

4. Zoning Code Revision Meetings

- A. Notification: through ONA coordinators and district planning committees.
- B. Purpose: To provide a forum for detailed discussions of Code revisions proposed in fourth alternatives in order to identify issues to be addressed as part of the Comprehensive Plan.
- C. Meetings:

<u>District</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Attendance</u>
Inner SE	March 7	8
North Portland	March 16	10
Inner NE	March 22	4
NW	March 23	5
Mid SE/Far SE	March 30	
SW/Far SW	April 11	
Far NE		
CBD		

5. District Town Hall Meetings

The distribution of the first four district editions (Inner SE, North Portland, Inner NE, and Northwest) is delayed due to a printing contract problem beyond City control; the town hall meetings for these districts are also delayed. These editions will be mailed the week of April 17, rather than April 3; town hall meetings are scheduled for the second week of June to allow for 30 days notifications, rather than the last week of April. The publication of the last six district editions and town-hall meetings are on schedule.

6. Planning Process

The new planning process was passed by City Council on March 22, 1978.

7. General Citizen Awareness/Education Activities

- A. ADII campaign kick-off
- B. Series of Comprehensive Planning articles in Oregonian
- C. KWJJ (1080 AM) taping - "Probe" - to be heard the weekend of April 1,2, Saturday am or Sunday pm.
- D. CETA grant approved by City Council for general notification of district editions and analysis of responses.

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

March  
1978

1. Special Interest Groups

- A. Notification: February 1, 1978; letter, reply card and City Planner to 150 groups.
- B. Purpose: To provide opportunity for organizations to identify issues and goals, and review and respond to alternatives.
- C. Response: 34 groups returned reply cards; staff followed up with reminder phone calls.
- D. Meetings: March 6 and March 9, 7:30 PM; 20 groups represented. City Planner and City Planner Handbooks distributed, along with a group response process, time schedule and opinion poll.

2. Information Exchanges

- A. Notification: February 27, 1978; 75 flyers posted and mailed to city bureaus and other governmental agencies.
- B. Purpose: To provide the opportunity for city and other agency staff people to share information relevant to the issues that are shaping Portland's future.

<u>C. Meetings</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Attendance</u>
March 10	Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan-Philosophy and Development	23
March 17	Federal Funding for Housing	18
March 24	Economic Development in Portland	22
March 31	Planning in the Region	

3. Neighborhood Planning Kit Distribution

- A. Notification: March 8, 1978; letter to Neighborhood Association Chairpersons (70).
- B. Purpose: To aid Neighborhood Associations in identifying data, inventory, goals, issues, proposals, problems and opportunities for their own area.
- C. Meeting: March 22, 1978; 7:30 PM. Thirteen neighborhood associations represented; kits distributed.
- D. Follow-up: Staff will hand deliver those kits not picked up at the meeting.

5. Oregon Attitudes Survey

Interviewers began field work on April 7th and have completed 350 of the planned 450 interviews; expected completion date, May 1, 1978.

6. Zoning Code Revision Meetings

A. Notification: ~~District meetings through ONA coordinators and district planning committees;~~ March 30, 1978 invitation to 57 city bureaus, other governmental agencies and special interest contacts.

B. Purpose: To provide forum for detailed discussions of Code revisions proposed in fourth alternatives in order to identify issues to be addressed as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

C. Meetings:

<u>District/Other</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Attendance</u>
Far SW/SW Hills District	April 11	12
Far NE District	April 13	8
City Bureaus	April 13	10
Special Interest Groups	April 14	10

7. District Editions

The inserts for the Far SW and SW Hills Districts delivered and mailed the week of April 24 on schedule. Remaining Districts to be delivered and mailed during the first two weeks of May.

8. District Edition and town-hall meeting notification flyer

~~Four CETA people have been hired for preparation of the district editions for mailing.~~ Additionally, 160,000 flyers publicizing the availability of the district editions will be mailed by district beginning the first week of May.

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

April  
1978

1. Special Interest Groups

April 13, 1978, 7:30 PM; follow-up meeting for attendees of March meetings. Representatives from three groups attended. One group submitted a completed Opinion Poll; deadline for submission is May 31, 1978.

2. Open House

A. April 14, 3-5 pm, Bureau of Planning; planned for one Friday afternoon each month.

B. Notification: March 22, 1978 to all neighborhood association chairpersons and contacts; "April Comprehensive Planning News" to all neighborhood association chairpersons, special interest group contacts, Planning Commission, CCI and City Council.

C. Purpose: to provide informal forum for general comprehensive planning discussions.

D. Response: ~~Approximately 12 attended.~~

3. Information Exchanges

A. Notification: April 4, 1978, April agenda sent to 70 governmental agencies, city bureaus, Planning Commission, City Council and CCI.

B. Purpose: to provide opportunity for city and other agency staff people to share information relevant to the issues that are shaping Portland's future.

<u>Meetings</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Attendance</u>
April 7	Neighborhood Plans and the Comprehensive Plan	23
April 21	Portland's Storm and Sanitary Sewer Plans	14
April 28	Crime Prevention and Land Use Planning	

4. Neighborhood Planning Kits

~~55 kits have been distributed, leaving a balance of eight.~~

6. Neighborhood Planning Kits

All kits have been distributed; a workshop was held in early May to provide help to those associations who needed it. 25 neighborhood associations were represented at the May 4th meeting. This neighborhood planning element of the comprehensive planning process, added during the planning process ordinance in March 1978, seems to have satisfactorily addressed a major concern of the neighborhood associations.

7. Media

Media interest has been good recently with KBOO, KEX, KGW radio & T.V., KOAP, KOIN and local newspapers providing coverage on the comprehensive plan and upcoming town hall meetings.

8. CCI Vacancies

The 13-person committee currently has three vacancies; 17 applications have been submitted and a CCI sub-committee will be interviewing during the week of June 19.

**Citizen Involvement Activities**

May  
1978

1. The City Planner: District Editions

34,500 copies have been distributed as follows:

- 15,500 - Neighborhood Association mailing lists
- 3,500 - Phone or mail requests
- 14,000 - Banks
- 1,500 - Misc. (gov't. agencies, media, town-hall mtgs.)

2. Town Hall Meetings

<u>District</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Attendance</u>
Mid SE	5/30/78	70
SW Hills	5/31/78	100
Far SW	6/1/78	35
Far NE	6/5/78	40

3. Special Interest Groups

Three groups - Mazamas, YMCA and Junior League - have returned their polls and responses. Staff is currently soliciting response from the remaining 10 interested groups.

4. Information Exchanges

These Friday afternoon sessions continued during the month of May, with "Regional Planning," "Comprehensive Plan Fourth Alternatives," and "Powell Butte" as topics. Attendance from city and other governmental staff averages 20-25 per meeting.

5. Opinion Poll Returns

Approximately 450 opinion polls have been returned to date. The ratio of returned polls to the number of district editions mailed and distributed is poor. Staff is currently working on some media/press coverage of the poll.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION  
IN  
PORTLAND, OREGON

Presentation Prepared for  
National Conference for  
Neighborhood Coordinators

Mary C. Pedersen  
May 19, 1976

Disclaimer: The statements  
contained herein are the  
observations of the author  
only, and have not been  
endorsed by neighborhood  
associations or by the City  
of Portland.

Portland, Oregon  
Office of Neighborhood Associations  
Coordinator - Mary Pedersen  
City Hall  
1220 S.W. 5th Ave., Portland, Oregon 97204  
(503) 248-4519

The purpose of the Office of Neighborhood Associations is to encourage and stimulate citizen participation. This task is accomplished largely through improving communications: (1) between citizens (as individuals or organized groups) and city officials; (2) among citizens in a neighborhood on matters affecting neighborhood livability.

In Portland, the neighborhood associations date back into the early 1960's. The Office was established in February, 1974. Today there are approximately 45 organized neighborhood associations, of which about two-thirds are active at a given time. Industrial or commercial neighborhood organizations are being formed as well as residential or general membership groups. Four or five areas have not yet organized.

## I. INITIATION

Eight Northeast neighborhoods had Model Cities funds, and 5 Southeast groups had OEO funds. Here staff was available to assist neighborhood groups. The renewal agency also had several field offices. Planning efforts in other areas, however, were difficult to accomplish without assistance to the participating citizens.

The planners proposed a system of district planning organizations. The mayor appointed a task force to study the proposal. The DPO Task Force met for a year and submitted a report in December, 1972. The new Mayor Neil Goldschmidt obtained council support for budget funds for a staff he called Bureau of Neighborhood Organizations. Commissioner Mildred Schwab was given the responsibility of writing an ordinance implementing the proposal. She hired Mary Pedersen who for 4 months worked with neighborhood groups to prepare drafts.

At a meeting of 100 citizens held to review the first draft, it became clear that neighborhoods feared that District Planning Organizations (DPOs) would usurp the role of the neighborhood associations. The task force had tried to answer this concern, by calling for a two tier structure of neighborhood planning organizations (NPOs) and DPOs.

In the second draft of the ordinance, DPOs were to be established by neighborhood organizations if they chose to do so, and would enjoy only those responsibilities delegated to them. In its deliberations, City Council decided that they did not want any structure intervening between bureau officials and neighborhood groups any more than some neighborhoods, so DPOs were deleted from the ordinance.

FINDING 1. Task forces are a good method to begin studying the forms of citizen participation, but they should be asked to study alternatives. If they are established to study a given proposal, they can end up defending that proposal and this reduces their flexibility.



Other provisions of the ordinance were:

- 1 - minimum standards for group membership (open to residents, property owners, business licensees, and representatives of non-profit organizations);
- 2 - one group per area with no overlapping boundaries;
- 3 - groups were asked to notify people when matters directly affecting them were being discussed, and majority views and dissenting views were both to be recorded;
- 4 - formal recognition by Council resolution of groups meeting the standards.

One year later, the ordinance was challenged by groups who did not want to change their membership standards. Council then responded by re-drafting the ordinance to be more flexible.

The recognition process was dropped altogether. Structural standards (such as those for membership and boundaries) were replaced by performance standards (no discrimination, recording dissenting views, dues voluntary). A copy of the ordinance as amended is enclosed.

FINDING 2. Some type of eligibility requirements are essential to guide staff work. Standards should be based on how the groups should or should not behave, rather than on their structures, because structures are not uniform. A consensus on the ways groups should operate is easier to develop.

#### BASIS OF AUTHORITY

The original ordinance passed Council by a 4-1 vote in February, 1974. The amended ordinance passed Council in November, 1975, after 3 hearings.

FINDING 3. Establishing a program by ordinance is quicker than charter changes, and amendments are easier. The existence of the program may not be as secure, but results begin to show more quickly.

#### BUDGET

For fiscal year 1973-74, the Council allocated \$105,000 to begin the program. Only \$25,000 was spent as the implementor and one secretary were the only employees that year.

In FY 1974-75, \$140,000 was approved. The process of writing contracts with neighborhood associations took 6 months, so the implementation was later than anticipated. Expenditures totalled \$80,000.

In FY 1975-76, a six-months budget was approved of \$95,000. After the ordinance was amended, additional funds were allocated for a yearly total of \$177,000.

Recent Council budget hearings saw the approval of a 1976-77 budget of \$187,000 by a vote of 3-2.

These funds are City general funds. The Southeast neighborhoods office (S.E. Uplift) is funded partly through Housing & Community Development funds and partly through local money of the Portland Development Commission. The budget for fiscal year 1975-76 was \$22,891, in local funds, plus HCD monies.

## II. ORGANIZATION AND COMMUNICATION

Neighborhood associations in Portland are regarded as independent, non-profit groups. About 1/3 have formally incorporated. They organize themselves, although they may consult with staff on methods of organizing.

The organizing process usually begins when an individual or a small group approaches ONA to explore the possibility of organizing. Sometimes the pressure of an immediate need or issue will lead to a request for assistance with a flyer or meeting notice. If the group wishes to organize as a neighborhood association, a meeting of 20 to 30 interested people is generally held, and a staff member of ONA will attend to describe techniques used successfully by other groups.

The next step is a larger general meeting. Flyers are prepared by the neighbors and printed by ONA or Southeast Uplift. The citizens are responsible for distribution. At the meeting, the group is encouraged to identify needs or problems and form small groups or committees to discuss what can be done. Subsequent meetings may focus on these issues and bureau officials may be invited to speak to the group. ONA informs the neighbors who to contact in which bureau, and may facilitate the contact.

When bylaws are written and boundaries adopted, the association is placed on the map compiled by ONA, and the chief officer and contact person are listed on the neighborhood list. Thus the group is recognized by this informal process. To be eligible for staff assistance with newsletters and projects, the bylaws must meet the following standards as stated in the ordinance:

3.96.030. Minimum Standards. In order to be eligible to receive the city assistance provided for in this chapter, neighborhood associations must meet the following minimum standards:

(a) Membership. The membership of a neighborhood association shall not be limited by race, creed, color, sex, national origin or income. Dues shall be collected only on a voluntary basis.

(b) Dissent. A neighborhood association shall follow a written procedure by which dissenting views on any issue considered by the neighborhood association shall be recorded and transmitted along with any recommendations made by the association to the city.

(c) Grievances. A neighborhood association shall follow a written procedure whereby persons may request the association to reconsider a decision which adversely affects the person or causes some grievance.

(d) A copy of each association's bylaws shall be kept on file in the Office of Neighborhood Associations.

Neighborhood associations vary in the frequency of meetings. Most associations have a board which meets monthly, and general membership meetings may convene monthly, quarterly, or annually. Several associations have developed strong committee structures---planning, traffic, parks, etc. Elections are usually held annually at a neighborhood meeting, but some groups establish polling places at neighborhood stores.

The ONA staff have been required to find the least expensive, dependable ways of distributing neighborhood newsletters. At the present time, the budget allows for 12 pages (legal size) of printing per neighborhood per year. Neighborhoods with IRS tax deductible status can apply for non-profit mailing permits. ONA reimburses the cost of using the permit for newsletters at 1.8¢ each, plus reproduction of labels. Neighborhoods without non-profit status look for local individuals willing to distribute newsletters at 2¢ per copy. Teenagers and Scout troops have been quick to apply for the work.

Many neighborhoods produce newsletters as needed, a few write them monthly. Neighborhood news is also carried in the weekly papers, as prepared by ONA staff from neighborhood newsletter items.

The Office of Neighborhood Associations sends a newsletter 10 times a year to the officers of neighborhood associations and other interested people. City staff edit the Council agenda for publication in the two major daily newspapers on Monday (prior to meetings on Wednesday and Thursday). Direct notification to property owners within a given distance of zone changes, etc., is carried out by the Auditor's Office. The Bureau of Planning notifies associations of zone change requests in their area.

ONA has co-sponsored two conferences on communications topics covering subjects such as phone systems, block organizations and news conferences. A booklet will be produced soon to aid in neighborhood communications.

### III. CONTENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD PROGRAMS

The most important trend in the last few years seems to be the development of larger volunteer efforts---for cleanup and recycling programs, for door-to-door work signing up property owners for street improvements or tree planting, and for distribution of flyers or rehab information. Another important step has been the development of neighborhood planning.

About one-third of the organized neighborhoods have had some form of

comprehensive planning. Recently the Northwest Plan passed City Council and others are due for hearings soon. Meantime, the Housing & Community Development funds (HCD funds) are being used in about 13 neighborhoods.

The main emphasis of the HCD program has been to stabilize inner-city neighborhoods, especially through cooperation with the lending institutions. Funds are programmed for rehabilitation loans, parks, existing community centers, street and sewer improvements, and a few smaller projects.

City-wide comprehensive planning is due to begin this summer (1976). Local planning will have to meet State goals and standards, and involve citizens at every stage of the process.

Planning for the Arterial Streets Program has been a city-wide effort. Meetings were held in 11 areas of the city, and people were involved in classifying streets for future traffic and transit uses. Over 500 people participated.

Since 1933, steady efforts have been made to build neighborhood requests into the City budget process. At first, citizens were appointed to budget task forces (5), but they really had insufficient time and information for close review. In 1974, nine task forces worked and 7 produced written reports. Meanwhile, 15 neighborhoods sent in 104 budget requests. In 1975, 25 neighborhoods put in 131 budget requests. These requests were sent to both the appropriate bureaus and budget task force. This latter improvement seems to have had a significant impact. (Two plus two equals five.) Evaluation of the 1976-77 budget process gets underway in June.

Needless to say, if a neighborhood request doesn't find its way into the budget process, the request has a low chance of implementation.

FINDING 4. Some system for integrating neighborhood budget requests into the process must be developed to result in an effective system. The requests need to be monitored as they go through the process. The budget process may be too detailed for neighborhood groups to follow closely as a whole. This monitoring function can be performed by committees drawn from nominations made by civic and neighborhood groups, or by other means.

Social welfare activities seem to have developed their own constituents who appear at hearings or budget meetings to advocate for the services. The Bureau of Human Resources focuses on employment, and services to youth and the elderly.

This year six neighborhood advisory committees have been formed around the city to work with the Youth Environmental Program (a DOL-funded summer youth employment program). Neighborhoods are encouraged to work up projects to employ youth, and this year the NACs will have an important role in hiring the supervisors and workers.

Many municipal services are implemented with citizen involvement. The Police have started Precinct Councils (4), the Bureau of Human Resources funds 9 senior centers and 4 youth centers around the city, the Bureau of Neighborhood Environment coordinates meetings with neighborhood groups to try to solve environmental problems involving more than one bureau. Most social services (health, some day care, etc.) are the responsibility of the county or the state.

Self-help efforts are of two kinds. The first type is an effort initiated and carried out by citizen volunteers. This type in Portland includes large recycling and clean-up efforts, building parks, and planting trees. For a while, one set of male volunteers established an escort service for women as part of an anti-rape program. The service was mostly used by older women who feared assaults and purse snatching. Several groups have become increasingly self-reliant. One supports a 16-page monthly paper through ad revenue. The Southeast neighborhoods began a tool-lending library with an ACTION mini-grant, and two neighborhood corporations have won a bicentennial grant to establish volunteer skill banks. Few neighborhood groups have independent sources of financing large enough to support staff.

The second type of self-help projects is that which builds the services of volunteers into staff programs. Hence volunteers in Portland have gone door-to-door signing property owners for street improvements, have carried literature on home rehabilitation (first contact for marketing), done exterior or windshield surveys, prepared maps. These efforts mean not only lower staff costs and less drain on general tax funds. Work done by neighbors means that the first-hand knowledge gleaned by door-to-door activity stays in the neighborhood. This familiarity may grow into an improved intra-neighborhood communications system.

Portland has a long tradition of volunteerism---the only difference lately is that the volunteer efforts show a focus on the small geographic entity of the neighborhood.

#### IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AND POLITICAL RELATIONSHIPS

Portland has a commission form of government. The Council is composed of 5 commissioners, one of whom is the Mayor, first among equals. The only direct power of the mayor is the power to assign bureaus to each commissioner for administrative purposes, and to keep those bureaus which will best implement his/her own program for the city. Each commissioner administers 2 or 3 major bureaus, and a number of smaller efforts. Expenditures larger than \$2,500 must be passed through Council.

According to the charter, all legislative authority resides in the Council and only administrative authority may be delegated. The Planning Commission reviews zone change requests, but their recommendations must be approved by Council. Other decisions, such as variances, are final, unless appealed to City Council. A hearings officer has recently been hired to free the Planning Commission to focus on comprehensive planning.

Committees such as the Budget Task Forces are advisory. Neighborhood associations can act on their own, but any matter requiring legislative action must go through Council, and the neighborhood acts in an advisory capacity. In reality, the degree of neighborhood influence depends upon the amount of homework they do and the soundness of their recommendations. Neighborhoods are required to report dissenting views, and the commissioners will often try to resolve objections at a hearing. For a complex matter, the Council may appoint a mediator or arbitrator.

Bureaus are obliged to notify a neighborhood association of any matter affecting the livability of their area. Policy matters require 30 days notice, unless "waiting 30 days may injure the public health or safety, or would result in a significant financial loss to the city or to the public."

The HCD program, the budget review process, and the open door policies of several commissioners have meant that a great deal of discussion goes on between bureaus and citizens groups before any action is taken. Once action is taken by Council, a bureau may contract with a neighborhood association to carry out a program or to review it. For example, three neighborhoods hold contracts with the City, not only for their neighborhood offices, but also for youth or senior service centers. The contracts provide for a review board to oversee the operations of the facility, but Council retains control of the overall budget. Neighbors may fundraise to supplement the allocation.

The neighborhood program has led to the development of competent, vigorous leaders at the local level. Several of these individuals have run for office, although they seem more successful in running in state legislative districts than for Council, because City elections are at-large.

Coalitions of neighborhood groups exist in:

Northeast - as successor to the Model Cities Board.

Southeast - both in the SE Uplift (all 15 SE neighborhoods sit on this board) and in the Inner-Southeast Coalition (the 7 neighborhoods closest to downtown).

North - the association in North is a federation of 7 smaller neighborhoods.

In Northwest and Southwest, the neighborhood associations each send one representative to the review board which oversees the neighborhood office, but there is no coalition for general issues.

There has been talk of a Congress of Neighborhoods, but as yet (3 years) no action toward establishing one.

Neighborhood bylaws frequently state that the organization will remain non-partisan and non-sectarian. Groups which have tax-exempt status from the IRS are required to avoid taking stands on political races. Newsletters printed by the City can carry no election material because city funds cannot legally be employed for electioneering. Informational

statements about ballot measures may be included in newsletters, if they are objective statements. No endorsements are permitted.

FINDING 5. Legal restrictions on political activities are matched by neighborhood opinion that it is better to avoid partisan strife. The associations were formed to enhance neighborhood livability and these issues alone are sometimes contentious enough to strain intra-neighborhood ties.

#### V. CONCERNS AND ISSUES IN NEIGHBORHOOD PROGRAMS

The Portland neighborhood program has reached the point where creative solutions are needed in four areas: timing, interfacing, communications, citywide programming.

##### 1. Timing

Citizen participation in Portland resembles the chinook salmon runs--- it occurs in the spring and the fall. From February through June, and again from September to Thanksgiving, neighborhoods meet. At the holiday season and during the summer, neighbors meet only if absolutely necessary, knowing that attendance will be slight.

This shortened season can create a certain tension as neighborhoods struggle to handle both their own projects and projects or planning initiated by city bureaus or other agencies.

FINDING 6. In order to enable neighborhoods to work out a flexible and responsive schedule, staff should give neighborhood boards as much advance notice as possible. If possible, neighborhood representatives should be involved in the planning of the City's time schedule, or should at least be consulted by phone. This courtesy will save many problems later. Advance scheduling of events with a regular pattern should be established where appropriate; for example, the budget process should follow a clear time pattern of submitting requests, reviewing priorities, and holding hearings. Staff cannot assume that citizens will automatically know what this predictable schedule is without orientation.

Neighborhoods do not all move at the same pace, and they often have to juggle meeting schedules to be responsive both to their own priorities and staff programming. City staff who have been volunteers in their own neighborhood are often the most sensitive to this problem, while some technicians still regard their projects as so important that all groups should want to give it top priority. Coordination among the bureaus can help to work out some of the problem, but if staff cannot include neighborhood leaders in the process of setting time schedules where possible, then neighborhood groups can hardly be criticized for being unresponsive. The questions are: How can planning and programming be arranged so that schedules are economical with people's time, and how can the workload be met without getting people "meetinged out"?

## 2. Interfacing

For the purpose of this discussion, interfacing is defined as the process whereby relationships between volunteers and staff are set up so that they mesh easily in working with one another. When staff meets downtown to review proposals initiated out in the neighborhoods, the possibilities of misunderstandings, and fruitless and frustrating discussions are too high. In 1975, neighborhood advisory committees met and struggled with guidelines for the summer youth employment program. Projects were proposed and sent to staff for review. Staff did not clearly understand all the ideas for projects, which placed some staff people in defensive or advocacy positions. After two rounds of meetings, work began later than it should have, and in a rather disorganized fashion. In 1976, staff met with a group of representatives from each advisory committee; in one meeting, 14 people revised and clarified the guidelines. Clearer proposals were sent to a review meeting of the same integrated group, supervisors were hired earlier and there was time for orientation before hiring the young workers.

In the budget review process of 1975, neighborhoods filled out budget request forms and sent them to the capital improvements planning staff for review. A good number of projects slipped between the cracks. In 1976, the groundwork was laid earlier, and budget requests upon receipt at ONA were routed to the appropriate bureau and to the budget task force (citizen review committee) for that bureau. The task forces include some citizens nominated by neighborhood groups. The end result was a more fruitful stage for discussion of bureau priorities, and a more careful tracking of what happened to neighborhood requests.

This problem is not resolved for all issue areas in Portland. Nevertheless, an awareness of the need for interfacing can open the door to more productive relationships. The question is: how can citizen-staff relationships be set up so the parties can meet as partners in problem-solving? What works for the employment program might not work for the budget process, and a good deal of deft tailoring is needed. For some issues, written letters may be good answers, and in other cases, a full-fledged council hearing may be the only way to sift through countering points of view. But most programs merely need a common ground for citizens and staff to meet as equal members of the community.

## 3. Communications

In a city with many cultural and sporting events competing for people's attention, how can City Council and their staff get through a message about the importance of and the schedule for planning or other matters? How can neighbors reach other neighbors? Newsletters help, the publication of an edited version of the council agenda in the newspapers help, neighborhood newspapers or newsletters help, but the written word does not seem to be sufficient. Media time is expensive, public service spots are short, and public service programs are on the air at odd times.



It probably goes without saying that the messages must be short and appealing. Staff has found that the more personal the contact, the more effective the message. Newsletters are okay, written letters are better, phone calls are better still, and a personal visit can be the best method of all. It is also true that the more personal the contact, the more people are needed to complete a given number of contacts. So one person can produce a newsletter, half a dozen can coordinate a telephone tree, dozens may be needed to accomplish a door-to-door project.

On the other hand, how can citizens be sure that their communications do not become a nuisance? Can swift and accurate message communication systems be set up? What does it take to make block communication systems work?

This subject is on the frontier of neighborhood programming. It could provide grist for many theses and complicated studies, or the answers may be as close as summer street festivals and fairs in the parks.

#### 4. Citywide Programming

If we agree that the one problem the authors of the Federalist Papers did not foresee was the increase in scale of our society, and if we agree that neighborhood programming is one way to approach the re-introduction of a more human scale, then we need to think not only about how to ~~make~~ neighborhoods speak for themselves. We need to be concerned about how to take a problem that affects every neighborhood, or a majority of them, and bring it to the neighborhood level without too much fragmentation and staff overtime. In Portland, staff and neighbors have begun to work on this problem through: trying to arrange that city committees have a balanced representation from the different areas of the city, the formation of neighborhood coalitions or joint committees, decentralizing the hearing process to the 5 major districts of the city without going as far as holding a meeting in all 45 neighborhoods, by all-neighborhood meetings where representatives are asked to carry the information back to their own neighborhood for review.

The method of all-neighborhoods meeting seems to work in a situation where briefing is needed, and not so well for decision meetings. Most neighborhood representatives do not want to cast a vote until they have had a chance to consult with their board or general membership.

District meetings work at the committee level, but do not work as well for general assemblies of people on a common problem. When a meeting is held outside the neighborhood, what staff can generally expect is that the neighborhood will send out its scouts and not its troops. Once again, this type of meeting is not too useful for decision-making, but it can be used for opinion soundings, and for brainstorming, and for discussion leading to the identification of alternative courses of action.

## VI. THE PORTLAND EXPERIENCE

Portland enjoys a relatively open political climate. What we have learned in and about Portland will probably not apply to Chicago or Phoenix. Here are some observations which may be useful.

Citizens and staff have complementary kinds of knowledge. Staff has the professional training to recognize symptoms and should have some ideas about alternative courses to resolve problems. Citizens have the intimate familiarity with a neighborhood territory, resources, and social networks to supply staff with needed information, and to have a pretty good idea about which possible solution may work in a given area.

People in some areas are more ready to volunteer for work projects than in others, and it makes a difference whether the project is initiated by the neighborhood or by staff. We still do not know all the factors behind that readiness, but we do know that citizens of both high and low incomes are willing to take on part of the work in Portland.

Citizen volunteers do not like being overworked or used, but only they can tell you whether or not they wish to be involved in a given project. It is best to ask. On the other hand, in some situations, the same people are consulted all the time, and soon become professional citizens at some distance from the grass roots.

Neighborhoods need equitable, fair and responsive treatment. Equal treatment can hardly reflect questions of need and budgetary limitations. If equitable treatment is sought, staff must be prepared to publish their guidelines in draft form and consult with citizens as partners before the guidelines are adopted.

Using more than one medium of communication is desirable in order to get a message through. Different people respond to different media, and in any case, it sometimes takes more than one message to have the message sink in. A direct letter combined with newspaper coverage and follow-up phone calls is a good combination. However, it is too great an investment of work for some projects even using volunteers. Another combination is newsletters, mixed with public service announcements. Ask yourself: who is the audience we are trying to reach? What is their natural and pre-existing form of communicating? How can we work our message into that system? How can the message be phrased so that it will be assimilated? Two-way communication interchanges are much more effective and desirable than one-way communications, but they are usually used only on the small scale because of the large time investment required.

Staff cannot expect the participation of all of the people all of the time. One can hope for many people most of the time. But if staff are not successful in reaching at least some of the people most of the time, there is something wrong with the program.

Minutes from the City-Wide Citizen Participation Working Committee Meeting on November 3, 1978

Members Present: James Loving, Chairman; Ed Leek, Sharon Roso, Don MacGillivray, Mary Boyle, Larry Day, and Dell Taylor

Staff Present: Joe Gross

Mary Pedersen presented charts which showed citizen participation funds used in the City - both ongoing and one-time expenditures. Information for these charts was obtained by Joe Gross and by Mary.

Joe Gross reported that as many of the ODOT projects requiring citizen participation had been identified with the information presented at this meeting. Note was made that salaries were not included.

Ed Leek submitted a letter to the Committee which represents the position of the Committee. In the form that it was presented to the Committee, it presumed that Measure #6 would pass. Staff should insert appropriate wording when retyping the letter to reflect the outcome of the election.

Four alternatives were adopted to be included in the letter:

- 1) All citizen participation efforts should be coordinated through contract to the Office of Neighborhood Associations. Special projects will also be coordinated under ONA.
- 2) Individual services should be contracted out by ONA and the individual neighborhood offices. Committee wants to keep the distinction between neighborhood offices and the downtown office.
- 3) All City services should be consolidated in the neighborhood offices and disbursed from there.
- 4) Neighborhood controlled Local Development Corporations should be created.

At the request of the Committee, Joe prepared a draft of a letter to go to the legislators inviting them to a work session to discuss the Missouri Plan for adoption in Oregon. Letter should be corrected to say that Missouri Plan is modeled after Pennsylvania plans.

James Loving suggested that at the end of Ed Leek's letter, a notation should be added that "we realize that Council will be considering several alternatives in light of the tax situation and consider this alternative as they consider others". He asked that staff retype Mr. Leek's letter and insert the appropriate wording.

Sharon Roso suggested that the Committee ask Council to examine the letters before they are presented to legislators at a work session.

November 5, 1978

Revised list of Board Members, Eastmoreland Neighborhood Association, following the election of October 12, 1978.

TERM EXPIRING IN 1979 (elected September 20, 1976)

Ralph G. Alberger.....	7326 S.E. Reed College Place	774-4298
Ralph Coleman.....	2923 S.E. Tolman Street	774-7446
Paul A. Eckelman.....	2835 S.E. Lambert Street	771-9362
Mrs. Sally McCracken.....	6215 S.E. Reed College Place	774-7120
Mrs. Carolyn McMurchie.....	7709 S.E. 31st Avenue	775-6259
James K. Neill.....	6428 S.E. Reed College Place	777-3792
John Stryker.....	7530 S.E. 35th Avenue	774-6031

TERM EXPIRING IN 1980 (elected September 22, 1977)

Mrs. Pat Beadling.....	7716 S.E. 27th Avenue	771-8552
Ray C. Guimary.....	6707 S.E. 34th Avenue	771-6081
Elizabeth Joseph.....	7110 S.E. 29th Avenue	774-4732
Gary W. Lindberg.....	7351 S.E. 35th Avenue	777-3513
George Okamoto.....	2756 S.E. Bybee Blvd.	777-1363
Mrs. Sonnie Russill.....	7020 S.E. 34th Avenue	775-6282
William H. White.....	7429 S.E. 28th Avenue	774-4358

TERM EXPIRING IN 1981 (elected October 12, 1978)

Mrs. Beverly Burnett.....	6319 S.E. 30th Avenue	775-8880
Don Carlson.....	6555 S.E. 34th Avenue	771-7623
Mrs. Janet Clark.....	6060 S.E. 32nd Avenue	774-3334
Eugene Feltz.....	3616 S.E. Bybee Blvd.	771-9158
Samuel Moment.....	2916 S.E. Woodstock Blvd.	771-5607
Sam Pierce.....	6314 S.E. 32nd Avenue	774-7914
Donald Riddle.....	7017 S.E. 28th Avenue	777-2171

Copies of announcements to be mailed also to Miss Mary Pedersen, Office of Neighborhood Associations, 1220 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Room 412, Portland, Oregon 97204.

Alfred F. Parker, honorary board member, 3017 S.E. Tolman, Portland, OR 97202.

CITY-WIDE WORKING COMMITTEE ON CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

A Report

Committee Members:

James Loving, Chairman  
John Werneken  
Sharon Roso  
Larry Day  
Dell Taylor  
Robert Taylor  
Don MacGillivray  
Mary Boyle  
Ed Leek  
Bob Johnson

December 4, 1978

In anticipation of cuts in the Office of Neighborhood Association's budget if Ballot Measure 6 passed, a city-wide meeting was held on September 21 to discuss the future of the Office of Neighborhood Associations and its citizen participation support services. Some 35 participants from all areas of the City agreed that those support services are vital to both the City and the neighborhoods and should be sustained, and that a city-wide working committee should be established to that end. The Committee was charged with the responsibility of determining the range of citizen participation activities now supported by area governmental bodies, and with identifying alternative funding sources for neighborhood associations.

The City-wide Working Committee on Citizen Participation, with assistance from the Office of Neighborhood Associations and from Commissioner Jordan's Office, has undertaken those responsibilities. An additional effort it has undertaken is to identify the support services that citizens now provide to government in terms of the value of their participation in the process of governing. That participation, without which government would be paralyzed, is as important to government as the support services government provides to citizens.

The Committee learned that the city (including PDC), the county, the school district, CRAG, Tri-Met, and the Port together spend over \$1,000,000 annually for ongoing efforts to involve citizens. Another \$805,000 has been or will be spent on special projects such as crime prevention and the study of the Banfield alternatives, spread over a three year period.

The coordinators in the neighborhood offices worked with citizens to identify how many citizen hours were involved in meetings alone during a "typical month". The figures show that nearly 10,000 citizen-hours a month are coordinated through the City's neighborhood offices alone. Time invested in volunteer work outside meetings or in special projects coordinated by the school district, Tri-Met, or other agencies are not included in this total. Clearly, government is receiving quite a return on its investment.

Nevertheless, the Committee does not argue that the level of funding be increased at this time. Instead, we suggest that a more comprehensive, agency-wide approach to citizen participation will yield greater results for the same dollars. Further, we believe that a more comprehensive approach to citizen participation, as opposed to the present fragmented system may even allow cuts to be made in some citizen participation budgets without hindering the citizen participation process itself, if such extreme measures are necessary as a result of future legislative action.

The Committee has arrived at recommendations to provide for this more comprehensive approach. These recommendations are:

- 1) Relevant city services should be consolidated in the neighborhood offices and be disbursed from there. For example, much of the work of the Portland Development Commission, the Bureau of Neighborhood Environment, the Bureau of Planning, and street maintenance should be provided from the neighborhood offices.
- 2) A management strategy of assigned field days should be used, making centralized staff (such as with street lighting) available to the public in the neighborhood offices at regularly scheduled times. Through inter-agency agreement, the Neighborhood Coordinator should be able to respond to citizen requests by scheduling additional field days. With special projects (such as the comprehensive plan) staff should be available in the field at key times.
- 3) All agencies' efforts for city-wide citizen participation should be coordinated through the Office of Neighborhood Associations under inter-agency agreements. Specific services such as answering the telephone, minute-taking, or public notification should be contracted to the individual neighborhood office concerned. The distinction between neighborhood offices and the downtown office should be kept.
- 4) Neighborhood-based corporations should be established (as neighborhood-controlled corporations) to respond to community needs. The development corporations should be co-located and coordinated with the neighborhood offices. The Office of Neighborhood Associations should be directed to develop a strategy with the neighborhood associations for establishing such development corporations.

An additional source of funding for the citizen participation process identified by the Committee is modeled after the Missouri and Pennsylvania Neighborhood Assistance Programs. In those programs, state tax credits are given to businesses who contribute in financial ways to neighborhoods and community services. The Committee recommends that an Oregon version of this program be drafted in cooperation with State Legislators, and submitted to the legislature with the support of Council and other bodies.

We believe that a more comprehensive citizen participation process combined with a State-funded Neighborhood Assistance Program will ensure that vital citizen participation support services will be more effective to citizens and local government.



## STATE OF OREGON

## INTEROFFICE MEMO

ODOT - METRO

238-8460

DEPT.

TELEPHONE

TO: The File

DATE: January 29, 1979

FROM:

*Stephen D. Crouch*  
Stephen D. Crouch  
Project Coordinator

SUBJECT:

Powell Phase II  
Citizens Advisory Committee meeting  
January 23, 1979

Richard Binger, CAC Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm in the ODOT Metro office. The 16 persons on the attached list attended. The meeting's purpose was to review the additional studies done in preparation for the February 1, 1979 City Council hearing.

Three studies have been developed and were available to the Citizens Advisory Committee. They are:

1. Draft hearing study report
2. Commercial Redevelopment under Alternative 2
3. House Moving

The draft hearing study report is a summary of all project development to date, it included: an opinion of the project's direction, project background, public hearing analysis, typical section, summary of the environmental impacts, a hearing map, a list of citizens and technical advisory committee membership, a hearing transcript, and project newsletters. It concluded that the favored alternative is #2.

Commercial redevelopment under alternative #2 study was undertaken to determine how to implement that aspect of the design. Alternative #2 seeks to achieve an organized pattern of commercial redevelopment on the south side of the street between SE 50th and 82nd Avenues. The main objective is to integrate redevelopment with the design of the street improvements and land uses on the north side of the street. Other objectives are, to encourage unified redevelopment of the cleared land within a reasonable time following completion of the street improvements and, to retain local markets and other neighborhood oriented businesses on Powell.

The report concludes that the City of Portland could undertake a redevelopment program at the same time that the Oregon Department of Transportation improves the street. Under this program the city would re-zone parts of the south side of the street, apply design controls to the new development, and provide assistance to businesses displaced by the street project that wish to remain on Powell. To encourage redevelopment, the program would also include an urban renewal project to purchase and assemble the three sites where ownership is fragmented. They would be re-sold to commercial developers when the street project is finished.

**RECEIVED**

JAN 30 1978



The house moving study began with the premise that as proposed, the Powell Boulevard Phase II project would displace 24-33 single family houses that are considered suitable for moving. The exact number of these houses depends on which alternative improvement plan is selected. It is likely that all or most of them would be moved to a new location by the private housing market.

It would be desirable to move the houses to the vacant Mt. Hood corridor surplus properties owned by the Oregon Department of Transportation. There are enough of the surplus lots in the city to accommodate all the displaced houses that are suitable for moving.

The study lays out a method for accomplishing the house moving objective if the city and state wish to do so.

The meeting was then thrown open for comments and concerns from the CAC members.

Left turn refuge locations with alternatives #2 and #3 are still a concern of local businessmen, some adjustments may be necessary in the final design phase. Three factors will be involved in any changes considered: city transportation needs, state transportation needs and business access needs.

Leland Armstrong, dentist located at 5607 SE Powell asked that consideration be given to providing a east-bound to north-bound left turn refuge at 56th to serve his office and provide access to Franklin High School. Businessmen generally feel that a continuous left turn refuge would be most desirable with any plan considered.

Frank Trullinger of Stewart Sandwiches located at 5037 SE Powell related his difficulty with truck loading access. He has problems with the present situation and felt that it would be impossible with any of the build alternatives. It was suggested that perhaps vacating 51st north of Powell would help both his situation and the auto repair business across the street.

None of the build options would take the Stewart Sandwiches building but Trullinger would rather that were the case. He feels that alternative #3 is best for business. Ernie Munch suggested the possibility of recommending Trullinger's location as an urban renewal area.

812 -

Richard Binger expressed some interest in redevelopment site 11, a location that affects the Green Shutters Tavern, his place of employment. The Portland Development Commission's representative, Mark Davis, said that PDC can allow a specific business to purchase a specific redevelopment site. This should allow displaced businesses who desire to remain in the area an opportunity to do so.

All CAC members were invited to attend the Portland City Council hearing on this project to be held at the City Hall after 2 pm on February 1, 1979.

SDC/PE

Attachment

cc: CAC  
TAC  
D.R. Adams  
J.D. McClure  
E.J. Dunn  
L. Oseran-Wyden  
Bill Blosser, CH2M/Hill  
Interested Parties

Powell Phase 2

1-23-79

PROJECT

DATE

Citizens Advisory Committee

ODOT Metro Office

TYPE OF MEETING

PLACE

NAME	REPRESENTING	GUEST NAME & ADDRESS
Steve Crouch	ODOT 238-8160	
RICHARD BINGER	CHAIRMAN POWELL REV CAN	775 0730 8012 SE POWELL
Paul H. Madison		5205 SE Powell Powell Park
D L Denson		8318 S E Holgate
Marie Brown		3323 SE 71st
Frank H. Tullings		5037 SE Powell
DAVID KAPLAN - RICHMOND VA.		2033 SE 35th PL
Uni. W/C Club	ODOT	Metro-
Keland E. Armstrong DMD		5607 SE Powell Blvd.
Mark Travis		PDC
Betty Ream		5815 SE Rhine Foster Powell N A 97206
Ruth Montgomery		3811 SE 76th Ave
Doris C. East		3829 SE 76th
Louis C. Kiser		5015 S. E Rhine
Don Callery		2640 S E 78th Ave
Erise Munch	BoP	

Lee  
are all  
these people  
on mailing  
list?

Mary P.  
for your  
info  
Julie

COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT October, 1978

✓ Sam Anderson 7215 SE 34th Portland, 97202	Home: 777-5369 Work: 224-5473	Attorney
✓ Berta Delman 7325 SW Gable Park Rd. Portland, 97225	Home: 292-2349 Work: 221-0984	LWV, Council of Jewish Women, CUE
✓ Sheila Driscoll 7106 N. Alta Portland, 97203	Home: 286-3853 Work: 286-8228	North Portland Citizens Committee
✓ Martha Fah 2129 NW Northrup, #7 Portland, 97210	Home: 223-6917 Work: 644-2191	Beaverton Planning Dept.
✓ Michael L. Farley 2812 NE Stanton Portland, 97212	Home: 281-9132 Work: 228-3047	Oregon Common Cause
✓ Mel Hamilton 5532 NE Cleveland Portland, 97211	Home: 283-2752	Humboldt Neighborhood Association
✓ James Harris 1907 NE Ridgewood Dr. Portland, 97212	Home: 282-2785 Work: 223-9147	CRAG Citizens Committee
✓ Richard Hartnack 44 DaVinci Lake Oswego, 97034	Home: 636-9586 Work: 225-2653	Banking
✓ Tim Kehoe 9810 SW 34th Place #1 Portland, 97219	Home: 246-5681 Work: 223-8309	Advertising
✓ Robert Ruiz (Chairperson) 1525 NE 41st Portland, 97232	Home: 287-6362 Work: 248-3356	Housing
✓ Peg Slauson 2606 NW Westover Rd. Portland, 97210	Home: 227-6074 Work: 221-1900	Real Estate
Peter Stiven (Vice-Chairperson) 1708 NW 25th Portland, 97210	Home: 227-0026 Work: 224-4444	Marketing, Budget Advisory Committee, OPD
✓ Betty Walker 3124 NE 17th Portland, 97212	Home: 281-1768 Work: 771-1112 (ex. 261)	Sabin Community Association

Staff: Julie Nelson, Bureau of Planning, 424 SW Main St. 97204  
248-4260

to: Mary  
From: Julie

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

JUNE  
1978

1. Town Hall Meetings

<u>District/Group</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Attendance</u>
Mid SE	5/30/78	70
SW Hills	5/31/78	100
Far SW	6/1/78	35
Far NE	6/5/78	40
Far SE	6/7/78	35
Downtown/Lld.Ctr.	6/8/78	10
North Portland	6/12/78	50
Inner SE	6/13/78	60
Northwest	6/14/78	30
Inner NE	6/15/78	20
"Make-up" meeting	6/19/78	12
Special Interest Groups	6/22/78	8

RECEIVED  
JUN 30 1978

At least two, and in most cases three, members of the Planning Commission were present at each meeting to hear and respond to citizen testimony. One member of the Committee for Citizen Involvement was also present to assist the staff and to evaluate citizen participation in this phase of the process.

Summaries of the town hall meeting testimony are available.

2. District Editions

An additional 175 district editions were mailed during the month of June bringing the total distributed to over 34,600.

3. Opinion Polls/Citizen Response

Due to the low return of the opinion polls through May 1978 (450), 3,500 "reminder" flyers were mailed on June 15, 1978, to those people who had requested a district edition by either mail or phone. Additionally, a public service announcement was sent to radio stations in an effort to solicit the return of the polls.

The total return of polls to date is 837, which is a substantial improvement.

The polls, along with the town hall meeting testimony, the district workshop reports and other citizen response, are being analyzed and will be presented in a results report to be available in mid August.

4. Special Interest Groups

In addition to the group responses returned in May, three groups read statements into the record at the special interest group town hall meeting (1000 Friends, Mazamas and Portland Tenants Union) and the Portland Association of Teachers hand-delivered their response the following day. The City Club has discussed responding to the first draft of the plan and will be devoting time to this task during the next 6-8 months.

5. CCI Vacancies

The membership sub-committee and Sarah Hartley, Planning Commission member, interviewed eight applicants and selected three potential new members, subject to the approval of the president of the Planning Commission, Mryon Katz.