5 th ave #5 Portland 97201	

Parsons, Susan

From: Jennings, Gayla
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2018 11:59 AM
To: Council Clerk – Testimony
Subject: FW: Written submission testimony re: July 18, 2pm Agenda item on ONI Name change

Hello, Council Clerk,

This testimony was received by Auditor Hull Caballero for what appears to be this Wednesday's afternoon time certain agenda items 771 and 772. I'm not sure if you received a separate email from Chuck – my apologies if this a duplicate.

Thank you!

Gayla Jennings
 Deputy Auditor | Office of the City Auditor City of Portland, Oregon Phone (503) 823-3560

-----Original Message-----

From: Charles Duffy [mailto:charles.p.duffy@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2018 4:03 PM
To: Wheeler, Mayor <MayorWheeler@portlandoregon.gov>; Commissioner Eudaly <chloe@portlandoregon.gov>; Commissioner Fish <nick@portlandoregon.gov>; Commissioner Fritz <amanda@portlandoregon.gov>; Commissioner Saltzman <dan@portlandoregon.gov>; City Auditor, Mary Hull Caballero <AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov>; allan@nwexaminer.com
Subject: Written submission testimony re: July 18, 2pm Agenda item on ONI Name change

Dear Mayor Wheeler and Council Members,

I have been a resident of Northwest Portland since 1975 and have always been involved in my neighborhood in a variety of ways including times on the NWDA board when I once served along side former Mayor Vera Katz.

I wish to make this one simple point regarding this proposed name change.

Although I support the concept of a committee to review the functions and obligations of the current ONI office, I would hope you would defer passing this requested name change as an Emergency measure.

These are my reasons:

1. There certainly and clearly is no emergency, nor is one actually stated as required.

By its own admission ONI has said that this has been the result of numerous changes to the office's obligations over the years. There is no emergency. There is time to get a new name correct and supported by the whole community.

2. To change its name and then explore a committee in effect to set out what its statutory duties are, is to say the least, putting the cart before the horse. Obviously the sensible thing to do is to defer and wait until the committee does its work and produces a report. Then the proper name for those duties should be clear. Names matter. Let's get it right.

So please, do not pass this name change as a false emergency ordinance. Do it right and wait for the code amendments and result of the committee.

Thank you for reviewing my testimony.

Chuck Duffy
Northwest Portland

Moore-Love, Karla

From: Roger Leachman <rogerleachman@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2018 8:36 PM
To: Commissioner Fritz; Fish, Nick; Commissioner Saltzman; Commissioner Eudaly; Wheeler, Mayor; City Auditor, Mary Hull Caballero
Cc: Moore-Love, Karla
Subject: Testimony re ONI Re-branding et al
Attachments: email to council 18 July 2018.odt

I attach testimony re 771 & 772 on Council 18 July 2018 agenda.

Roger Leachman
742 SW Vista Ave., # 36
Portland, OR 97205
(704)962-6523
rogerleachman@hotmail.com

17 July 2018

**Testimony re 771 & 772
Portland City Council 18 July 2018**

My name is Roger Leachman. I serve on the board of the Goose Hollow Foothills League, the board of NeighborsWest Northwest coalition, & on the ONI BAC. I speak here for myself as a citizen, although I will mention that all of you have received 3 letters over the past year & a half from GHFL on the unaddressed & unaccomplished reform of ONI --the most recent from last month. I voted for all of them.

When the Office of Neighborhood Associations (ONA) changed its name to the Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI) in 1995, it was after a substantive public process that was not “top down,” controlled & directed by the bureau, but representing affected parties, holding meetings, & seeking for wide public input.

There could hardly be a starker contrast with the behavior of the bureau these past months & leading up to the seeking of “emergency” action by City Council.

How is this an “emergency”? This is not a life threatening situation where any people will suffer from delay. Delay is in fact called for, because of the lack of public process.

I suggest that the “emergency” is to save embarrassment to the Director & Commissioner-in-charge because they spent \$25,000 of our tax monies (to a PR firm) to re-brand the bureau, then treated it as a fiat, a done deal –not even (it would appear) realizing or researching the fact that Council action would be required.

Let’s rehearse the history of the re-branding matter.

Only Felicia Williams, at a 2016 ONI BAC meeting raised & pushed for a name change. She said that the bureau should not want to be identified with neighborhoods (she then later played the board of the NeighborsWest Northwest (NWNW) coalition for rubes, saying they should push back against the idea of neighborhoods as “toxic,” omitting to tell them that it was *she herself* who pushed the narrative). Her reception at the BAC, however, was that this was a “very low” priority. And there it would have appeared to have died.

Why then resurrect an idea no one had bought into other than a coalition president who would shortly be ousted by her board?

I believe there are basically 2 reasons. The primary one is that the name of ONI was seen as toxic after the shortcomings & dereliction of duty documented in the November 2016 audit of the bureau (which I would say covered only the “tip of the iceberg” --agreeing with the expressed concern of a city employee at one of the Auditor’s 2017 meetings). So have the bureau take the approach of Blackwater, the mercenary group, which re-branded itself as “Xe”--hoping that people would not remember what went before under the old name.

The second is that, without *any kind of public process* as had happened in the past (e.g., 1995 –but various other times too) --hey, let’s change ONI’s functions. Because of course if you have to really involve concerned & affected parties in that, you are likely to hear things you’d rather not. This is also a way of distancing the bureau from the audit, so that you don’t actually have to address it & do anything about it. And the latter is what has happened, as I can testify from regular attendance at BAC & Coalition Directors & Chairs meetings. There’s a huge elephant in the room that nobody wants to see.

Yet another approach to distance yourself from something like the audit is to demonize someone else, to distract attention from what you are doing or not doing. Who better than the groups you were originally formed to serve, whom you see as problems for you, so you can minimize them. And this has gone on as well, as I & others have documented (& can document further).

In January an online survey was launched to gather suggestions for a re-branding. Funny thing, the most votes went to the existing name (personal disclosure: I voted for the current name). The second most went to Office of Neighborhood Associations (ONA). There are the usual caustic ones, like Office of Everything Else, Office of Neighborhood Ignorement [sic], & others much worse I won't mention. However, to scroll through all of the 163 which the *Portland Mercury* (& good for them) posted online is salutary. It actually shows that people think & care. However the results were not what the bureau wanted, hence the out-sourcing at taxpayer expense.

One must ask, where was the emergency to go this route? Just as we ask, where is the emergency today?

It puts me in mind of the Queen of Hearts in *Alice in Wonderland*: "Sentence first –verdict afterwards." For us in Portland: Decisions first –processes afterwards.

Putting aside the black humor, it is a terribly serious & disturbing matter that the bureau supposedly charged with developing proper public process can't or won't do it themselves. How could they possibly tell anyone else how it should be done? Answer: they cannot.

You have the opportunity here to make it be done correctly –processes first, decisions afterwards.

Roger Leachman
742 SW Vista Ave., # 36
Portland, OR 97205
(704)962-6523
rogerleachman@hotmail.com

Moore-Love, Karla

From: Michael Mehaffy <michael.mehaffy@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 7:30 PM
To: Moore-Love, Karla; Wheeler, Mayor; Commissioner Eudaly; Commissioner Fritz; Fish, Nick; Commissioner Saltzman; City Auditor, Mary Hull Caballero
Subject: Fwd: Mehaffy letter regarding ONI reform
Attachments: Mehaffy - Letter to City Council Jun 23 18.pdf

Dear Mayor, Commissioners, and Auditor Hull Caballero,

I previously submitted personal testimony regarding the ONI name change. I re-attach that letter here and ask that you take it formally as testimony for the hearing planned for Wednesday July 18th at 2PM, regarding the same matter. Thank you very much.

Michael W. Mehaffy, Ph.D.
 Senior Researcher, KTH University, Stockholm
 Executive Director, Sustasis Foundation

 742 SW Vista Ave., #42
 Portland, OR 97205
 (503) 250-4449

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Michael Mehaffy <michael.mehaffy@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 25, 2018 at 12:51 AM
Subject: Mehaffy letter regarding ONI reform
To: "Moore-Love, Karla" <karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov>, "Wheeler, Mayor" <MayorWheeler@portlandoregon.gov>, Commissioner Eudaly <Chloe@portlandoregon.gov>, "Fish, Nick" <NickFish@portlandoregon.gov>, Commissioner Fritz <amanda@portlandoregon.gov>, Commissioner Saltzman <dan@portlandoregon.gov>, "City Auditor, Mary Hull Caballero" <AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov>, "Rhee, Suk" <Suk.Rhee@portlandoregon.gov>, "Riley, Dianne" <Dianne.Riley@portlandoregon.gov>

Dear Mayor, Commissioners, Auditor Hull-Caballero, and Director Rhee,

Please find attached a letter regarding the ongoing reform of the Office of Neighborhood Involvement.

Please note that this letter comes from me as an individual, and is distinct from the letter sent yesterday by me on behalf of the Board of the Goose Hollow Foothills League.

Thank you!

Michael W. Mehaffy, Ph.D.

 742 SW Vista Ave., #42
 Portland, OR 97205
 (503) 250-4449

MICHAEL W. MEHAFFY, PH.D.

June 23, 2018

Portland City Council
1221 SW 4th Avenue
Portland, OR 97204

Dear Mayor Wheeler and Members of the Council,

RE: Reform of the Office of Neighborhood Involvement

Thank you for considering my views as a citizen on the above-referenced matter. For the record, I am also president of the Goose Hollow Foothills League, a business owner in sustainable development consulting with an international practice, and executive director of a small non-profit think tank in sustainable urban development called Sustasis Foundation (www.sustasis.net). However, I wish to make it clear that this letter represents only my own views as a citizen.

I greatly appreciate a recent visit I had with Suk Rhee, ONI director, and her colleague Dianne Riley, at their invitation. I found them to be very bright, capable, thoughtful people who I am sure are sincerely trying to do a better job serving all the citizens of Portland, and especially communities that have been under-represented in the past – in fact, in some notorious cases, subjected to shocking historic injustices. I think we can all agree that the City needs to do much more to promote justice and equity within our borders.

At the same time, we are all well aware of the organizational problems in the Office of Neighborhood Involvement, documented in the Auditor's Report of November, 2016 (prior to the appointment of Ms. Rhee, it should be noted). I have come to believe that these problems arose over the years from a fundamental confusion of mission and constituencies, and "mission creep". I further believe that the increasing path of inclusion of non-geographic entities will compound, and not reverse, the dysfunction that arose previously. This includes the recent "re-branding" of the agency, entirely removing the word "neighborhood" and greatly downplaying the visible roles of neighborhoods within the renamed bureau. In our meeting, we had a very cordial but very frank exchange of views on this subject.

It is worthwhile to remind ourselves of the original intent of the bureau, and its initial value to the City. The City of Portland became a national leader in public involvement when it created the Office of Neighborhood Associations in 1974 – a bureau narrowly drawn to serve neighborhood associations as fundamental geographic constituencies of the City. As Dr. Matt Witt wrote in his history of the bureau,

"...urban neighborhood based coalitions formed to fight freeway developments, hospital expansions and other incursions that threatened the last vestiges of inner-city neighborhood livability--an attribute long in decline following years of suburban development and diminished central city political stature. Portland would come to figure prominently as these historic forces unfolded..." (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/oni/article/36333>)

In my travels internationally, I am often impressed by Portland's ongoing reputation as a pioneer in the revitalization of city cores that has been proceeding for several decades now. These inner urban areas are especially valuable now, as both assets in their own right, and as models of more sustainable forms of urban development elsewhere, including rapidly-growing suburbs around the country and the world.

Of course, issues of livability are still very much with us in Portland today, as well as growing issues of equity and political participation. Neighborhoods and their residents are still doing the hard work of activism and representation, often forming a check on other less accountable forces. In fact I believe that effective, engaged, representative neighborhood associations are needed more than ever.

However, there are many in Portland who seem to see neighborhood associations as no longer relevant – not sufficiently inclusive or representative, not solution-oriented, too focused on “NIMBY” policies, too interested in protecting their home values, perhaps even racist – or at least deaf to urgent social justice concerns, and so on.

As a renter on a diverse NA board, I know this is untrue, and grossly unfair. Moreover, if we are serious about democracy, surely the solution for a component of our democratic system that we feel may not be functioning well is not *less* democracy, but *more* and *better* democracy. Surely we can all agree that we need a better process with better outcomes. So let’s work together constructively on that.

Speaking as one who has spent the majority of my career in public involvement, usually working on the other side of the table from neighborhood groups and with or for developers and city officials, it is rather shocking to see, from the neighborhood side of the table, what has been happening in my home city – the belligerent attacks on neighborhoods, the wide perception of stiff-arming, the calls for marginalizing, the proposals for new laws that bypass participation, and so on. And now a name change that seems to say, “your role is even less important to us than ever.”

Surely we can agree that citizens have every right in a democracy to participate as stakeholders in decisions that shape their public realm, including the private buildings that frame their edges. They have every right to speak about impacts to their quality of life and livability, and to be informed about actions within the public process, including planning, permitting and design review. They have every right to caucus within their neighborhoods, and to be recognized by the City as geographic constituents of the larger city. They have every right not to be abused and marginalized – another form of injustice.

Let us remember that neighborhood associations perform several essential functions within our city:

1. ***Geographic representation.*** Neighborhood associations provide a vitally important geographic complement to the at-large council system, which otherwise leaves outer neighborhoods under-represented and under-recognized in city affairs.
2. ***Transparency and accountability.*** Neighborhood associations have requirements for open meetings and records, disclosure of potential conflicts of interest, and proper representative process, that other kinds of organizations do not have.
3. ***Openness to all.*** Neighborhood associations do not and cannot exclude by identity, but are (and should be) open to all residents within their boundaries.

I believe the source of much of the dysfunction within the bureau in recent years has been the muddle that has been created by trying to treat different kinds of organizations as though they were the same. This muddle fails to recognize that neighborhood associations are narrowly focused on the governance issues related to activities that occur within their neighborhoods, and that impact the lives of all their residents. Other kinds of organizations – business associations, advocacy groups, communities of identity and so on – by their very nature have other interests that may be exclusionary, proprietary, or otherwise non-transparent and unaccountable to the public.

Portland City Council
June 23, 2018
Page Three

I have therefore concluded that it is now necessary to fundamentally re-structure the bureau. I am mindful that this would pose a burden on Director Rhee and her colleagues, but I do believe this is now unavoidable. I believe it is necessary to:

1. Create a separate bureau, named once again the **Office of Neighborhood Associations (ONA)**, charged again with supporting neighborhood associations as fully representative, transparent and accountable constituents of city governance.
2. Retain the existing bureau, re-organizing the remaining elements, named the **Office of Community and Civic Life**, charged with providing a voice for other entities, including non-geographic groups, advocacy groups, business associations, and others with specific interests that may or may not be transparent.
3. Re-form the current coalition and neighborhood association boundary structures, through a **Neighborhood Association Convention**.
4. Re-structure funding to neighborhood associations, to be distributed through **direct participatory budgeting**, together with administrative support provided (at NA discretion) through a **support contractor pool** offering services, insurance etc., to be vetted by the City.

I believe the time has come to fundamentally revitalize Portland's historic but troubled neighborhood association system. It is only reasonable to hold neighborhood associations accountable as open, participatory and inclusive representatives of all citizens within their boundaries. But it is also only reasonable to ask that a bureau charged with giving them a true voice in city affairs actually do so.

Sincerely,



Michael W. Mehaffy, Ph.D.

In January an online survey was launched to gather suggestions for a re-branding. Funny thing, the most votes went to the existing name (personal disclosure: I voted for the current name). The second most went to Office of Neighborhood Associations (ONA). There are the usual caustic ones, like Office of Everything Else, Office of Neighborhood Ignorance [sic], & others much worse I won't mention. However, to scroll through all of the 163 which the *Portland Mercury* (& good for them) posted online is salutary. It actually shows that people think & care. However the results were not what the bureau wanted, hence the out-sourcing at taxpayer expense.

One must ask, where was the emergency to go this route? Just as we ask, where is the emergency today?

It puts me in mind of the Queen of Hearts in *Alice in Wonderland*: "Sentence first –verdict afterwards." For us in Portland: Decisions first –processes afterwards.

Putting aside the black humor, it is a terribly serious & disturbing matter that the bureau supposedly charged with developing proper public process can't or won't do it themselves. How could they possibly tell anyone else how it should be done? Answer: they cannot.

You have the opportunity here to make it be done correctly –processes first, decisions afterwards.

Roger Leachman
742 SW Vista Ave., # 36
Portland, OR 97205
(704)962-6523
rogerleachman@hotmail.com

17 July 2018

**Testimony re 771 & 772
Portland City Council 18 July 2018**

My name is Roger Leachman. I serve on the board of the Goose Hollow Foothills League, the board of NeighborsWest Northwest coalition, & on the ONI BAC. I speak here for myself as a citizen, although I will mention that all of you have received 3 letters over the past year & a half from GHFL on the unaddressed & unaccomplished reform of ONI --the most recent from last month. I voted for all of them.

When the Office of Neighborhood Associations (ONA) changed its name to the Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI) in 1995, it was after a substantive public process that was not “top down,” controlled & directed by the bureau, but representing affected parties, holding meetings, & seeking for wide public input.

There could hardly be a starker contrast with the behavior of the bureau these past months & leading up to the seeking of “emergency” action by City Council.

How is this an “emergency”? This is not a life threatening situation where any people will suffer from delay. Delay is in fact called for, because of the lack of public process.

I suggest that the “emergency” is to save embarrassment to the Director & Commissioner-in-charge because they spent \$25,000 of our tax monies (to a PR firm) to re-brand the bureau, then treated it as a fiat, a done deal –not even (it would appear) realizing or researching the fact that Council action would be required.

Let’s rehearse the history of the re-branding matter.

Only Felicia Williams, at a 2016 ONI BAC meeting raised & pushed for a name change. She said that the bureau should not want to be identified with neighborhoods (she then later played the board of the NeighborsWest Northwest (NWNW) coalition for rubes, saying they should push back against the idea of neighborhoods as “toxic,” omitting to tell them that it was *she herself* who pushed the narrative). Her reception at the BAC, however, was that this was a “very low” priority. And there it would have appeared to have died.

Why then resurrect an idea no one had bought into other than a coalition president who would shortly be ousted by her board?

I believe there are basically 2 reasons. The primary one is that the name of ONI was seen as toxic after the shortcomings & dereliction of duty documented in the November 2016 audit of the bureau (which I would say covered only the “tip of the iceberg” --agreeing with the expressed concern of a city employee at one of the Auditor’s 2017 meetings). So have the bureau take the approach of Blackwater, the mercenary group, which re-branded itself as “Xe”--hoping that people would not remember what went before under the old name.

The second is that, without *any kind of public process* as had happened in the past (e.g., 1995 –but various other times too) --hey, let’s change ONI’s functions. Because of course if you have to really involve concerned & affected parties in that, you are likely to hear things you’d rather not. This is also a way of distancing the bureau from the audit, so that you don’t actually have to address it & do anything about it. And the latter is what has happened, as I can testify from regular attendance at BAC & Coalition Directors & Chairs meetings. There’s a huge elephant in the room that nobody wants to see.

Yet another approach to distance yourself from something like the audit is to demonize someone else, to distract attention from what you are doing or not doing. Who better than the groups you were originally formed to serve, whom you see as problems for you, so you can minimize them. And this has gone on as well, as I & others have documented (& can document further).

Moore-Love, Karla

From: Michael Mehaffy <michael.mehaffy@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 7:26 PM
To: Moore-Love, Karla; Wheeler, Mayor; Commissioner Eudaly; Fish, Nick; Commissioner Fritz; Commissioner Saltzman; City Auditor, Mary Hull Caballero
Subject: Testimony from GHFL Regarding Wednesday July 18th hearing on ONI name change
Attachments: GHFL Letter RE ONI Re-branding June 22 18.pdf

Dear Mayor, Commissioners, and Auditor Hull Caballero,

I previously submitted testimony at the unanimous request of the Board of the Goose Hollow Foothills League regarding the ONI name change. I re-attach that letter here and ask that you take it formally as testimony for the hearing planned for Wednesday July 18th at 2PM, regarding the same matter. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Mehaffy, Ph.D.
 President, Goose Hollow Foothills League
 Senior Researcher, KTH University, Stockholm
 Executive Director, Sustasis Foundation

 742 SW Vista Ave., #42
 Portland, OR 97205
 (503) 250-4449

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Michael Mehaffy <michael.mehaffy@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Jun 22, 2018 at 4:42 PM
Subject: Letter from GHFL Neighborhood Association Board
To: "Moore-Love, Karla" <karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov>, "Wheeler, Mayor" <MayorWheeler@portlandoregon.gov>, Commissioner Eudaly <Chloe@portlandoregon.gov>, "Fish, Nick" <NickFish@portlandoregon.gov>, Commissioner Fritz <amanda@portlandoregon.gov>, Commissioner Saltzman <dan@portlandoregon.gov>

Dear Mayor, Commissioners, Auditor Hull-Caballero, Ms. Rhee et al.,

Please see the attached letter from our Board regarding ONI re-branding.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Mehaffy, Ph.D.
 President, Goose Hollow Foothills League
 Senior Researcher, KTH University, Stockholm
 Executive Director, Sustasis Foundation

 742 SW Vista Ave., #42
 Portland, OR 97205

(503) 250-4449



GOOSE HOLLOW FOOTHILLS LEAGUE
2257 NW RALEIGH STREET PORTLAND, OR 97210 503-823-4288

June 22, 2018

Portland City Council
1221 SW 4th Avenue, Room 110
Portland, OR 97204

Dear Mayor Wheeler and members of the City Council,

RE: “Re-branding” of the Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI)

The Board of Goose Hollow Foothills League has directed me by unanimous vote to send the following letter.

Following upon the November 2016 City Auditor’s report, “Community and Neighborhood Involvement: Accountability Limited, Rules and Funding Model Outdated,” which documented many shortcomings within the Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI), the Goose Hollow Foothills League (GHFL) adopted successive letters urging the necessity of reforming the bureau^{1 2}.

The agency’s major response to the audit is an attempt to re-brand itself. This has been done without a formal citywide public involvement process, hearings, or council action. The assertion that “this change is the result of a recognition by many, through focus groups, research, and dialogue, that our name should better represent the wide range of ways our office supports and engages with all Portlanders” is unsupported by evidence. No convening or reaching out to the neighborhood associations on this matter took place. In fact, as we noted, and as the Northwest Examiner reported, an attempt by a neighborhood association member to discuss the associations’ roles and importance at the city hall focus group was met with hostility by ONI staff – in complete violation of the announced focus group guidelines.

Only one person ever advocated publicly at ONI BAC meetings for changing the agency name, and the response to her was that this had always been deemed a low priority. It is also the case that ONI’s own survey found little sentiment for a change:

<https://www.portlandmercury.com/blogtown/2018/02/02/19650970/office-of-beyonce-involvement-and-other-great-and-ignored-suggestions-for-renaming-oni>

¹<http://www.goosehollow.org/images/GHFLLetter20170316CityCounsel--NeighborhoodInvolvement.pdf>

²<http://www.goosehollow.org/images/GHFLLetter20180305CityCounsel-ONIRreform.pdf>

Portland City Council

June 22, 2018

Page Two

Quite as troubling is that \$25,000 of our tax dollars went to a firm linked to the commissioner-in-charge. Why should a consulting firm (who made no attempt whatever to reach out to ONI's "customers") be utilized to re-brand a city agency? This is troubling.

We suggest this unstudied change is a cosmetic diversion. It constitutes a faint hope that citizens' memories are short and they will forget what went before. On the contrary, we suggest that most citizens desire accountability, and lose their trust when that is not forthcoming.

This re-branding is part of the agency push, again on its own and without any citywide process, substantially to alter its statutory function while denying that is their intention to those who complain about it. City Code Section 3.96.060(F) states that ONI shall "support and promote public involvement *within the Neighborhood Association framework* [our emphasis]". Is the agency's desire to forgo or water down this core function related to its lamentable performance? The audit has a telling quote from an unnamed neighborhood leader: "The City of Portland seems unconcerned about the perspectives of residents as reflected through their neighborhood associations." And the Minority Report on the FY2018-19 ONI Budget, referenced in our March 2018 letter, laid out the perverse history of ONI and the Coalitions actually disenfranchising Portland residents, which, it is worth repeating, "strikes at the heart of participatory democracy, fosters concentration of power in coteries, engenders apathy in ordinary citizens, and devastates neighborhood involvement." We note that this remains unaddressed and no restorative action has been forthcoming or contemplated re the disenfranchised associations.

In essence we are seeing the continued destruction of envisioned independent neighborhood associations by top-down control. We need reforms that restore and empower the neighborhoods as grass-roots channels within the City. Neighborhood associations have a unique obligation of open participation, public meetings, public records, and transparent disclosure of potential conflicts of interest. They can be held accountable by their memberships. The same is not true for other kinds of organizations, a difference that carries profound implications for transparency and accountability, two necessities of healthy democracy.

We ask that City Council:

- 1) specifically review the name change, conducting public hearings to gather formal citizen testimony; and
- 2) consider restructuring this agency, a process that might be helped along by a "true" neighborhood summit (unlike the one in 2015), open to all.

189078

Portland City Council
June 22, 2018
Page Three

Given the history of the agency and the audit, many of us would advocate for a separate, stand-alone office, divorced from what we experience as an unresponsive bureaucracy, which would be devoted to providing strictly-defined core services to neighborhood associations.

Sincerely,



Michael W. Mehaffy, Ph.D.
President, GHFL

Copy: Ms. Mary Hull Caballero, City Auditor
Ms. Suk Rhee, ONI Director