

Neighborhood Mediation Advisory Committee Minutes
September 22, 1978 12:00 p.m.
401 Corbett Bldg.

Present: Elaine Howard (for Margaret Wolszon), Sarah Newhall,
Wayne Potter, Patti Jacobson (for Mary Pedersen),
Jerre Brown, Elaine Walsh, Nick Barnett, Sidney Splawn,
Bonnie Thomas

Nick Barnett, Chairman, began with the summary of the Neighborhood Mediation Project. He stated that the idea started due to the many complaint calls received by the Metropolitan Human Relations Commission concerning interpersonal disputes, some of which were very complex. MHRC wanted a way to systemize MHRC's response to these complaints. Buzz Willets was hired as a researcher, and the report that he gave validated that the problems were numerous enough and serious enough that MHRC needed to look further into the possibilities of developing a Neighborhood Mediation Project. City Council was then made aware of the need to research and develop a community self-help organization. After receiving CETA funds, MHRC hired Elaine Walsh, Karen Powell, and Bonnie Thomas to continue research on the Project, prepare a Proposal and begin implementation of the Neighborhood Mediation Project.

Elaine began discussion on funding and staffing of Centers. She went over Center Staff and Volunteer Mediators' functions and responsibilities. She also reviewed the mediation training program as well as the staff and mediator's progress on the job to date. The most recent report done by the Neighborhood Mediation Centers is the two-month report for June 12 - August 11, 1978. Centers have received 168 referrals from City/County agencies, of which most cases have been appropriate. (See attached report.) The question was raised on how quick response by staff was to a referral. Sidney stated that initial contact was made with the Complainant the same day as intake, and generally within 48 hours with the respondent. (See attached report for further info.)

Jerre Brown suggested that NMP formalize its relationship with the pretrial release or recog program and utilize Neighborhood Mediation procedures as a condition of pre-trial release. Discussion followed, and concern was expressed about how such a relationship would effect the nature and scope of the Project.

Patti Jacobson suggested clarifying for both present and potential referring agencies, NMP's referral methods and processes. Jerre and Patti will work with Elaine in defining the needs in this regard.

Discussion on Center site locations and referral boundaries of Centers. Based on previous research of other neighborhood mediation centers nationally, and staff ratio per Center, the Project was set up to deal with a population of 150,000 (50,000 per Center). The Neighborhood Mediation Centers are presently taking and handling all referrals made, even those outside initially determined Project boundaries.

Further concern was expressed about all City/County service systems being aware of the Project. A Public Relations (P.R.) Committee composed of Sarah Newhall, Elaine Howard, and Terry Kelly (to represent BNE), will meet with Elaine to discuss information penetration to other City/County systems.

Other suggestions made for increased awareness of Project were:

1. Press Tour
2. Contacting the group called the Managers Forum (Doug Capps) and at a later date have them visit Neighborhood Mediation Centers.
3. Contact the Junior Executives who disperse public service announcements.

Jerre Brown noted the importance of the Project's research being able to show that it is not only cost effective, but it is also cost reductive to County Justice Services. He suggested that someone from the Corrections Department be on the Advisory Committee. He noted the potential positive impact of the Project on the total criminal justice system.

The Committee decided to seek additional expertise from other individuals when the need arises.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday September 28, 1978 at 12:00 p.m.

Neighborhood Mediation Advisory Committee Minutes

September 28, 1978

401 Corbett Bldg. 12:00 p.m.

Present: Stevie Young (for Sarah Newhall), Chrys Martin, Elaine Howard (for Margaret Wolszon), Diane Julian, Juli Stream, Wayne Potter, Sidney Splawn, Nick Barnett, and Bonnie Thomas.

The meeting was chaired by Nick Barnett. He started the introduction by stating that this meeting was a follow-up meeting for the first meeting held on September 22, so that he could contact all of the members. Meetings will not normally be held so close together. Regular meeting time has been set for the fourth Thursday of each month. Minutes and a telephone follow-up will be given to members not attending or absent from meetings.

The following introduction followed mainly the same information given at our first meeting such as the summary of the Neighborhood Mediation Project, how it was formed and its activities up to this point. Also brought out was the fact that extensive research and planning has made the Project as successful as it is.

Also discussed in last weeks meeting was the point of information. How does it get out to individual persons and the public agencies. Information Penetration was felt to be very important. At every level persons should know about NMP.

Another topic of discussion in the first meeting was the matter of referrals. Look into referrals as a procedure as how they are made in one agency opposed to another. Referrals may be made under different conditions. Patti Jacobson, Jerre Brown, and Elaine Walsh have taken the task of checking into this further.

Further discussion continued on the subject of funding. Nick Barnett and Elaine Walsh were said to be working on this point, and all others that might be able to contribute in any way, were invited to help out. Diane Julian suggested contacting Jim McKillup for funding from grants that they have on hand in their office. Mediation has been dropped from their budget, but we can see about reestablishing funding. Juli Stream will talk to Jim McKillip on this subject.

Jerre Brown had suggested in the first NMP meeting, that we formalize relations with the Justice Services Department and NMP. Nick brought out the point that NMP must preserve the concept of the Project. The Committee must look at how ideas might change NMP. We should stick to the basic idea.

Sidney reviewed statistics. The count for this week is up to 264 cases from each of the Centers. (For more information see last week's minutes, also see NMP Two-Month Report.) She also mentioned that most cases involve a multitude of disputes. They were able to identify 202 types of disputes.

A continuous two-month tracking report will be done to keep members up to date. (For more information, see June 12 - August 11 report.)

Chrys Martin mentioned that the District Attorney's Office was extremel impressed with the results of cases referred by their office. She estimated that their office is distributing approximately 100 brochures per month.

Wayne Potter brought out the need to print more of the Neighborhood Mediation Brochures. His office (BNE) needs 50,000 alone. Diane Julian also requested further brochures for her Crime Prevention Neighborhood Training sessions to be held next week. Others expressed their needs.

Diane Julian went on to suggest sending brochures to the Circuit Court Administrator's Office, contact person, Mike Hall extension 3173. She also mentioned that the Sheriff's Office and Crime Prevention need more brochures and that Margaret Wright of County Lines should also be contacted. She felt that Mrs. Wright would be happy to do an article on the Neighborhood Mediation Centers.

Sidney mentioned the good support from the North and Northeast Police. Southeast is not as great. Team 4 in Southeast says they do their own mediation. It was also brought out that Team 4 has the greatest homicide rate of the City. The suggestion was made to try to reach Team 4.

Help them to see and get a better idea of what NMP really does. Jerre Brown was suggested to be contacted for help on improving the response from the Sheriff's Office.

Diane Julian stated that notice of mediation results to referring agencies is valuable.

The subject of confidentiality was discussed next. Nick brought out that it cannot be absolute confidentiality since mediators and staff share certain feelings between respondents and complainants. A lawyer Mr. Cooper, will be called in to discuss this matter with the Committee.

Diane Julian brought out the subject of the possibility of having to subpoena Mediation records. How will Centers proceed in this instance. Nick stated that only conciliation work notes and the final resolution are all of that paper work that is kept as a precautionary method to the possibility of subpoena. Also he stated that the Committee must work closely with Sidney in watching her record keeping and the data that she might compile,

In closing Nick reminded everyone that if they might have a topic for discussion, to please contact either Elaine, Sidney, Bonnie, or himself to let us know, so that we can have it put on the agenda.

F
THE NEIGHBORHOOD MEDIATION PILOT-PROJECT
Two Month Report
June 12, 1978 - August 11, 1978

In the first two months of operation, the Neighborhood Mediation Project handled 168 cases. The Southeast Mediation Center and the Northeast Mediation Center handled 62 cases each. The North Mediation Center, located in St. Johns, handled 44 cases. The lower figure was partly due to a delay in beginning operations.

Out of the 168 cases handled, 134 or 80% were accepted for initial interview. Of the 168 cases, 34 or 20% were declined.

Referral Sources

City Service Agencies accounted for 69 or 41% of the referrals made to the Project. BNE was the source of 19 referrals, constituting 11% of all referrals made. Youth Service Centers were the second largest sources of city agency referrals by making 14 referrals or 8% of all referrals made. The Mayor's Office was third in making a total of 8 referrals, constituting 5% of the referrals made.

City agencies making more than one referral included: PACT (4), MHRC (4), City Hall (3), Commissioner Frank Ivancie's Office (3), Neighbors North (2), and ONA (2).

Those agencies making one referral included the City Attorney's Office, the Northeast Senior Adult Service Center, Commissioner Jordan's Office, the City Auditor's Office, Portland Development Commission,

Housing Authority, North Community Action, Southeast Uplift, the City Assessor's Office and the North Mediation Center.

City/County law enforcement agencies referred 46 or 27% of the cases. The Portland Police Department was responsible for referring 41 cases or for 24% of the referrals made. The Multnomah County Sheriff referred 3 cases. The Crime Prevention Bureau made 2 referrals.

Miscellaneous sources were responsible for 38 or 22% of the referrals. Twenty-one cases or 12% were self-referrals. Other sources in this category included neighbors (5), Legal Aid (3), Tenants Union (1) and Tri-County Information (1).

Twelve of the referrals or 8% came from County agency sources. The District Attorney's Office was responsible for referring 6 cases, civil and criminal, accounting for 4% of the referrals made. Project Able made 3 referrals. Those County agencies making one referral included the SE Quadrant, Multnomah County Corrections and Victim's Assistance.

Three of the referrals or 2% came from State agencies, 2 from DEQ and 1 from Adult and Family Services.

For a complete breakdown of referral sources for each Center, consult the attached report.

Types of Cases

Only a few of the cases handled involved one specific kind of problem. The majority involved multiple criminal and civil complaints or a combination of both. The Project handled 168 cases involving a total of 222 types of disputes.

Out of the 222 types of disputes handled, 135 or 61% constituted criminal offenses. Eighty-eight cases or 40% involved juvenile offenders. Forty-seven or 21% involved adult misdemeanants.

Verbal Abuses and/or Disorderly Conduct constituted 48 cases or 22% of the combined adult and juvenile total. Vandalism and/or Minor Property Damage came in second with 37 cases or 17% of the adult and juvenile total. Assault and Trespass came in third, each accounting for 16 cases or 7% of the cases handled. Littering (11), Phone Harassment (6) and Petit Theft (1) constituted the rest of the criminal offenses handled.

Purely civil disputes were involved in 87 cases or 39% of the Project's intake. Fifty-two cases or 23% involved traditional code violations. Noise ordinance violations, animal control violations, public nuisance complaints and traffic code violations (illegal parking) were handled (in that order) by the Project.

Thirty-five cases or 16% involved private civil disputes. Property disputes, such as boundary questions, overhanging limbs, easement usage and general maintenance constituted 30 cases or 14% of the complaints handled. Landlord-Tenant and other miscellaneous problems accounted for the remaining cases.

For further information concerning the amount and types of cases handled by each Center, consult the attached report.

Case Results

Declined Cases

Out of the 168 total referrals, 34 cases were declined. Twenty-three

of those were referred to more appropriate agencies. In 5 cases, the parties declined to participate beyond initial intake.

Six cases were determined to be inappropriate for panel hearing or Center services, either due to lack of a real controversy, evidence of a party's severe mental or emotional imbalance or that the dispute concerned matters outside the Project's guidelines.

Accepted Cases

Out of the 134 cases accepted, 54 or 40% resulted in staff conciliated resolution. Those pending numbered 23 or 17%. Successful mediation panel hearings accounted for 19 cases or 14%. Fifteen cases or 11% resulted in the parties declining to participate. Six cases or 4% resulted in the parties reaching resolution independently. Four cases or 3% resulted in a hearing set-respondent's failure to appear. Three cases or 2% resulted in the parties being referred to a more appropriate agency. Cases determined to be inappropriate for Center services numbered 2 or 1%. Ten cases or 8% resulted in one party being unavailable and/or a combination of the above results.

Demographic Data

Due to the fact that the original interview forms did not allow for recording demographic data on all parties involved in the dispute, the following figures do not completely reflect the number of people that were affected by or participated in the Project's resolution process. Efforts were made to obtain as much information as possible concerning earlier cases. The original forms did not record the extent of police contact nor the duration of the dispute. The field specialists

were consulted as to whether they could recall the nature and extent of police contact and the duration of the dispute. Therefore, this information constitutes a rather generalized, probably low estimate in the earlier cases.

The following information includes only persons interviewed in person on a case by case basis.

Number of Persons Interviewed

Out of the 168 cases referred to the Project, 202 disputants were interviewed in person in the field.

Male-Female Ratio

Female disputants numbered 60% or 122, and male disputants were 40% or 80.

Race-Ethnic Group

Of the individuals involved:

80% or 161 were Caucasian

8% or 17 were Black

6% or 12 were Native American

3% or 7 were of varying ethnic origins, including Greek, Italian, and Dutch Indonesian.

2% or 4 were Hispanic American

Less than 1% or 1 was Asian American

Employment

Not employed persons were 45% or 92. Seventy-two or 36% were female and 20 or 10% were male.

Fifty-two or 26% were employed full time. Thirty-six or 18% were male. Sixteen or 8% were female.

Thirty-one or 15% were retired. Sixteen or 8% were female and 15 or 7% were male.

Age

Fifty-six or 28% were persons over 60. Thirty-six or 18% were female. Twenty or 10% were male.

Thirty-seven or 18% were persons ages 31-40. Twenty-six or 13% were female. Eleven or 5% were male.

Thirty or 15% were persons ages 26-30. Nineteen or 9% were female and 11 or 5% were male.

Of the 222 disputes handled, 40% involved juvenile related crimes although demographic data was recorded on only 12 individuals under 18 or 6% of the 202 interviewed.

Police Contact

The police had been previously contacted in 62 cases or 37% of the 168 cases handled. They were dispatched at least once in 29 cases or 17%, 2-3 times in 19 or 11%, 4-5 times in 6 or 4% and over 6 times in 2 or 1%.

Duration of Dispute

In 78 cases or 46% of the 168 cases handled, there had been prior similar incidents. These prior incidents had been going on for 1-5 years in 24 or 14% of the cases, under six months in 23 or 14% of the cases and

six months to a year in 20 or 12% of the cases.

Length of Residency

Sixty-two complainants or 31% of the 202 persons interviewed had lived at their residence for more than 5 years. Of the respondents, 30 or 15% had lived at their residence for the same period of time.

Thirty-two complainants or 16% had lived in their homes 1-5 years. Twenty-four respondents or 12% had lived at their residence for the same period of time.

Eighteen complainants or 9% had lived in their homes for six months to one year. Seventeen respondents or 8% had lived in their homes for that period of time.

Three complainants or 1% had lived at their residence for less than six months compared to 15 respondents or 7%.

For a complete and detailed analysis of the demographic data recorded and a breakdown of the above categories per Center, please consult attached report.

Operational Data

Length of Time from Complainant's Intake to Complainant's Interview

Out of the 202 persons interviewed, 36 complainants were interviewed through a field visit on the same day that the intake was received. In 31 cases or 15%, there was a one day lag between intake and interview. In 18 cases or 9%, there was a two day lag between intake and interview.

Length of Time from Complainant's Intake to Respondent's Interview

In 25 cases or 12% the respondent was interviewed via a field visit on the same day the complainant's intake was received. In 14 cases or 7%, the delay was seven or more days, often due to inability to identify or locate the party. In 12 cases or 6%, the delay was 3-4 days from intake to interview. In 11 cases or 5% the delay ran 5-6 days. In 10 cases or 5%, only one day lapsed between intake and review.

Length of Time From Complainant's Intake to Hearing

In 18 cases resulting in panel hearings, the hearings were scheduled 6-10 days from the complainant's original intake. Four of those resulted in the respondent's failure to appear and were rescheduled 11-15 days from the complainant's original intake. Two hearings were held within 5 days from intake. Three hearings were held 11-15 days from intake.

For complete information regarding staff response time per Center, please consult attached report. Please note that all references to an attached report refer to a complete 4 month study and graph of the above information. The 4 month report and graph study will be available in latter October.

✓
NEIGHBORHOOD MEDIATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

November 16, 1978

Southeast Mediation Center, 3214 S.E. Holgate, 3rd Floor

Persons Present: Margaret Wolszon, Jerre Brown, Juli Stream, Wayne Potter, Steve Ziolkowski, Nick Barnett, Sidney Splawn, Elaine Walsh, Karen Powell, Emmanuel Paris, S.E. Mediation Center staff.

I. OPENING

Nick Barnett opened the meeting and distributed the following literature.

- a) Advisory minutes of October 26, 1978.
- b) 4 Month Mediation Research Report.
- c) Article from Wall Street Journal, submitted by Wayne Potter, about current mediation centers existing throughout the country.

Nick requested corrections in the October minutes. The minutes were approved with the following corrections.

- a) p. 2 Dave Wade
- b) p. 4 Juli Stream had complaints at Commissioner Jordan's office not the D.A's.

II. PROJECT REFERRAL UPDATE

Elaine Walsh discussed current referral contacts. The Precinct Captains have agreed to "flyer" each officer's mailbox with a Neighborhood Mediation brochure and make them available in their front offices for public information.

Elaine submitted an article about the Project to O.N.A. for their December newsletter and also the the West/Northwest O.N.A. office for their newsletter. Willamette Weekly has completed an article about the Project which should be in next week's edition. Project Center Coordinators and Elaine will be meeting with the Portland Observer next week for further media coverage.

Marilyn Culp from Victim's Assistance Program was contacted again about the Project and will be speaking to all of the Mediation staff at the Tri-Center Inservice Friday, November 17.

Jill Nichols from the Retired Senior Volunteer Program was contacted and will be screening for applicants for volunteer community mediator positions in our Project.

III. 4 MONTH RESEARCH REPORT/ANALYSIS

Sidney Splawn reported the following information taken from the 4 Month Research Report recently completed.

RECEIVED

A. Case Intake/Results

311 Cases were referred to the three Mediation Centers in a 4 month period. 52 cases or 17% were originally declined and referred to other agencies. In 13% of these cases, disputants declined participation in the mediation process and

NOV 24 1978

NEIGHBORHOOD MEDIATION ADVISORY MINUTES - 2
November 16, 1978

13% were deemed inappropriate for Center services at initial intake.

259 cases or 83% were initially accepted at phone intake for a field interview by staff. Of significance was the fact that in the second 2 months of the Project, initial phone intake acceptance increased 7%. Of the 259 cases initially accepted, 195 or 75% were accepted after the field interview and of those, 149 or 76% resulted in staff conciliated resolutions, mediation panel hearings, or a combination of these and additional Center action.

B. Referral Sources

City agencies accounted for 37% of the total Project referrals. Bureau of Neighborhood Environment, Youth Service Centers and Mayor's Office were the 3 primary city referral agencies.

Law enforcement agencies accounted for 27% of the referrals with the Portland Police Department referring 79 or 25% of the cases, Multnomah County Sheriff's Department referring 4 or 2% of the cases and the Crime Prevention Bureau referring 2 or 1% of the cases.

County agencies accounted for 8% of the referrals with the D.A.'s Office referring 12 or 4% of these cases, and Project Able referring 5 or 2%.

Other sources of referrals included self-referrals which constituted 9% of the total case referrals, neighbors and friends which constituted 6% and Legal Aid which referred 4%.

C. Types of Cases

311 initial cases referrals involved a sum total of 448 complaints.

260 or 58% of the complaints involved alleged criminal activity. Juveniles accounted for 38% of the 260 complaints and adults accounted for 20%. Verbal abuse and disorderly conduct accounted for 98 or 22% of the alleged criminal activity and vandalism and minor property damage accounted for 60 or 13%. Assault accounted for 40 or 9% of the cases, a significant rise in the second two months of the Project.

188 or 42% of the 448 complaints involved civil matters. Code violations involving noise and animal issues, public nuisance issues and matters related to automobiles parked and stored, accounted for 24% of the civil matters. Property disputes accounted for the other 18% of civil disputes.

D. Police Contact Data

The Portland Police Department were reportedly dispatched at least once in 39% of the total case referrals to the Project. They were dispatched from 2 to 3 times in 14% of case referrals and 4+ times in 6% of total case referrals.

E. Prior Similar Incidents Between Disputing Parties

51% of the disputing parties reported having prior similar disputes with each other and 15% of the cases involved a dispute going on from 1 to 5 years.

NEIGHBORHOOD MEDIATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES - 3
November 16, 1978

F. Response Time from Phone Intake to Initial Field Interview

44% of the case referrals were interviewed within 2 days of the initial phone intake. In 23% of the cases, complainants were interviewed on the same day of the phone intake, and one day following in 14% of the cases.

IV. ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT

A general discussion followed about the implications of the Research Report. Clarification was asked regarding the definition of noise, traffic, disorderly conduct, and public vs. private nuisance issues.

Elaine stated that in the next two month's Research Report the Project will have data regarding the specific neighborhood areas which Centers are servicing within their boundaries.

V. NEXT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING - Thursday, December 21, 1978.

F: Meko
Human
Relations.

Emmons Henry
Beth Mason
Nick Barnett
Bizz Willets
Kal Szekely.
Mary Pedersen.

Roger Rook & Beth Mason
arbitration / night prosecutor.

Kathy Steinberg now in Clackamas County.
Columbus O. Orlando Fla.

Law prof - city atty / diversion.

minor crimes w grounds to prosecute
Law students used as hearings officers. Work Study.
5 pm - midnight intake & hearings.
flexible, student turnover OTS training
16,000 cases/yr. 55% solution. w manual
5% ind in prosecution.

L.A. Roosevelt Dorn.

prof. Law Enforcement - retired police
\$20-25,000 - phrs. of hearings. - 8 officers.
stiff notices, if don't show up, evidence of guilt.
20,000 cases 50%-60% solution 5% prosecute.
Notes. Do read rights $\frac{1}{3}$ no-show - Some not-prosecute
May subpoena officers.

allow attys & witnesses, but discourage.

Small spaces. Aggressive, intense, daytime.

FAILURE TO APPEAR MAY RESULT IN PROSECUTION.

Can't say this in Oregon

CLACK CO.

Started w volunteers, used voter registration.

35,000 letters 500 responses. — Screened.

3 levels — 1) psychal Mental Health Bob King.

2) prelim ~~interview~~ — prior volunteer & responsible position.

3) interview [LEAA Mental Health
9 geo. areas. w 9 separate
debriefing hearing officers.

Coordinator monitor, training, meetings to keep
in touch SET up to handle 3.5 K.

Training: 2 weeks 40 hours. Law (crim ^{oriental} ^{feedback} ^{MOCK} ^{HEARINGS} ^{history})
SOURCES of MISUNDERSTANDING. training. \$20 hr.
RESOURCES. Dr. Barbara Biggs-CA-trained trainers.
trainers did hearings
paid only for teaching.

PHIL:

Has to be tied into prosecution. Bring in Haas.

Eastern PDX — juvenile mediation.

Reasons people don't get
into Jeanne Seals.

Non-criminal —

LA now does admin law cases, too.

Give legal advice? Suspense — rights & confidentiality
Look book — Indexes crimes. of volunteers?

Conflict of interest & physical safety.
Reserve officers.

Evaluation - monthly mgs w 9 Coords.
Quarterly reports to CRAG.
flexible grant \$22,000 (asked for 38k)

*50% animal related.

*harassment, menacing.

assault * crim mischief & trespass

no juris. over juvenile

1 night a week - every other week.

not crisis intervention - a little cool down.

3 days - 2 weeks.

8 hearings 4 hours x 2 offices. Takes 1 hour.

Policy about who to hear.

Not interested in witnesses, only int. parties.

Coordr.
2 hearings
offices

clerk
reserve officer.

Coordr + hearing officer decide.

Minimize calling in as witness to court
by recording. Not read rights
so info cd n b used in court.

40 in 2 months - semi-operational, then O'Leary.

Mediation wd n get as much attendance - maybe 40/100.

Kathy Actimer - word processing.

352 clerical.

million in typing support.

productivity & speed

measure work load - routine, statistical

work-related share equipment - centralized tend to break down

diff. applications of diff. machines.

Secy of typing & of admin. work

cross-training & relieve boredom.

update clerical - info end April.

Study done July - Aug.

→ Standard filing system.

Economic stimulus.

Title I Pub Wks

\$4 billion

II Contracs

↑ \$4 million PDX ?

Ceta II/VI

T. I conference comm. next week ACT 4-7-77.

II & VI after 4-17.

PDX residents \$16 million max

Or min \$53M

will compete w School District, County

of unemp., rate of unemp., per cap Y

9.6% = 18%
in state.

Admin. positions Civil Service
or Special Qualifns.

Drop out right in million Some II, some VI
to need money 6 months spec projts.
% city 60% city - 40% outside.
may be up to 1/2 yrs.
then 9-30.
7P.

out-city applicatns. not good & may cut.
40 need city hall jobs - where?

235 City

NWDA, Inc.
NPCE, Inc.
PACT

NE? General Buller in process

SE planner levels

NW + N Skill Exchange

Tool Banks - Staff work.



METROPOLITAN HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

Multnomah County — City of Portland
208 City Hall ■ Portland, Oregon 97204 ■ 248-4187
410

Walter Sakai
Chairman
Vernon Summers
Director
James R. Sitzman
Assistant Director

August 12, 1974


MEMORANDUM

Results of Survey in Woodward-Powell Area

In conducting the survey, MHRC's primary objective was to determine how many of the residents of the disputed area oriented to the north (Richmond) and how many oriented to the south (Mid-Southeast). Accordingly, responses were coded "North," "South," and "Indefinable." Responses labeled "Indefinable" were those which indicated the neighborhood as being wholly within the disputed area ("too small"), those which indicated the entire map as the neighborhood ("too large") and those which indicated the neighborhood as extending outside the disputed area, but not significantly in either direction ("other").

Totals are as follows:

Number of residences visited	514
Number of responses	233
No response:	
Not interested	145-160
Not home on second call	115-130
Vacant	10 (Approx.)
TOTAL "No Response"	281
TOTAL NORTH	56
TOTAL SOUTH	25
INDEFINABLE	
Area indicated too small	103
Area indicated too large	32
Other	17
TOTAL INDEFINABLE	152


Kalman C. Szekely
Human Relations Representative

KCS:gp