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A Code for All Portlanders: Writing Racial, Disability, and Social Justice into the Office of Community & Civic Life

Executive Summary

THE CITY OF PORTLAND took a momentous step in recognizing Portlanders’ interest and participation in government by creating the Office of Neighborhood Associations. Since our bureau’s establishment over 45 years ago, our functions have evolved and so has our name. In 1996 we were renamed the Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI) and in 2018, our bureau went through another transformation and changed our title to its current name—The Office of Community & Civic Life (Civic Life). While our role in City government continues to grow, the heart of our mission remains the same: to open the doors of City Hall to the insights of communities and to create opportunities for civic leaders to emerge. This report reflects our shared purpose in building a more inclusive and equitable Portland and is another important step in the history of Civic Life’s continuous development.
A 2016 audit of the Community and Neighborhood Involvement Center of the then Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI), found that ONI did not hold grantees accountable, core tasks remained incomplete, and roles and responsibilities were based on an “outdated City Code, standards, and funding model.” In addition, the audit found that City Code Chapter 3.96, the Code that describes the functions of the bureau, only names three types of groups for “recognition” and “acknowledgement”—a significant gap that does not reflect the diversity that already exists within Civic Life programs and the broader Portland community.

However, the calls for change began long before 2016. The gap between ONI structures, functioning, and the broader Portland community has been a focus of critique for three decades. In 1994, a Task Force on Neighborhood Involvement made similar calls for increased inclusion and more representative civic engagement structures. Throughout these calls for change, Portland has continued to grow, diversify and be shaped by race, income, and other equity dimensions. Racial, Disability and social justice continue to demand the City’s focus and investment.

On July 18, 2018, the bureau was renamed the Office of Community & Civic Life. The new name, visual identity, and messaging were another step in an ongoing process to better express the mission, programs, and communities the bureau serves. For example, adding “community” to our name signals that our programming is inclusive of all Portlanders and adding “civic” highlights our role in engaging the public in local government. On July 18, 2018, Portland’s city council also adopted Resolution 37373, which called for Civic Life to reaffirm “its commitment and responsibility to engage ALL Portlanders” and recommend changes to City Code Chapter 3.96 to include “a unified set of culturally-responsive practices for engaging a diverse range of community partners; an updated description of the Bureau’s responsibilities; and a set of voluntary guidelines that represent best practices for civic engagement.”

Thus, began a process to update the current City Code Chapter 3.96 to represent the functions, responsibilities, and constituencies of Civic Life as well as create a framework that reflects Portlanders’ complex relationship with their city government.

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY & CIVIC LIFE MISSION

Promoting a culture of civic engagement by connecting and supporting all Portlanders working together and with government to build inclusive, safe and livable neighborhoods and communities.

The Code Change Process

In 2005, City Council adopted Civic Life’s current Chapter 3.96 based on the work and recommendations of a volunteer committee called the Guidelines Review, Empowerment and Assessment Team (GREAT). The committee was comprised of 13 individuals from 8 neighborhood associations, 3 district coalitions, 1 business district association, and 1 at-large community member (see appendix).

Thirteen years later, Civic Life convened a volunteer committee to update Chapter 3.96 language. Calling themselves the Committee 3.96, the 25-members represent a broad and diverse cross-section of Portlanders. It includes civic
leaders and entrepreneurs from the three types of groups named in the current Chapter 3.96—neighborhood associations, district coalitions, business district associations (6 of 25 members)—as well as faith-based and disability communities, nonprofits serving specific communities and issues, local business, youth organizations, and more. Many of the committee members also had experience working in and with various levels of government.

The committee’s work spanned eight public meetings over nine months. This timeframe enabled the committee to analyze and discuss data collected through multiple sources and collaborate on the proposed language contained in this report.

In parallel with the Committee’s work, Civic Life developed a multi-faceted, multilingual, multicultural, and intergenerational engagement plan that sought to inform the public and gather feedback. This included:

- 3 citywide surveys distributed through:
  - Civic Life updates;
  - New partnerships such as Bridgeliner, Partners in Diversity (an affiliate of the Portland Business Alliance Charitable Institute), and Portland Bureau of Emergency Management; and
  - Existing relationships with district coalitions: 5 which are grant-funded nonprofit organizations and 2 which are city-staffed
- 26 email updates, which were sent to a 4,000+ subscriber list, with information about the process, meeting dates, and FAQs;
- 5 language-specific community meetings (English, Spanish, Somali, Vietnamese and Russian);
- 1 community convening to introduce different community networks to each other
- Presentations to 16 neighborhood associations about the process and proposed code change language;
- 2 presentations hosted by district coalitions;
- Partnerships with David Douglas and Parkrose High Schools resulting in 2 youth multimedia projects; and
- Dozens of meetings in 3 languages at existing community groups gatherings.
- Provided briefings to 12 City bureaus about the work and opportunities for collaboration.

The New Proposed Code

The proposed Chapter 3.96 language acknowledges the complexity and range of functioning within Civic Life and recognizes the role civic engagement plays in building an inclusive city. This includes an honest recognition of our government’s history and origins, how this has shaped communities’ relationships with their city government, and the City of Portland’s responsibility to deliver more racially and socially just outcomes.

Since its creation in 1974, Civic Life has been positively shaped by community-led and social movements which has expanded its capacity to serve Portlanders including, but not limited to, neighborhood associations. Today, Civic Life supports Portlanders in the many ways they organize and includes programming for community safety, immigrants and refugees, cannabis, liquor licensing, and more.

The volunteer efforts of community members have shaped the City of Portland since its earliest days. Civic Life thanks all individuals—and the families and communities that support them—for their contribution to the continuous development of the bureau over the decades.
The Office of Community & Civic Life is a multi-faceted bureau supporting a diverse range of civic and regulatory needs. Chapter 3.96 must reflect the breadth of Civic Life’s functions and mission.

The new code proposed by the Code Change Committee:

- Holds government accountable for delivering racially and socially inclusive outcomes through community and civic engagement;
- Names the people of Portland (not types of groups) as whom Civic Life serves and respects their choices for how they engage with their communities; and
- Maintains the notifications, benefits and privileges that neighborhood associations, district coalitions, and business districts currently receive as recognized organizations.

Conclusion
We’ve learned a lot about civic engagement since 1974 and we’ll continue to learn and evolve our processes over time. The City Code Chapter 3.96 proposed by Committee 3.96 reflects the input of thousands of people and dozens of communities that have never felt they had a voice in their city government. Writing this new language into city code affirms their faith in the potential for a more inclusive and equitable Portland. Most importantly, it establishes a foundation by which all Portlanders can share a role in shaping the future of our city.

Introduction: A Call to Leadership

PEOPLE-POWERED ACTIVISM is our shared heritage in Portland. In each era, Portlanders have redefined accessibility and accountability from their government. In 1974, the idea for government to partner with individual neighborhoods through the creation of the Office of Neighborhood Associations was a response to the closed-door politics of the times and was a hoped-for remedy for the deficiencies of an at-large voting system that failed to represent all five quadrants of Portland.

Similarly, culturally-specific organizations, identity communities, and many other groups of Portlanders have built histories here and organized to demand more inclusive services that enriched our city in countless ways. Thanks to the efforts of many communities, we are a city that celebrates Pride. We are a sanctuary city. We are a city that stands united against fascism and hate. All these avenues of engagement have helped to establish Portland's reputation as one of the most civically-engaged cities in the U.S.

We are proud of our activist history. Yet, over the last 50 years, we’ve also seen the limitations of our previous actions to end discrimination and exclusion. Our progress has exposed gaps between our values as a community and how we live in our city day by day. The challenge before us today—as in every era—is whether we are willing to change our government structures and systems to be accountable to every community in Portland. We have an obligation to acknowledge how our history has shaped government systems to center the experience and wisdom of only some constituents while marginalizing others.

In November 2018, Civic Life—against this backdrop and responding to decades-long community calls for change, a 2016 audit, and the resulting Resolution 37373—began the process to update City Code Chapter 3.96.

A new code for the 21st century required that we apply what we have learned about civic engagement from previous processes. The objective this time was to engage a diverse cross-section of Portlanders and employ practices that center lived experience and build in flexibility to learn and adapt along the way. The plan was multifaceted, multilingual, multicultural, and intergenerational. Civic Life strove to ensure that each engagement was open to all Portlanders and that interpretation—for English and non-English speakers—was available.

The result of this engagement, which brought together a cross-section of Portlanders to offer experiences, ideas, and constructive criticism, is a proposed code designed to serve all Portlanders. It is a shared vision for how Civic Life must better serve individuals, groups, and communities to engage with their government.

The proposed Code:

- Holds government accountable for delivering racially and socially inclusive outcomes through community and civic engagement;
- Names the people of Portland (not types of groups) as whom Civic Life serves and respects their choices for how they engage with their communities; and
- Maintains the notifications, benefits and privileges that neighborhood associations, district coalitions, and business districts currently receive as recognized organizations.

Next Step: Resolution for Policy Review of Cross-References for Public Involvement

For 45 years, Chapter 3.96 has indelibly shaped citywide approaches to public involvement by naming neighborhood associations, district coalitions and business district associations as the bureau’s only recognized groups. Other bureaus have followed suit in their own sections of code and have codified benefits and privileges to these recognized groups in the form of notifications, appeals and waivers, exemptions, committee appointments, and more.

A resolution is proposed to convene a multi-bureau workgroup that will be tasked with conducting a broader policy review of cross-referenced responsibilities for public involvement in citywide code. This workgroup will be staffed and coordinated by Civic Life and will present to Council its recommendations for updating public involvement practices so all Portlanders can be equitably served. Until these more equitable systems are proposed and adopted by Council, all existing benefits and privileges to recognized organizations will be maintained.

Conclusion

We’ve learned a lot about civic engagement since 1974 and we’ll continue to learn and evolve our processes over time. The City Code Chapter 3.96 proposed by Committee 3.96 reflects the input of thousands of people and dozens of communities that have never felt they had a voice in their city government. Writing this new language into city code affirms their faith in the potential for a more inclusive and equitable Portland. Most importantly, it establishes a foundation by which all Portlanders can share a role in shaping the future of our city.
civic engagement to emerge. It is an opportunity to continue to grow and evolve as a city, to keep demanding more from ourselves and our leaders.

The Unrealized Promise in Our History

Native Lands
Since time immemorial, Native peoples have called this place home. This has been a region of prosperity since before European colonization, when members of the Multnomah, Wasco, Cowlitz, Kathlamet, Clackamas, Chinook, Tualatin, Kalapuya, Molalla, and many other peoples’ established seasonal camps for hunting and gathering food.¹ Before the creation of the state of Oregon, the U.S. government acknowledged Native nations in the northwest through the Northwest Ordinance of 1789.

“I’m proud that the code actually references the colonial origins of Portland because there’s no way to move forward without recognizing that history.”

-KRISTEN GALLAGHER, CODE CHANGE COMMITTEE MEMBER

The Seeds of Exclusion

As the U.S. began to establish Oregon, first as a territory, then as a state, white supremacist ideas influenced the formation of its governments. In the years leading up to the U.S. Civil War, both pro-slavery and anti-slavery advocates saw Oregon as an opportunity to tip the national debate over slavery in their favor. Oregon’s political leaders in the 1840s and 1850s adopted what they called a “popular sovereignty” philosophy, which was both anti-Black and anti-slavery.² This thinking led to the 1844 Exclusion Act, which required Black Oregonians to leave the state under penalty of corporal punishment and indentured servitude. In 1857, exclusion was codified in the Bill of Rights of the Oregon Constitution. That law stipulated that people of African-American or Chinese descent, who moved to Oregon after the state’s constitution was adopted, were to be removed from the state.

Portlanders of conscience understood the fundamental wrongness of those early exclusion laws. When the Oregon Territory attempted to expel Abner and Lynda Francis under the 1849 Exclusion Law, many prominent Oregonians, including Thomas Dryer, the publisher of the Oregonian, and future U.S. Senator H.W. Corbett, petitioned the territory to repeal the law. Unfortunately, the culture of white supremacy was strong in the early days of Oregon and, while the Francis family was not forced to leave, the law was not repealed until 1926. Other racist language in the Oregon Constitution was not removed until 2002.

Failures of Leadership

After the U.S. Civil War ended official slavery, Oregon and Portland had an opportunity to lead the nation as a land of freedom and opportunity for all. For many generations, our forebears failed to recognize this potential.

As Portland grew in the early 20th century, covenants written into the deeds of houses in Laurelhurst, Mock Crest, Raleigh Hills, and many other neighborhoods explicitly excluded people of color from purchasing or residing in those homes.³ In neighborhoods where no explicit covenants existed, neighbors sometimes organized to pressure people of color to relocate. One infamous incident involves Dr. Norval Unthank, a Black physician and civic leader who purchased a home in Ladd’s Addition in 1930. A group of neighbors brought him a petition signed by 75 residents objecting to the presence of the Unthank family in the neighborhood. When the Unthans did not move, their house was vandalized, windows were broken, trash was scattered on the property, and a dead cat was left on the lawn.⁴

During this period, Japanese and Chinese communities were expressly excluded from settling in the United States, first through the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and later through the Immigration Act of 1924. Locally, Asian settlers were sometimes violently driven from their land and organizations such as the American Legion organized against Japanese farmers to prevent them from purchasing land. During World War II, Japanese residents were confined in internment camps, destroying the businesses and community organizations they had established.

Some basic protections for LGBTQ+ Portlanders have been won in recent years but are currently being challenged in the Supreme Court. In recent decades, the Latinx population has endured profiling and numerous economic, public safety, and social threats; this has been heightened in recent years based on racialized immigration debates. Many other immigrant, refugee and faith groups have faced explicit and implicit actions intended to make them feel unsafe and unwelcome in Portland and Oregon. Students with disabilities, especially students of color, are too often pushed out of classrooms and into the juvenile and criminal justice system, referred to as the school-to-prison pipeline.

These histories run deep, and the examples of official and unofficial exclusion are too numerous to include in this report. Each generation has had opportunities to remedy exclusionary practices and bring our city together, but the systems in place, rooted in white supremacy, have limited our progress. Communities, however, have moved us forward. In the 1960s new opportunities emerged for the public to have a say in how our city was run. Commissioners and other leaders began to see how the riches of our city included the perspectives and ideas of Portlanders. As the decision-making table grew, our city began making progress. That work continues today.

---

Activism Is Our Shared Heritage

A Quest for Accountability

EARLY 20TH-CENTURY PORTLAND was plagued with corruption. City Council was run by ward bosses who hired city officials using the “spoils” system and exploited political fealty for personal gain. Reform-minded Portlanders, many of them business owners and homeowners in the new single-family neighborhoods of the inner eastside, narrowly voted in 1913 to adopt the commission form of government.

The hope was that the city would be run by public works experts and strong leaders who could push through needed reforms and be accountable to Portlanders in every neighborhood of the city.

The commission form of government reduced the size of Portland’s city council from 11 members to four commissioners, plus the mayor, and requires all members to be elected citywide. The unintended result was a city council that often did not understand the individual communities and neighborhoods of Portland.

The Rise of Public Involvement: 20th Century

For the first 50 years of the commission system, the public had very few opportunities to influence city government. Portland of the 1950s and 1960s was a top-down, white male-dominated city that prioritized the interests of politically connected Portlanders and prominent business owners. Public process of any kind during that time was rare.

However, national trends and local politics combined to open up pathways for civic engagement in Portland. Urban Renewal, the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Model Cities Program were three pieces of federal legislation that required cities to engage with the public on planning and land use decisions. In Oregon, SB 100 expanded statewide requirements for city and county planning to include public input.

The effects of urban renewal and other federal programs intended to reduce “blight” in cities also helped spark neighborhood activism in Portland. Students, renters, and Jewish and Italian residents displaced by development in the South Auditorium district formed the Hill Park Association in 1970. The association’s activities delayed the development, which caused the city to lose some federal funding.

Other development projects led to the formation of neighborhood groups to organize against plans to demolish houses and businesses. In Northwest Portland, the Northwest District Association formed to oppose, and later to make recommendations to reduce the impact of, the construction of I-505 and I-405. And in Southeast Portland, neighborhoods joined together to oppose the Mount Hood Freeway, which would have run where the Clinton Street bike corridor is today. The termination of that project led to the funds being transferred to public transit projects, including the first MAX line.

At the same time that additional pathways for civic engagement were being pursued locally, Oregon’s then-governor Tom McCall (born in Massachusetts) publicly voiced his infamous “Come visit, don’t stay” slogan. Referring to Oregon’s tourist industry in 1971, he stated: “I urge them to come and come many, many times to enjoy the beauty of Oregon. But I also ask them, for heaven’s sake, don’t move here to live.” That sentiment was shared and rejected alike by Oregonians. In every era, Oregonians have actively debated the type of welcoming community that we want to become.

---

6 “New Government for Today’s Portland: Rethinking 100 Years of the Commission System,” City Club of Portland, https://drive.google.com/file/d/1y7q4WVoWjA32GIc6YqA9t2LQy/0dVTF7VcZ/view (February 2019)
Inequitable Access to Civic Power

The early days of freeway construction and urban renewal also show the inequities in city planning and city responses. For example, the Albina area was considered “blighted” and “unsalvageable” by city leaders after World War II, despite the growth of inner North and Northeast Portland as a center of Black life in Portland. Governments pushed through the I-5 project, which cut through the Albina community and eliminated more than 100 homes. The construction of Veterans Memorial Coliseum displaced another 150 people. And the expansion of Emanuel Hospital displaced even more Black residents.

These and other projects initiated in later decades came with promises of growth and economic prosperity for Portland’s Black community. Despite strong organizations such as the Urban League (founded 1945), Portland branch of the NAACP (founded 1914) and Portland chapter of the Black Panthers Party (founded 1969), Black residents’ own vision for their neighborhoods were not accepted by the City. The economic prosperity those projects created was primarily enjoyed by adjacent areas such as downtown and Lloyd Center, and by developers and businesses that were not rooted in Albina. In fact, the Black community in Albina has seen a decline, both in numbers and in prosperity. Casey Parks in the Oregonian estimated that 10,000
Black residents have moved away from the Albina neighborhood in recent years and the incomes of Black residents who have stayed in the area fell by 31 percent between 2000 and 2013.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Local Leaders Rise to the Challenge}

The power that some neighborhoods were able to leverage to oppose highway and redevelopment projects led Mayor Terry Schrunk to convene a District Planning Organization Task Force to explore a structure for involving residents in planning decisions. Under Mayor Neil Goldschmidt, the Office of Neighborhood Associations (ONA) was formed in 1974.

The official recognition of neighborhood associations was a monumental victory for many civically-minded Portlanders.

The early years of the ONA brought new and significant opportunities for many Portlanders to participate in their government and introduced a level of accountability that Portland government had never before seen. Portland began to emerge as a forward-thinking city whose innovation was fueled by the energy and creativity of its residents.

But by the mid-1980s it became clear to city leaders and neighborhood association members that, in addition to the minimum standards, guidelines needed to be put in place to ensure that neighborhood associations followed consistent rules. Both the original standards and newer guidelines banned discrimination based on race, creed, color, sex, or national origin. Despite these statements, and a genuine hope that neighborhood associations could serve as a voice for every community in Portland, neighborhood associations—just like local government and other institutions—rarely represented the full diversity of the neighborhoods they served.

\textbf{The City Struggles to Meet its Mandate}

By the 1990s, participation in Neighborhood Associations was beginning to wane and Portland residents who felt they were not being served by their Neighborhood Associations were beginning to ask questions about the purpose of the organizations and whether they were capable of providing truly representative engagement.

A Task Force on Neighborhood Involvement was initiated in 1994 with a charge to examine the Neighborhood Association structure, consider opportunities for greater diversity beyond the current ONA structure, and look for opportunities to improve civic participation. In 1996, the task force outlined a framework for resident involvement and made eight recommendations. What is notable about the task force’s effort is that it reiterated the need for inclusion and more representative civic engagement structures. It also documented the feeling by many Portland residents that Neighborhood Associations often are driven by small groups of people who invite conflict, use bureaucracy to slow progress, and who do not represent the diversity of their neighborhood.

This effort led to ONA becoming the Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI) and expanded the office’s role beyond support for the neighborhood system to also include business district associations and Elders in Action.

Unfortunately, by the early 2000s, very little progress had been made in diversifying the range of voices heard in public involvement processes and a significant number of Portlanders did not feel they had a voice in their city’s government decision making.

In 2008, Mayor Tom Potter, building upon Bureau Innovation Project No. 8, initiated a five-year plan to increase community involvement in Portland. Commonly referred to as “Community Connect,” the plan was not formally adopted as City policy, but was used as a guide for the work of the Community and Neighborhood Involvement Program.\textsuperscript{14} Similar to previous reports and recommendations, Community Connect had three goals: (1) increase the number and diversity of people involved in their communities, (2) strengthen community capacity to take action and move forward on priorities, and (3) increase community impact on public decisions. It was clear that it was unreasonable for the City to expect Neighborhood Associations to deliver all three goals in full. To begin filling in the gaps, ONI initiated new programs with the goal of increasing civic involvement of underrepresented groups: Disability (2005), Diversity and Civic Leadership (2006), City/County Multnomah Youth Commission (2008), and the New Portlanders/Immigrant and Refugee Program (2015).
The People’s Plan

When the Portland African American Leadership Forum (PAALF) launched its People’s Plan in 2017, executive director, Joy Alise Davis, told the Skanner News that traditional planning models often intimidate community members with technical language and complex processes. PAALF’s People’s Plan was designed to frame civic engagement from the perspective of what’s possible for the Black community if longstanding systemic barriers are removed. PAALF’s plan demands that Portlanders of all communities recognize the wealth of potential in the Black community right here and right now.

Through the People’s Plan and other efforts, PAALF is investing in the leadership of Black Portlanders, expanding our ideas of who is a leader and what leadership looks like in the community.

“There through the unapologetic assertion of our voices we will be the ones to shape the policies that impact our Black community,” wrote Robin Johnson, executive committee co-chair, in the opening letter to the People’s Plan. “Anything that lacks the breadth and depth of our collective voice will fall short in the policies that seek to foster a Portland the Black community has truly shaped and designed.”

Portland Street Response

Last spring, Street Roots, the Portland nonprofit that publishes a weekly newspaper that is sold by people experiencing homelessness or extreme poverty, unveiled its Portland Street Response plan.

The plan, designed by communities that have experienced homelessness, offered a practical solution to one particular problem. People struggling with their health and wellbeing while living on the streets often face escalating (and expensive) police interactions that do little to address an individual’s needs. Street Roots proposed a new response system. Based on a program in Eugene called CAHOOTS, the responders would dispatch to help a homeless person when a call comes in to Emergency Management. Each response team would include two-person units made up of one firefighter-EMT and one peer support specialist, both with additional de-escalation and behavioral health training.

“We need a sense of urgency,” Kaia Sand, executive director of Street Roots, wrote in her letter announcing the plan. “In the worst of moments, these are issues of life and death…. Decisions about the city budget are happening now, so Street Roots will be knocking on the doors of City Hall, and we expect plenty of people in our community to join us. As it stands… even if it is funded, the timeline is in excess of three years. We must act faster.”

Sand’s call to action and the mobilization of the homeless community led to Mayor Wheeler including $500,000 in the Fiscal Year 2019/20 City budget to move forward with developing a plan.

Living Cully

For years, the Sugar Shack, a triangle of pavement and cheap construction between Portland Highway, Killingsworth Street, and Cully Boulevard was known for drugs, prostitution, and violence. In 2015, residents decided to take charge of their community and use the property as a center for the neighborhood’s transformation.

Las Adelitas, the housing and community center currently under construction by Hacienda Community Development Corporation, is one big example of how Living Cully is using investments in neighborhood sustainability to reduce poverty, slow the rate of involuntary displacement, and improve livability for all residents. Formed in 2010 by Habitat for Humanity Portland/Metro East, Hacienda CDC, Native American Youth and Family Center, and Verde, Living Cully is drawing on deep partnerships (including with Cully Association of Neighbors), the skills and strength of people of color in the neighborhood, and a hunger by community members to build a neighborhood that truly reflects the values of the people who live there.
Office of Community and Civic Life

The Code Change Process

TODAY CIVIC LIFE is a bureau serving a diverse range of civic and regulatory needs. Its programs seek to create a culture of collaboration, expand opportunities for all Portlanders to contribute their knowledge, experience, and creativity, and help solve local problems.

Portlanders see their experiences, concerns, and aspirations reflected in City-supported programs.

Today, Civic Life continues its evolution. We are opening the doors of City Hall wider than before and partnering with Portlanders from many communities to develop systems of engagement that will help us live our values as an inclusive, welcoming, and collaborative city.

A Necessary Change

The 2016 audit and Resolution 37373 are clear. The City of Portland cannot serve all Portlanders while only naming some of them in city code. Furthermore, only naming some Portlanders in code while serving multiple functions programmatically does not allow for the full potential of a civic engagement bureau. It has also been clear for many years that Civic Life’s code does not acknowledge how civic engagement has historically taken multiple forms, nor does it allow for evolution and new forms of engagement to emerge. It is time, again, for the city to act on its stated values and update the structures that ensure its obligations to all residents.

City Code Chapter 3.96 has been changed many times over the last 45 years. However, the changes were often technical and failed to address a core concern: Can any one set of groups named in code reflect the full diversity of Portland’s communities? Each decade, reports found that the city’s system of resident engagement did not meet this basic requirement and each decade a process was carried out that delivered a slightly modified version of what already existed.

This time, community leaders realized that Portland cannot carry out the same process and aspirations reflected in City-supported programs.

Over the past year, Civic Life staff created a multifaceted, multilingual, multicultural, and intergenerational engagement plan that endeavored to inform the public and gather feedback from a broadly diverse cross-section of Portlanders. The approach was to invite different groups of Portlanders, reflecting the city’s investment in neighborhood associations and the city’s history of exclusion, to lead a conversation and to bring their experiences and issues to the center. Every engagement activity was open to all Portlanders and language interpretation, childcare, and physical accommodations were available at community meetings and gatherings.

In November of 2018, Civic Life assembled a code change committee and throughout the following nine months held eight public committee meetings to develop new language for Chapter 3.96. Concurrent with those meetings, Civic Life conducted a paper and online citywide survey; hosted five language-specific community conversations; solicited feedback in online forums; gathered input from community groups at their regular meetings; presented an overview of the code change process and emerging concepts at existing community gatherings; hosted a Community Connections gathering that brought people together to meet and connect, reflect on what they’ve learned through the code change process, and see the initial language that the committee had drafted; met with students and young emerging leaders; and met with local news media. Each of these efforts was an investment in neighborhood associations and the city’s history of exclusion, to lead a conversation and to bring their experiences and issues to the center. Every engagement activity was open to all Portlanders and language interpretation, childcare, and physical accommodations were available at community meetings and gatherings. Civic Life conducted a paper and online citywide survey; hosted five language-specific community conversations; solicited feedback in online forums; gathered input from community groups at their regular meetings; presented an overview of the code change process and emerging concepts at existing community gatherings; hosted a Community Connections gathering that brought people together to meet and connect, reflect on what they’ve learned through the code change process, and see the initial language that the committee had drafted; met with students and young emerging leaders; and met with local news media. Each of these efforts was an investment in neighborhood associations and the city’s history of exclusion, to lead a conversation and to bring their experiences and issues to the center. Every engagement activity was open to all Portlanders and language interpretation, childcare, and physical accommodations were available at community meetings and gatherings.

The following section includes a summary of each engagement strategy leading up to the conclusion of the Code Change Committee’s work.

Code Change Stories: Jennifer Truc Ly Le

Jennifer is a Portlander and a member of the Vietnamese-American Community. We asked her to share her thoughts about the code change process during our April 30 multilingual Community Connections gathering.

What are some of the ways you engage with Portlanders?

“I do my best to understand other communities and their stories by engaging in conversations with people who are different than me. This also helps me share my story so that others can understand more about the Vietnamese community.”

What do you want to make sure we don’t miss through this process?

“A lot of the Vietnamese elders weren’t used to giving their opinion the night of the conversation, and it’s because they never really got that freedom to speak when they were in Vietnam. They don’t understand civic engagement because most of their mindset is still in survival mode.”

What is civic engagement to you?

“Civic engagement to me is being aware what is happening in your community. It is important to have a healthy relationship with the government on all levels, because being afraid or not caring what they are doing doesn’t help anyone.”
Gathering Perspectives

To gather perspectives from a cross-section of Portlanders, Civic Life conducted a citywide survey, convened the code change committee, organized community gatherings, met with groups at their existing gatherings, and has continued to meet with various people and groups throughout Portland.

The Survey of Civic Life

The Survey of Civic Life was the first initiative to gather input for new code language. The survey was conducted between November 7, 2018 and March 13, 2019 and was distributed through Civic Life’s website, online newsletter, social media, and through the outreach efforts of district coalition partners.

Early on, it was clear that distribution of the survey through Civic Life’s existing channels and program partners was not returning a representative sample of Portlanders. Respondents were highly educated and older than the general population. Throughout the four months the survey was available, Civic Life staff reviewed respondent data weekly looking for gaps in representation. As those gaps were identified, staff members sought community partners who could reach underrepresented communities and help Civic Life develop relationships in real time.

To further distribute the survey to wider audiences, Civic Life partnered with Disability communities, Diversity and Civic Leadership partners, Bridgeliner, Code Change Committee members, city bureaus such as Portland Bureau of Emergency Management and 911, the East Portland Community Office, Partners in Diversity, Commissioner Eudaly, and the Community Alliance of Tenants. Civic Life also promoted the survey at community gatherings and with various youth groups. The survey was available both online and on paper in five languages: English, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese.

More than 1,000 Portland residents responded to the survey, providing insights into what civic life means to them, what they expect City government to provide to all residents, and the unique needs of their communities. The survey respondents reported that they value being involved and informed, they expect the City of Portland to keep all residents safe and to make resources accessible. It also expressed a need for funding for neighborhoods and protection from discrimination.

Survey respondents reported that voting, taking surveys, and volunteering are the most common forms of their civic engagement in Portland. Ninety-eight percent of respondents said they are at least somewhat interested in engaging with their communities and 94 percent said they are interested in engaging with the City of Portland. Such strong results were an important validation of the value of the work Civic Life is doing to expand civic engagement.

The survey was also a reminder that Civic Life still had a lot of work to do to gather diverse perspectives from across Portland. A significant number of respondents live in inner Northeast, inner Southeast, or far Southwest Portland. From Civic Life’s networks alone, 82 percent of respondents have a bachelor’s degree, compared with 48 percent citywide according to the 2017 U.S. Census and 28 percent of respondents were 65 or older compared to 12 percent citywide.

While the survey concluded with a strong representation of Black or African American respondents, Asian and Hispanic respondents were underrepresented in our survey. It is also important to note that while white responses appear to be below the citywide average, a closer look at the “other” and “prefer not to disclose” options indicate that white respondents were roughly representative of the overall population. The survey demographics reinforced that surveys are not an effective form of outreach for...
all communities and that additional engagement methods were crucial for gathering feedback. Civic Life went on to ensure that Portlanders had multiple platforms to author their own experiences.

Committee 3.96
In November 2018, Civic Life worked with existing partners in the bureau’s network and reached out to new networks to form a diverse code change committee representing a broad cross-section of Portland. Called Committee 3.96, the 25-members include civic leaders and entrepreneurs from groups named in the current Chapter 3.96—neighborhood associations, district coalitions, business district associations (6 of 25 members)—as well as faith-based and disability communities, nonprofits serving specific communities, local business, youth organizations, and more. Many of the committee members also had experience working in and with various levels of government.

"When young people can engage with Portlanders who may not look like them, I hold a newfound respect for the institution that does that outreach.”
-TAJI CHESIMET, CODE CHANGE COMMITTEE MEMBER

The committee’s charge was to recommend changes to Chapter 3.96 that reflect a unified set of culturally-responsive practices for engaging community partners, update the description of the Bureau’s responsibilities, and create a set of voluntary guidelines that represent best practices for civic engagement.

Over the course of nine months, the committee met a total of eight times to learn about the current state of Civic Life, analyze data and feedback from community members, and collaborate on new code language. Each meeting was open to the public and included time for public comment.

It was important to committee members to thoroughly and faithfully consider multiple questions to and gather a significant amount of input before proposing new code language. Throughout the code change process, the committee worked to:

- Define “civic engagement” and the conditions that make it possible;
- Identify existing Portland communities where Civic Life could build new relationships and whose perspectives could help shape the work of the committee;
- Review data from the citywide survey, Community Conversations, and existing gatherings to shape their work; and
- Ensure that when drafting their recommendations, they are responsive to feedback they received.

After considering extensive feedback on their initial language from community meetings and feedback surveys, the Committee asked two important questions about Code Chapter 3.96:

- Should the benefits described in the ONI Standards be available to all community groups?
- Should ONI Standards continue to dictate the governance and operations of volunteer community groups around civic engagement?

The Committee agreed that all community groups should have access to the benefits outlined in ONI Standards and that voluntary guidelines are helpful tools for civic engagement. A volunteer group of three committee members—including two neighborhood association leaders—worked to further edit the draft language for their colleagues between meetings six and seven. This group met with Civic Life staff, a facilitator, and City legal counsel to edit and propose additional language. The resulting draft was the basis for developing the committee’s final recommendations.

After nine months of hard work, intense reflection, and engagement with Civic Life and a broad cross-section of Portlanders, the Committee voted 17-2 to recommend its proposed code language to City Council. Six committee members were absent from the final vote. Four of these committee members submitted letters indicating if they had been present, they would have voted in favor; the two voting against submitted a “Minority Report” (see appendix).

Multilingual Community Conversations
Civic Life contracted with Design+Culture Lab to develop engagement activities tailored to fit the unique needs of the Portland community and Civic Life. Design+Culture Lab is a research-driven, urban-social enterprise that focuses on the involvement of community members in the transformation of their cities, neighborhoods, and blocks. Together with Civic Life staff, Design+Culture Lab designed five community conversations in English, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese. The conversations centered around experiences in today’s Portland and the opportunities each community sees to further shape the work of city government. Civic Life staff worked closely with each facilitator to adjust the sessions to ensure that they were culturally appropriate and productive.

Bilingual community leaders selected by the host organizations led sessions in Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese. All facilitators personally identified with the cultural group they were facilitating. The host organizations included Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization (Vietnamese and Russian), Hacienda CDC (Spanish), Somali American Council of Oregon (Somali), and Parkrose High School, which collaborated with Civic Life to host the English-language session.

Each session included childcare and began with a shared meal. The session activities included an interactive exercise that allowed participants to share their desires for how government and community can work together to address public concerns. Next, attendees participated in a large group discussion focused on understanding common perspectives in each community and how different communities want to connect with their City government. The facilitators asked the following questions:

- How do you currently interact with city government to meet needs of the community?
- How do you define civic engagement?
- Based on your definition of civic engagement, how can City of Portland support you or others during future civic engagement activities?
- How do you define your community?

The sessions were structured similarly and...
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Each one took on its own unique shape to better fit the needs of the group. For example, the Vietnamese community changed the interactive activity as it was originally designed because many elders were afraid to write down expectations or criticisms of the government. In Communist Vietnam, people who criticized the government often experienced retaliation, and elders still held strong memories of those times.

Each session was recorded, a designated staff member took notes, facilitators wrote comments on flipcharts, facilitators typed flipchart notes, participants produced a workshop insight summary, and participants submitted session evaluation forms.

The sessions produced a wealth of insights and were captured in the report “Community Conversations Report” (see appendix). A few notable highlights from those sessions include:

- English-language participants mentioned many of the official channels for government engagement, especially neighborhood associations and issue-based committees. Russian-language participants also mentioned neighborhood associations and the Slavic Advisory Council. However, no one in the Somali, Spanish, or Vietnamese sessions mentioned neighborhood associations as a way they interact with the City to meet the needs of their community.
- Many participants felt that city government needed to do more to facilitate engagement so that everyone can share in the responsibility of participating in their community and government.
- People define community in a multitude of ways, from geographic markers to groups of people with shared values, identities, or interests. Design+Culture Lab presented its report to Civic Life on April 16 and the code change committee reviewed data from the five conversations during its April 18 meeting.

### Community Gatherings

As Civic Life carried out its early engagement efforts, staff members recognized that they could not always ask people to come to meetings organized by the city. The city needed to meet with community members in their own spaces, on their schedule, and in more intimate settings. In parallel with the community conversations, Civic Life attended existing community gatherings to introduce the bureau, present the code change work, and open the door for ongoing conversations.

Civic Life intentionally reached out to communities and groups not currently well-represented in city partnerships including faith-based groups, local businesses, immigrants and refugees, youth, and those who are experiencing homelessness. Community conversations were held with: Portland Indian Leaders Roundtable, Black Male Achievement Steering Committee, Age-Friendly Portland Executive Committee, Lao Temple Citizenship Class, Voz: Workers’ Rights Education Project, Business for a Better Portland Board, Portland Spirit Led Justice Alliance, New Portlanders Policy Commission, Right 2 Survive, Public Involvement Advisory Council, Multnomah Youth Commission, and City Club of Portland. The Voz gathering was carried out in Spanish and the Loa Temple meeting was in Lao.

Additional conversations with neighborhood associations, community groups and other institutions are ongoing as Civic Life continues to share the proposed update to Chapter 3.96. Civic Life is also seeking out relationships with groups of people and organizations who have not previously worked closely with city government to hear their thoughts on how the city can build stronger relationships and encourage involvement in decision-making.

### Assumptions Examined

Every engagement process reflects assumptions about who should be engaged and how. Civic Life sought to uncover and challenge our own assumptions, and those embedded within previous practices, in this process. Some of these assumptions included:

#### Assumption: We can all start from the same place

Every community has its own history and relationship with city government, including historical trauma. Some communities could dive into the details about the existing code right away. Other communities required a broader conversation about civic engagement first, then city government, then the functions of Civic Life and code change. Some conversations could only be held after an introduction by a trusted community leader and in a trusted environment; other communities felt comfortable directly contacting staff and members of City Council from the start. Prescribing the same process for different groups incorrectly assumes that we have the same starting point and relationship with government. This disadvantages those requiring different forms of engagement.

#### Assumption: Language accommodation is for non-English speakers

Civic Life hosted five Community Conversations and only one was facilitated in English. Onsite interpretation was available for English speakers at all four of the multilingual meetings. Yet, many English-language speakers shared that they did not perceive the non-English language sessions were for them if not in their spoken language, or that the invitation to request interpretation applied to them. Those who did attend shared that it was, at the least, an eye-opening experience to engage through translation services.

#### Assumption: Engagement that generates more of the same is sufficient

When the objective is to reach a cross-section of Portlanders, it is important to continually examine and address the gaps in participation. Some processes generate quantitative results but distort the distribution of participation among groups, reflecting a large quantity of a few viewpoints. Different tools are needed, and multiple approaches are required to reach multiple audiences.

#### Assumption: Past participation reflects interest

Previous outreach efforts assumed that interested communities were those that are already well known. This led to assumptions that those who are not currently served are less interested or have less at stake in the outcome. This can lead to accepting imbalanced representation in public involvement. The participation at Community Conversations and Community Gatherings showed that there is a broad and diverse interest in engaging with the City of Portland.
Community Connections
As Civic Life met with various communities, participants often reflected that they wanted more opportunities to meet other communities and develop relationships. Through the intentional investment of a diverse range of communities, Civic Life was able to create an environment for Portlanders to connect across communities.

On April 30, at Mercy Corps in downtown Portland, Civic Life hosted an event to bring together the many communities that had participated in the code change process. The Office facilitated networking, shared the initial code language, gathered feedback on the language for the next code change committee meeting, and answered questions.

Proposed Code
Who Does the New Proposed Code Support?
ALL PORTLANDERS are recognized and supported in the new proposed City Code. Per proposed City Code Chapter 3.96.020, Subsection B:

“The Office serves people who live, play, worship, and work in the City as individuals and through all forms of groups, including but not limited to affinity-, business-, community-, identity-, issue-, and neighborhood-based groups, and across generations. This chapter directs the Office to effectively engage Portland communities in civic engagement and work together to deliver more just and equitable outcomes.”

Subsection D goes on to state:
“Civic engagement encompasses all the ways by which we participate in this form of democracy. The origins of our democracy include colonialism, white supremacy, and economic exploitation, as well as native sovereignty and the striving for self-determination by all communities. These origins continue to shape our assumptions, institutions, and practices. The Office’s purpose is to support civic engagement as a powerful way to expose assumptions reflecting historical origins and rebuild our government institutions and practices to be fairer, just, and in service of all Portlanders.”

These are strong statements directing Civic Life to do more than coordinate and support three types of organizations. Through this code, Civic Life’s mission is better realized and offers greater potential for a Portland where we all have a say in building a better city. This code not only acknowledges our history and our many realities but holds the bureau accountable to continually evolving its structures.

How Does the New Code Achieve the Goals of the Resolution?
Portlanders have offered a vision for Portland that has equity, connection, and sustainability as core values. The current City Code governing Civic Life does not put those values at the center of the conversation. In fact, by explicitly naming only some types of organizations, the City has inadvertently created a system where some have codified privileges that others cannot access.

Resolution 37373 did not only call for a new code. It calls us to consider different processes that might lead to different and better outcomes. As directed by the resolution:
• The proposed code reduces the barriers to civic engagement—and “reaffirms the city’s commitment and responsibility”—by explicitly naming all Portlanders as the population Civic Life serves and puts the responsibility back on Civic Life to ensure that city leaders are hearing a diversity of voices and perspectives;
• In defining the functions of the bureau (sections 3.96.040 and 3.96.050), the proposed code outlines the responsibilities for Civic Life’s engagement with people and communities, and with city bureaus and government partners. These functions offer “a unified set of culturally-responsive practices for engaging a diverse range of community partners,” and “updates the bureau’s responsibilities”;
• In outlining Civic Life’s role in seeking out and connecting communities and providing multiple ways to support, serve and collaborate (Section 3.96.040), the proposed code offers “a set of voluntary guidelines that represent best practices for civic engagement.” Section 3.96.020 also requires the City of Portland and all of us to recognize the origins of this democracy and their continuing influence in our institutions and practices. The proposed code requires that “best practices” for civic engagement be in service of our stated values and commitments to racial, Disability and social justice.

Conclusion
PORTLAND IS GROWING and diversifying. Our citywide community is as complex and vibrant as it has ever been. And our civic spirit is strong thanks to the decades of community involvement through neighborhood associations, culturally-specific organizations and countless other groups.

In 2019, we have an opportunity to articulate not just a vision for a more inclusive Civic Life, but to also put in place a structure that moves us closer to that vision.

The proposed changes are based, in part, on what our bureau has learned in the 45 years. We’ve learned that we can make big, positive changes when we rally together as a neighborhood. We’ve also learned that any one type of group cannot possibly represent all the different perspectives and needs of the many communities in Portland.

The code proposed by the code change committee seeks to build on this legacy and to continue opening the doors of City Hall wider. It holds government accountable for delivering racially and socially inclusive outcomes through community and civic engagement, names all people of Portland as who Civic Life is meant to serve, and maintains neighborhood associations, district coalitions, and business districts as essential partners in the civic fabric of the city.

We’ve learned a lot about civic engagement since 1974 and we’ll continue to learn and evolve our processes over time. The code proposed by the code change committee reflects the input of thousands of people and dozens of communities that have never felt they had a voice in their city government. Writing this new language into City Code affirms their faith in the potential for a more inclusive and equitable Portland. Most importantly, it establishes a foundation by which all Portlanders can share a role in shaping the future of our city.

Our country’s history of exclusion is not our destiny. The codes we live by today are more inclusive than ever, but the work is not done. The people are calling again for visionary leadership. It’s time to join together to take this critical step forward.
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Resolution 37373

RESOLUTION No. 37373

Convene a Code Change Committee to update City Code Chapter 3.96 (Resolution)

WHEREAS, the Office of Neighborhood Involvement was established in 1974 to formalize the relationship between neighborhood associations and the City; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 3.96 no longer adequately represent the Bureau’s current programs, responsibilities, or constituencies; and

WHEREAS, the 2016 Office of Neighborhood Involvement audit highlighted the need to update Bureau practices and City Code to ensure Portlanders have equal access to City decision-making; and

WHEREAS, the demographics of the City population have changed significantly since the last code update in 2005; and

WHEREAS, the Bureau was renamed the Office of Community & Civic Life in July 2018 to better represent the full scope of the bureau’s work and to acknowledge the current and prospective way it serves all Portlanders.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Bureau shall convene a Code Change Committee that will recommend changes to Chapter 3.96 that reflect: a unified set of culturally-responsive practices for engaging a diverse range of community partners; an updated description of the Bureau’s responsibilities; and a set of voluntary guidelines that represent best practices for civic engagement. These recommendations shall be presented to Council by July 2019.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City reaffirms its commitment and responsibility to engage ALL Portlanders in efforts to foster and support civic engagement.

Adopted by the Council: JUL 18 2018
Commissioner Chloe Eudaly
Prepared by: Wintu Yohannes
Date Prepared: 7/05/18

Mary Hull Caballero
Auditor of the City of Portland

1 of 2
PROPOSED

1. Complies with state public record and meeting laws or with the standards referenced in Section 3.96.020 C.;
2. Is classified as a non-profit organization, registered with the Oregon Secretary of State Corporation Division; and
3. Is formally recognized by the Office of Community & Civic Life or through City Council resolution or ordinance.

d. Amend City Code Subsection 16.20.830 C as follows:

C. An area that feels it is adversely affected by parking and is requesting permit parking must work through its neighborhood association or business district association as defined in City Code Section 3.96.020 and 3.96.030 3.96.060. If the area is not formally organized, it should directly contact the Office of the Neighborhood Associations Office of Community & Civic Life for assistance. The Office of the Neighborhood Associations Office of Community & Civic Life must review the request and discuss the eligibility of that area to form a neighborhood association or business district association in conformance with the criteria established.

Passed by the Council: Mary Hull Caballero
Commissioner: Auditor of the City of Portland
Prepared by: By
Date Prepared: Deputy

Committee 3.96 Recommendations, 1 of 5

PROPOSED

Committee 3.96 voted (17-2) on July 18, 2019 to recommend this language to City Council with the following instructions subject to continued legal review:

- Leaving the spirit and intent of the Committee’s recommendation intact, delegate minor wordsmithing for the purposes of simplifying or clarifying language to staff.
- The Committee’s intention with section 3.96.060 is:
  - To preserve the privileges currently cross-referenced in other sections of city code for groups currently recognized by the bureau (including but not limited to neighborhood associations, district coalitions, business district associations, and diverse and civic leadership partners);
  - To ensure that there is no gap in other City of Portland bureau’s ability to fulfill their administrative functions until an improved system is adopted, at which time section 3.96.060 is no longer in effect; and
  - As an essential part of a comprehensive, diverse, equitable, and inclusive approach to civic-engagement work, staff will include the Committee’s statement on the purpose of the future removal of this section in the report to Council.

Sections:
3.96.010 Definitions
3.96.020 Creation, Organization and Purpose
3.96.030 Director’s Duties and Responsibilities
3.96.040 Responsibilities for Engagement with People and Communities
3.96.050 Responsibilities for Engagement with City Bureaus and Government Partners
3.96.060 Recognized Organizations Referenced in Other City Code

3.96.010 Definitions

As used in this Chapter, the following terms have the meanings given them in this Section.

A. “Director” means the Director of the Office of Community and Civic Life.

B. “Office” means the Office of Community and Civic Life.
3.96.020 Creation, Organization and Purpose

A. This chapter establishes the Office of Community & Civic Life and sets out its functions, duties, and responsibilities to serve, respond, and adapt to the needs, aspirations, and opportunities of its evolving communities. This chapter outlines the basis for the role of civic engagement in creating an inclusive city in which each of us can contribute and belong. The Office consists of a Director and such other employees as the Council may provide.

B. The Office serves people who live, play, worship, and work in the City as individuals and through all forms of groups, including but not limited to affinity-, business-, community-, identity-, issue-, and neighborhood-based groups, and across generations. This chapter directs the Office to effectively engage Portland communities in civic engagement and work together to deliver more just and equitable outcomes.

C. The City is a welcoming, inclusive, sanctuary city. Through this code, the City and the Office commit to racial, Disability, and social justice within a multicultural, intergenerational, and ever-changing environment.

D. Civic engagement encompasses all the ways by which we participate in this form of democracy. The origins of our democracy include colonialism, white supremacy, and economic exploitation, as well as native sovereignty and the striving for self-determination by all communities. These origins continue to shape our assumptions, institutions, and practices. The Office’s purpose is to support civic engagement as a powerful way to expose assumptions reflecting historical origins and rebuild our government institutions and practices to be more fair, just, and in service of all Portlanders.

3.96.030 Director’s Duties and Responsibilities

The Director reports to the Commissioner in Charge. The duties of the Director include, but are not limited to:

A. Overall administration of the Office and supervision of its staff;
B. Implementing the policy directives of the City Council and the Commissioner in Charge;
C. Proposing policies and practices to achieve the purpose of the Office and adopting procedures and forms to assist in implementing City policies.

3.96.040 Responsibilities for Engagement with People and Communities

The Office engages with people and communities to:

A. Administer, assess, and report on the impact of programs and services as directed by City Council and approved through the budgeting process.
B. Connect people and communities with their government and facilitate exchanges through programs and partnerships that are responsive, at times iterative, accountable to community concerns, and reflect an equitable distribution of public resources.
C. Seek out, learn from, and engage a diverse range of community partners to support and implement community-responsive practices for civic engagement.
D. Compile and disseminate voluntary guidelines on emerging, culturally-empowering, data-informed, and promising practices for community and civic engagement to community and government entities.
E. Support and connect the social, organizational, and physical infrastructure for community members working with each other and with government.
F. Develop and implement learning opportunities that focus on culturally-empowering civic engagement through community-based partnerships. These learning opportunities should address a shared understanding of City functions, pathways to engage with the City of Portland, opportunities for participation and
PROPOSED

engagement, technical assistance and training, and the capacity to develop and influence policy.

G. Collaborate with government partners in defining, planning, and implementing efforts that affect the distribution of public resources and the livability of communities by balancing needs and public resources through an ongoing assessment that focuses on delivering more just and more equitable outcomes.

H. Lead by example and advocate for government to collaborate with community wisdom, knowledge, lived experiences, and public resources to create efficiencies and effectiveness that bring communities together around common goals and concerns.

3.96.050 Responsibilities for Engagement with City Bureaus and Government Partners

The Office supports city Bureaus and engages with other government jurisdictions in their community and civic engagement efforts to:

A. Develop programmatic, bureau, and citywide capacity to critically examine assumptions underlying community and civic engagement practices and analyze who benefits and is burdened as a result of decision-making processes.

B. Redirect public resources to reduce systematic barriers to community and civic engagement.

C. Reduce disparities and deliver equitable outcomes in agency practices and services through culturally-empowering models of community engagement.

D. Implement policies and practices that recognize the historical exclusions of marginalized and underrepresented communities and that honor the leadership structures of those communities.

E. Develop collaborative forums of learning that promote integration of emerging, culturally empowering, and promising practices in community and civic engagement by each jurisdiction.

F. Collectively and continually adapt to the ongoing evolution of community, identity, and place and recognize the critical relationship of community to their government in producing disparate outcomes and systematic exclusion.

3.96.060 Recognized Organizations Referenced in Other City Code

For the purposes of recognizing organizations as identified in other sections of city code, the Director must adopt a list of recognized organizations by administrative rule, including but not limited to neighborhood associations, district coalitions, and business district associations existing on the effective date of this code chapter. Addition or deletion of an organization from the list must be made by Council ordinance.
A Code for All Portlanders

PROPOSED

Policy Name: Office of Community & Civic Life recognized organizations

A. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to fulfill section 3.96.060 in city code:

For the purposes of recognizing organizations as identified in other sections of city code, the Director must adopt a list of recognized organizations by administrative rule, including but not limited to neighborhood associations, district coalitions, and business district associations existing on the effective date of this code chapter. Addition or deletion of an organizations from the list must be made by Council ordinance.

B. Policy Statement

The Office of Community & Civic Life’s recognized organizations are 7 District Coalitions, 94 Neighborhood Associations, and 51 Business District Associations outlined below.

District Coalitions
1. Central Northeast Neighbors (CNN)
2. East Portland Community Office (EPCO)
3. Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods (NECN)
4. Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Coalitions (SE Uplift)
5. North Portland Neighborhood Services (NPNS)
6. Neighbors West/Northwest (NW/NW)
7. Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc. (SWNI)

Neighborhood Associations
1. Alameda Neighborhood Association
2. Arbor Lodge Neighborhood Association
3. Ardenwald/Johnson Creek Neighborhood Association
4. Argay Terrace Neighborhood Association
5. Arlington Heights Neighborhood Association
6. Arnold Creek Neighborhood Association
7. Ashcreek Neighborhood Association
8. Beaumont-Wilshire Neighborhood Association
9. Boise Neighborhood Association
10. Brentwood/Darlington Neighborhood Association
11. Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
12. Bridlemile Neighborhood Association
13. Brooklyn Action Corps
14. Buckman Community Association
15. Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association
16. Centennial Community Association
17. Collins View Neighborhood Association
18. Concordia Neighborhood Association
19. Creston-Kenilworth Neighborhood Association
20. Crestwood Neighborhood Association
21. Cully Association of Neighbors
22. Downtown Neighborhood Association
23. East Columbia Neighborhood Association
24. Eastmoreland Neighborhood Association
25. Eliot Neighborhood Association
26. Far Southwest Neighborhood Association
27. Forest Park Neighborhood Association
28. Foster-Powell Neighborhood Association
29. Glenfair Neighborhood Association
30. Goosehollow Foothills League
31. Grant Park Neighborhood Association
32. Hayden Island Neighborhood Network
33. Hayhurst Neighborhood Association
34. Hazelwood Neighborhood Association
35. Healy Heights Neighborhood Association
36. Hillsdale Neighborhood Association
37. Hillside Neighborhood Association
38. Hollywood Neighborhood Association
39. Homestead Neighborhood Association
40. Hosford-Abernethy Neighborhood District Association (HAND)
41. Humboldt Neighborhood Association
42. Irvington Community Association
43. Kenton Neighborhood Association
44. Kerns Neighborhood Association
45. King Neighborhood Association
46. Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association
47. Lents Neighborhood Association
48. Linnton Neighborhood Association
49. Lloyd District Community Association
50. Madison South Neighborhood Association
51. Maplewood Neighborhood Association
52. Markham Neighborhood Association
53. Marshall Park Neighborhood Association
54. Mill Park Neighborhood Association
55. Montavilla Community Association
56. Mt. Scott-Arleta Neighborhood Association
57. Mt. Tabor Neighborhood Association
58. Multnomah Neighborhood Association
PROPOSED

59. North Tabor Neighborhood Association
60. Northwest District Association
61. Northwest Heights Neighborhood Association
62. Old Town Neighborhood Association
63. Overlook Neighborhood Association
64. Parkrose Heights Association of Neighbors
65. Parkrose Neighborhood Association
66. Pearl Neighborhood Association
67. Piedmont Neighborhood Association
68. Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Association
69. Portsmouth Neighborhood Association
70. Powellhurst-Gilbert Neighborhood Association
71. Reed Neighborhood Association
72. Richmond Neighborhood Association
73. Rose City Park Neighborhood Association
74. Roseway Neighborhood Association
75. Russell Neighborhood Association
76. Sabin Community Association
77. Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League (SMILE)
78. South Burlingame Neighborhood Association
79. South Portland Neighborhood Association
80. South Tabor Neighborhood Association
81. Southwest Hills Residential League
82. St Johns Neighborhood Association
83. Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood Association
84. Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
85. Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
86. Swan Island
87. Swan Island
88. University Park Neighborhood Association
89. Vernor Neighborhood Association
90. West Portland Park Neighborhood Association
91. Wilkes Community Group
92. Woodland Park Neighborhood Association
93. Woodlawn Neighborhood Association
94. Woodstock Neighborhood Association

Business District Associations

1. 42nd Avenue
2. 82nd Avenue of Roses
3. Alberta Main Street
4. Beaumont
5. Belmont
6. Belmont Area
7. Central Eastside Industrial

PROPOSED

8. Columbia Corridor
9. Cully Boulevard NPI
10. Division Midway NPI
11. Division/Clinton
12. Foster
13. Foster Area
14. Gateway Area
15. Goose Hollow
16. Greater Brooklyn
17. Hawthorne
18. Hillsdale
19. Historic Mississippi Ave
20. Historic Parkrose
21. Historic Parkrose NPI
22. Hollywood
23. Kenton
24. Kerns
25. Lents
26. Llloyd
27. Midway
28. Mississippi Avenue
29. Montavilla/East Tabor
30. Multnomah Village
31. Northeast Broadway
32. Northwest District
33. Northwest Industrial
34. Old Town
35. Our 42nd Avenue
36. Overlook Village
37. Parkrose
38. Pearl District
39. Portland International District
40. Portland International District
41. Sellwood-Moreland
42. Soul District
43. South Portland
44. St. Johns
45. Stadium District
46. Swan Island
47. University Park
48. West End
49. Williams District
50. Woodlawn
51. Woodstock
C. Reference to City Code Chapter 33.910 Definitions

Diversity and Civic Leadership program partners are referenced in Chapter 33.910.

The following Diversity and Civic Leadership program partners are not referenced in City Code Chapter 3.96 adopted on August 12, 2005, and therefore are not recognized organizations under PCC 3.96.
1. Immigrant & Refugee Community Organization (IRCO)
2. Latino Network
3. Momentum Alliance
4. Native American Youth and Family Center (NAYA)
5. Unite Oregon
6. Urban League of Portland

D. Contact Information

Any person having questions about this rule should contact the Office of Community & Civic Life.

E. References

City Code Chapter 3.96

F. History

Adopted by Council [DATE], Ordinance no. [NUMBER]
Effective [DATE]
WHEREAS, Council honors the hard work of Committee 3.96, comprised of volunteer civic leaders, whose recommendations were informed by a multi-faceted, multilingual, multicultural, and intergenerational engagement plan; and

WHEREAS, Portland City Code Chapter 3.96 informs citywide approaches to public involvement through cross-referenced responsibilities in other bureaus as identified in Exhibit B, so updates to Chapter 3.96 present an opportunity for broader policy review; and

WHEREAS, Council wishes to maintain the existing Portland City Code Chapter 3.96 until additional feedback can be considered about the impact and implementation of any potential changes to this section of code; and

WHEREAS, recommendations for updating Chapter 3.96 should be considered by Council alongside recommendations from partner bureaus whose public involvement responsibilities are cross-referenced by Chapter 3.96; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, Civic Life shall assume responsibility for coordinating and staffing a multi-bureau work group, which will provide recommendations for City bureaus’ civic engagement practices and methods (including the use of technology and the internet), to equitably provide City services to all Portlanders; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the work group will be comprised of representatives from bureaus including, but not limited to, the Bureau of Development Services, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, Office for Community Technology, Office of the City Attorney, Portland Bureau of Transportation, Portland Parks & Recreation, Portland Bureau of Emergency Management, Joint Office of Homeless Services and the Office of Community & Civic Life; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the multi-bureau work group shall convene to review cross-referenced responsibilities for public involvement in bureau functioning, including a determination of the scope of public involvement for which each bureau is responsible; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Civic Life shall be responsible for incorporating bureau feedback (including scopes of community engagement work and a timeline) into a coordinated stakeholder engagement plan and presenting the work group’s recommendations to Council in a public hearing no later than November 2020; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the stakeholder engagement plan will recommend the use of established involvement processes and advisory bodies of participating bureaus, identify any additional engagement processes required to reflect an inclusive cross-section of Portlanders in informing recommendations, and outline a community engagement plan for a process to include all Portlanders in discussing how to promote equity and inclusion in the City’s support for community engagement in Portland; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the November 2020 Council hearing, presented by Civic Life and informed by the multi-bureau work group, will include recommendations for the timing and additional public processes required, if any, for updating Portland City Code Chapter 3.96; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Civic Life shall release quarterly status memoranda on the progress of the multi-bureau work group to be shared with Council and the public through Civic Life Updates; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Civic Life shall bring forth an ordinance to request Council authorization for a three-year extension for the Neighborhood District Coalition contracts, which will currently expire in June 2020;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Accompanying the ordinance to extend the contracts will be a report, subject to Council vote, which shall include the outreach plans by Civic Life and the Commissioner-in-Charge to ensure continued meaningful engagement with neighborhood associations, neighborhood coalitions, community groups, and other stakeholders about how current civic engagement structures within the bureau can be updated to better serve all Portlanders; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, this resolution is binding City policy.
Chapter 3.96 Cross References in City Code

PROPOSED

Chapter 3.96 Cross References in City Code:

Title 2 Legislation & Elections
- Chapter 2.12 Regulation of Lobbying Entities

Title 3 Administration
- Chapter 3.107 Water Quality Advisory Committee
- Chapter 3.123 Portland Utility Board
- Chapter 3.21 City Auditor's Independent Police Review

Title 11 Trees
- Chapter 11.30 Tree Permit Procedure
- Chapter 11.45 Programmatic Tree Permits
- Chapter 11.50 Trees in Development Situations
- Chapter 11.80 Definitions and Measurements

Title 14B Public Order and Police
- Chapter 14B.100 Liquor License Recommendations
- Chapter 14B.130 Marijuana Regulatory License Procedure and Requirements

Title 16 Vehicles and Traffic
- Chapter 16.20 Public Right-Of-Way Parking

Title 17 Public Improvements
- Chapter 17.06 Administration of Public Works Permitting
- Chapter 17.102 Solid Waste & Recycling Collection
- Chapter 17.103 Prohibition and Restrictions on Single-Use Plastic
- Chapter 17.108 Residential Energy Performance Rating and Disclosure
- Chapter 17.93 Renaming City Streets

Title 18 Noise Control
- Chapter 18.14 Exemptions and Variances

Title 20 Parks & Recreation
- Chapter 20.04 General Provisions

Title 24 Building Regulations
- Chapter 24.55 Building Demolition

Title 33 Planning and Zoning

Comprehensive Plan

Committee 3.96 member list (November 2018-July 2019)
Affiliations are listed for identification purposes only

Amanda Manjarrez, Director of Advocacy, Latino Network
Angela Harris, Vice President with the “Good in the Hood” Multi-Cultural Music & Food Festival
Antonia McSwain, 2018-19 Multnomah Youth Commission co-chair
Chi Nguyen, Executive Director, Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon
Dani Bernstein, Executive Director, Multnomah County Office of Community Involvement
Dr. Alan DeLaTorre, Research Association, Portland State University Institute on Aging; Chair, Age-friendly Design Committee for the Academy for Gerontology in Higher Education
Heather Hoell, Executive Director, Venture Portland
Hilary Sundee Mackenzie, Sundee Mackenzie Architecture, Inc.; board member and past board chair, Neighbors West Northwest district coalition
JR Lilly, member of the Diné (Navajo) Nation; former Civic Engagement Coordinator for the Native American Youth & Family Center (NAYA)
Karli Hansen, former high school teacher at Jefferson High School
Kathleen Saadat, former roles: Executive Director, Oregon Commission on Black Affairs; Diversity Director for Cascade AIDS Project; Diversity Development; Affirmative Action manager, City of Portland; Chair, Community Oversight Advisory Board.
Kathy Coleman, Artistic Director, Disability Art and Culture Project; Commissioner, Portland Commission on Disability
Kristen Gallagher, CEO, Edify
Marcus Mundy, Executive Director, Coalition of Communities of Color
Molly Mayo, Executive Director, Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Coalition
Lakeitha Elliot, Commissioner, Oregon Bureau of Labor and Industries Council on Civil Rights; Co-Chair, Hill Block Project Working Group; Legislative Aide in the Oregon Legislature
Laura Young, N/NE Region Workforce Development Manager, Portland Community College Portland Metropolitan Workforce Training Center; board member and former board chair, Cully Association of Neighbors
Linda Nettkoven, former co-chair, Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Coalition; board member, Craft 3
Musse Olol, President, Somali American Council of Oregon; Commissioner, Oregon Commission of Black Affairs
Rabbi Debra Kolodny, Executive Director, Portland Spirit Led Justice Alliance
Scott Bricker, Director of Product Development, Travel Oregon; former board chair of St. Johns Neighborhood Association
Sophom Cheang, Director of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion/Affirmative Action, Office of Governor Kate Brown
Taji Chesemet, Founder and Director, Youth Educating Police; junior at De La Salle North Catholic High School; former Commissioner, Multnomah Youth Commission
Taylor Ford, co-founder, Brothers for Progress
Vera Pool, Lieutenant, Multnomah County Sheriff's Office
The Code Change Committee

The approval of resolution 37373 required Civic Life to redirect existing resources to hire a staff person to manage the project and to support Civic Life in putting together the Code Change Committee.

The Committee’s charge was to address the mission of Civic Life and Resolution 37373. In late October, the Civic Life team assembled a diverse committee with members whose experiences and expertise intersected across many Portland communities.

Committee Work: Meetings 1-3

The first meeting of the Committee was at City Hall on November 15. Committee members were welcomed by Commissioner Eudaly and Civic Life staff. The facilitator for the first Code Change Committee meetings was Robin Teater of Healthy Democracy, a nonpartisan nonprofit that pioneered the Citizens’ Initiative Review process, which provides voters with high quality information on initiatives and referenda that is written by voters, for voters. In March, Frances Portillo of Healthy Democracy joined Robin as a facilitator. This first meeting was also an opportunity for the public to make a comment for the benefit of the Committee. All eight Code Change Committee meetings began with public comment.

The first meeting was focused on building community, orienting committee members to the work ahead, and training them on their responsibilities as public officials through their service on the Committee. That first meeting also included standards for respectful, authentic, and productive conversation. In closing, committee members developed questions they wanted to ask Civic Life staff and community members.

The second Code Change Committee meeting was held in Northeast Portland on December 13 at the Native American Youth and Family Center (NAYA), an organization with a mission to “enhance the diverse strengths of our youth and families in partnership with the community through cultural identity and education.” The committee toured the NAYA space—a practice that would continue at all of the community spaces where the committee met—before the meeting began. Every meeting also began with a land acknowledgement to remind all committee members of the long history of this land before it became the City of Portland.

During this session, the committee was given a presentation on the ONI Standards and the 2016 audit (they were also sent a follow up email on December 20 with copies of these two documents), worked together to identify existing communities with a stake in how the city engages with residents and to consider possible outreach efforts. Civic Life staff also presented an overview of the bureau’s history, how it operates today, and its long-term goals. The committee then went to work in small groups to discuss what civic engagement means to them personally and in the context of their roles as community leaders.

After the small group sessions, the full committee came together to discuss the assumptions and emerging themes in their responses. The committee members, facilitators, and Civic Life staff felt it was important to identify assumptions early so that the committee could be aware and potentially address those assumptions as new Code language was being developed. Civic Life staff also took the opportunity to critically examine the assumptions the committee unearthed and used those assumptions to adapt the code change engagement process.

Meeting number three was held on January 17 at the Rosewood Initiative, a nonprofit community-based organization in outer Southeast Portland that provides space for people to...
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After a significant amount of data had been collected through Community Conversations, Refining the Language: Meetings 4-5 through their existing gatherings.

In February, between the third and fourth meetings, there was an intensive period of community engagement through multilingual Community Conversations and outreach to groups through their existing gatherings.

Refining the Language: Meetings 4-5

After a significant amount of data had been collected through Community Conversations, existing gatherings, and the survey, the Code Change Committee had a lot of new information to consider.

The fourth Code Change Committee meeting was held on March 21 at Bridge Meadows, an intergenerational community in North Portland that seeks to build place, permanence, and purpose for foster youth, adoptive parents, and elders. After a tour, dinner, introductions, public comment, and a review of the committee’s timeline, Civic Life staff presented the community input data, which included the public survey, Community Conversations, and progress on existing gatherings. These three data sets served as the building blocks for the new code language the committee would develop in the coming weeks.

The committee spent some time discussing the survey results and the engagement process, then got to work reviewing themes and emerging concepts to include in the code. In this session, the committee worked in small groups on each section of the code, rotating to each one and workshopping and debating the concepts to include and the community needs the code needed to address. Session five constituted some of the most challenging work committee members did in their eight months on the committee.

Meeting five was held on April 18 at the Milagro Theatre, a Latinx arts organization in inner Southeast Portland that produces bilingual theatre and arts education programs in and around Portland. After the land acknowledgement and public comment, the committee reviewed answers from Civic Life staff to their questions about the current state of Civic Life and civic engagement, which included the budget for the Code Change Committee’s work. The committee also agreed to add an additional meeting to allow them to be responsive and adapt to community feedback.

The committee began by working in small groups to write initial language for an updated City Code. The committee then took a step back and checked in on whether each section of its work to this point was still aligned with the committee charge and mission of the City of Community and Civic Life. After consensus was reached that the work remained aligned, focus turned to previous concepts and tools in the existing Code to discuss which might continue to be reflected in the new Code. The committee was presented with the ONI Standards in preparation for meeting six and a follow up email with a copy of the document was sent on May 16.

Writing the Code: Meetings 6-8

Meeting six was held on May 23 at the Southwest Community Center, a city-owned community center operated by Portland Parks & Recreation. The public again had an opportunity to comment and then the committee heard from students from David Douglas and Parkrose High Schools as they presented their projects reporting on the code change work to their communities and soliciting perspectives from their peers. The students at David Douglas High School created a documentary entitled “What Portland Wants” that summarized the committee work and invited fellow students to share their ideas for how the committee can gather more perspectives from young people. Writers for the Bronco Blaze, the student newspaper of Parkrose High School, produced a short publication that explained the code change work and its purpose and featured Antonia McSwain, a member of the Multnomah Youth Commission.

The committee was presented with the ONI Standards and then reviewed feedback from the community connections event, a second survey, and ongoing gatherings that solicited community response to the initial language for an update to Chapter 3.96.

Finally, during a group discussion the committee addressed two questions:

- Should the benefits described in the ONI Standards be available to all community groups? (The ONI Standards are rules for volunteer, community-lead groups that are the basis for whether those groups receive certain City benefits.)
- Should Civic Life dictate the governance and operations of volunteer community groups around civic engagement (aside from contracts, grants, etc.)?

The committee agreed that all community groups ought to have access to the same benefits. There was more discussion around the second question, in particular whether organizations ought to at least be given voluntary guidelines. The committee agreed that promising practices for engagement were helpful, but that dictating how communities ran their organizations, as in the ONI standards, was not working.

A volunteer group of three committee members—including two neighborhood association leaders—worked to further edit the draft language for their colleagues between meetings six and seven. On June 6 at the Penumbra Kelly Building, this group met with Civic Life staff, a facilitator, and City legal counsel to edit and propose additional language. The resulting draft was the basis for developing the committee’s final recommendations.

Meeting seven was held on June 26 at the University of Oregon campus in Northwest Portland. The meeting did not have enough members to constitute a quorum and the public was invited to comment for the duration of the meeting.

Meeting eight was the final committee meeting. The committee met on July 18 at the Portland Water Bureau in North Portland.

After public comment, the committee again reviewed its charge and the mission of Civic Life. The full committee then went to work reflecting on the language it had developed to this point. Each committee member shared what she or he was proudest of in the new language and what still needed work. The committee worked carefully through each item and several recommendations were moved forward through a consensus-building process led by the facilitators. After more than three-and-a-half hours of work, the committee voted to recommend the new code language to City Council on a 17-2 vote.
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Dear Suk Rhee,

I have been honored to be a part of the code change committee. The commitment to the disability community and Disability Justice will move us closer to a city that is genuinely for all its citizens. Disability Justice is a second wave movement for our community. It builds on the Disability Rights movement that started in the 1960s and moved us into this century, much like the new code change. As much as it expands the Disability Rights Movement, it also brings forth what was missing. The traditional disability rights movement focuses on access, services, independence, and advocacy, and was primarily a white movement. It focused on individual impairments instead of our community as a culture. Disability Justice does not dismiss the legislative battles that were won through this movement, nor the access that it gave us, but it isn't enough. The leaders of the Disability Justice movement are Black, Indigenous, People of Color, Queer, Trans, Non-Binary, and cross-disability. Lydia X.Z. Brown, a national leader in the Disability Justice movement, states:

"Disability justice is an intersectional imperative. It is imperative to recognize that disability is wrapped up intricately in queerness, race, class, gender, and so on. Moreover, that liberation, meaning not just the end of oppressive systems, but also the creation and the sustaining of just, equitable and life-giving, loving societies and worlds, has to be collective."

Disability Justice centers intersectionality, interdependence, and moves beyond access to dismantling ableism. Access and accommodations are critical to our participation, but it can’t stop there. Access must lead to justice. Just because there are ASL interpreters or a ramp doesn’t mean that ableism or tokenism isn’t present. Disability Justice emphasizes our lived experiences and acknowledges the barriers that exist when moving through a world that isn’t made for us. The values and systems we have in the dominant culture don’t always work for our community. The emphasis mainstream culture places on production, speed, independence, and typical minds and bodies devalue us as contributing human beings. We are perceived as less and not whole. The cultural shift that Disability Justice brings to the city code is a change our city needs. It values our wholeness, our authentic bodies, and minds without having to cure or change them to be non-disabled. It honors our lived experience, knowledge, expertise, and contributions. As the late Ki’ tay D. Davidson states Disability Justice is active love.

"I want to believe in peace. I want to believe we can unlearn violence and affirm our interdependency. I dream of a community of lovers, who navigate pain, joy, laughter, and grief together, collectively and with care; experiencing endless beauty. I think I am dreaming of a modern-day heaven, or perhaps I am dreaming of the good we were meant to be."

Disability Justice is imperative if we are to be included in the fabric of this city. The voices of the Disability Community and our intersectional identities cannot be left out of how we envision our city for the future. I hope you will support the code change that includes Disability Justice and many diverse voices of Portland.

Respectfully,

Kathy Coleman, MSW
Artistic Director
Disability Art and Culture Project

www.dacphome.org | disabilityartculture@gmail.com | 503-232-0010 x318
3534 SE Main St. Portland, OR 97214
September 10, 2019

To whom it may concern:

It has been an honor to be a member of the City of Portland’s Office of Community & Civic Life (Civic Life) committee. Since November 2018, the committee has come together to review, update and make recommendations to City of Portland Code Chapter 3.96.

I was unable to attend and vote at the final committee meeting, but I have reviewed and I am in full support of the code change committee’s recommendations that were voted on July 18, 2019.

Sincerely,

Sophorn Cheang
Code Change Committee 3.96 Member

Taji Chesimet

Mr. Taji Chesimet

3.96 Final Statement

Throughout the process of sitting on this committee for the last 9 months, we have forged a real understanding of our purpose, goal, and so eloquently, what we can deliver. The proposed code, pending City Council review, outlines in explicit detail the needs, wants, and desires of the community of Portland. The code reflects meticulous attention to detail and shows how far the net was cast to reach all Portlanders, no matter historical determents from accessibility.

I holistically support the current position of the code and if I was not abroad, I would’ve voted yay. Saying that, I do want to mention that this intense process was not easy for any of us. A large issue that was brought up from the very beginning was the antiquated methods of thinking that were attempting to cloud the new and progressive direction we were attempting to move towards. This issue I mention is with Neighborhood Associations. This form of civic engagement, no matter their historical precedent it has held, does not singularly reflect an ever-changing Portland. The backlash and quite honestly, misinformation, lead to a deep conversation on how the Neighborhood Associations are compiled of majority white, older, educated, and wealthier populations. This was a clear roadblock to expanding how we look at civic engagement. I want to clear the air and state that, as a youth, these people will continue to pervade and take up space that is so deserving of new and fresh voices. Not to say that the NA is not a pivotal aspect of civic engagement, rather their position should be treated just the same as any other neighborhood or non-neighborhood group that is speaking for their community.

At the end of the day, this was a new space for me, one that I now have a stronger passion for. I am proud of the work our committee has done. I am proud of the staff that has worked so long and tirelessly on this project and I urge City Council to vote to pass this legislation and see how the future of Portland can start today.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Taji Chesimet
September 3, 2019

Office of Community and Civic Life
1221 SW 4th Ave # 110, Portland, OR 97204

Via email

Dear Ms Rhee:

I write today as a participant in the Code Change Committee, a founding member of Portland United Against Hate, a clergy person, a lawyer, a non-profit Executive who has pursued grants from dozens of funders, a frequent flyer in offices of the Mayor and City Commissioners, a proud policy wonk and political activist who spent 26 years in the most political city in this country: Washington DC.

I write to offer my unequivocal support for the new language in the City Code in Chapter 3.96 that governs the Office of Community and Civic Life. Expanding Portland’s understanding of who is heard, who matters, who makes this city great is basic good governance. The revised language does exactly that.

Ensuring that the city opens competition for limited funding to community serving organizations beyond Neighborhood Associations is just good fiscal management. Period. Moreover, having served on the ONI BAC when the audit critiquing the Bureau was released, it is abundantly clear to me that the Code as revised was practically mandated by the audit.

I was also delighted to see that religious communities were invited to offer feedback on the draft revisions and from those I have spoken with they are as pleased with the new language as I am.

The new Chapter 3.96 aligns with the values of welcome, inclusivity and safety that the city espouses. Job well done!

Sincerely,

Rabbi Debra Kolodny
Executive Director

Molly Mayo, 1 of 2

Due to a planned vacation I was not at the final City Code 3.96 Change Committee meeting. In line with the vast majority of my esteemed colleagues on the committee, had I been able to attend, my vote would have been in favor of the proposed changes.

So much about the current City Code is outdated. As former director of one of the district coalitions governed by the existing code, my organization had to adhere to unique oddities that did not make sense when applied to a nonprofit structure, for example, the board of directors configuration was prescribed and required delegates instead of an elected board, which is far astray from nonprofit best practices. The current code also has outdated information about business associations, an outdated scope of the numerous programs Civic Life now oversees, and includes aspects of bureau functioning that would be more appropriate at the programming level.

Because the current code is severely out of date, and because the code language revision process followed the directives of the July 2018 City Council Resolution 37373, many of us on the committee were unaware that the year-long process would erupt in divisive public comment at the June 2019 meeting—controversy stemming from far-reaching misinformation. Word had spread that the committee was that night “voting to end neighborhood associations.” This rumor was entirely untrue. It is disappointing that this false narrative, misinformation, and distortion of the process and product continue to run rampant.

The continuing outright opposition to the Code Change has not been focused on developing a collaborative approach to increasing civic engagement or fine-tuning mechanisms for bringing more voices to the table. The uproar is about maintaining the status quo, and likely reveals frustration from some neighborhood associations that the City Code change process did not center around themselves. The process of updating the City Code was not about neighborhood associations, it was about inclusivity and involved numerous community partnerships. In addition to a variety of outreach from Civic Life, much of which targeted communities that have been historically marginalized, the diverse committee worked with a facilitator to envision an inclusive and equitable Portland. The outcome was the proposed language, to be used to guide inclusive civic engagement. The process was not about neighborhood associations; no plans to dismantle the neighborhood association were ever made; committee discussions simply did not center on neighborhood associations or any specific group. It is really quite surprising that stalwart supporters of civic engagement, such as neighborhood associations, would so fervently oppose the Committee’s broad language which acknowledges that there should be many avenues possible to interface with City government. Surely in addition to the contributions of neighborhood association volunteers, other groups should be valued!
In my opinion, the level of controversy that updating the City Code has engendered is ironically indicative of the historical imbalance of power in Portland communities. It’s time to remedy that and though there is a long path ahead, changing the code is one step in the right direction. When seeing which groups support the code change—Coalition of Communities of Color, United Oregon, the Native American Youth and Family Center, Portland African American Leadership Forum, Latino Network, Verde, Voz, Portland United Against Hate, Next Up, Oregon Food Bank, Western Regional Advocacy Project, Oregon NOW, Jim White of the Nonprofit Association of Oregon, and others—and then comparing those organizations with the main opponents of code change—neighborhood associations—it is virtually impossible to ignore how race, economic factors, power, and privilege are at play. Peering into the 3.96 debate with even the most nascent equity lens reveals layer upon layer of the need for significant reform.

Molly Mayo, Former Executive Director of SE Uplift Neighborhood Coalition
Founder of On-the-Move Community Integration

Code Committee Minority Report
September 6, 2019
Submitted by: Hilary Sundeleaf Mackenzie and Linda Nettekoven

We are honored to have served on the 3.96 Committee for the past eight months. We have been impressed with the knowledge, experience and sense of engagement that committee members have contributed to the process. Regrettably, however, we cannot support the draft document approved by the Committee on July 18, 2019. The 3.96 Code proposal adopted by the Committee abolishes an essential piece of Portland’s public involvement infrastructure without first having done the necessary work of collectively designing a more inclusive system. It was perhaps too large an assignment to be accomplished in six to eight months.

Recognition of the need for a 3.96 code rewrite was triggered by the 2016 Auditor’s report. It called for an updating of standards and a more equitable sharing of funding among Neighborhood Associations (NA) and other community groups along with greater accountability. Also suggested was possible formal recognition of other groups to give them a code-protected seat at the table and extend to them similar benefits to those NA receive under the existing Standards. The Auditor’s report also references the work of Community Connect which called for strengthening the work of NA and broadening the system to engage more diverse communities. Neither report called for diminishing the neighborhood association system for community engagement. The current draft language of 3.96 does not address the key points of either report. Neither does it create voluntary standards or specify ways to involve more diverse groups as required by Resolution 37373.

The process of engaging Portlanders in the update of the Code was seriously flawed. The resulting draft product reflects those failures. In addition, since our final Code Committee meeting, Civic Life has further modified the draft code language in addition to supplying some administrative rules. This makes it difficult to comment appropriately on any specifics of the proposal we had no role in drafting. We have elaborated some of our key concerns below that focus on both the Code Committee’s product and process.

1. The Product. We support the aspirational language contained in the original 3.96.010 and honor the work that went into its creation. The language in these first sections should function as a “North Star” for further definition of the rights and responsibilities of neighborhood and business associations and other community groups and organizations. We also suggest in Section .010 the second two sentences in D. should be expanded as follows for accuracy, completeness, and clarity: “The history of our country includes colonialism, genocide, white supremacy, economic exploitation, and the subjugation of women, as well as native sovereignty and the striving for self-determination...”
Beyond Sections .010 to .050 the draft code has several significant deficits that keep it from succeeding in its mission to create a more inclusive system. These deficits include:

a) Lack of structures to implement or operationalize the aspirations spelled out in 396.010;  
b) Lack of clarity in Section .060 regarding the maintenance of official lists; and,  
c) Lack of accountability for the Director.

a) Lack of appropriate structures. Our overriding concern is the lack of new “infrastructure” for implementing and operationalizing the aspirations spelled out in 396.010. Without an appropriate “structure” to support the work, meaningful change is difficult to accomplish and to measure. This task should not be accomplished via an administrative rules process.

b) Lack of clarity in Section .060. This section is unclear and contradictory. It requires the Director to maintain a list of organizations (Neighborhoods, Business, and Diversity and Civic Leadership partners) recognized at the time the new Code is adopted. Yet, there is no provision for what to do if any of them should fail to live up to the Standards under which they were recognized. Since the Standards for recognition of listed organizations would be abolished with the adoption of this new code, there would be no means to require accountability from such groups. A recent version of this section suggests that if the Director fails to maintain the list properly, groups would be added to the list by Council ordinance, which is not the proper legislative tool for the maintenance of a list.

The claim is that while this list exists NA will maintain their so-called “privileges.” The Director is working with other bureaus (i.e., Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, Bureau of Development Services, etc.) to develop a plan to remove or modify references to NA and other recognized organizations from other parts of the Code. It is not clear how long this process might take and what role, if any, recognized groups and the larger community might play in this conversation.

One of the NA “privileges” noted is access to the resources provided by Coalition offices such as insurance for community events, technical assistance, etc., advice on community outreach, City policies and proposals, and help connecting with other neighbors, neighborhoods & community groups that may share similar concerns. However, Civic Life has already begun a process to restructure Coalition offices by putting their sole source contracts or grants to an open bid process. This may or may not result in a more effective use of public resources, but there is as yet no public involvement plan to give neighborhoods and community groups a chance to comment on this major restructuring and its potential impact on the seven coalitions that deliver these services across the city.

c) Lack of accountability of the Director. Adopting this proposal leaves responsibility for the entire work of the Bureau of Community & Civic Life in the hands of the Director, with no clear standards of accountability for how she or any successor operationalizes the values in .010-.050 or evaluates the results of those efforts. She may be planning to address this lack through the use of administrative rules. However, these are easily changed by the Director, whether current or future. Given our current form of government, and the propensity of Mayors to shift Bureau assignments among City Commissioners on a regular basis, it leaves the civic engagement system even more vulnerable to chaos and confusion than it already is.

2. The Process.
We feel many of the shortcomings in the product stem from serious flaws in the process:

a) Inadequate outreach, especially failure to notify and involve NA;  
b) Lack of a comprehensive orientation for committee members about the history and contributions of the existing community involvement system, including past recommendations and prior improvements; and,  
c) An inadequate record of the Committee’s work.

a) Inadequate outreach, especially to NA, lessened the effectiveness of the Committee. Despite current code requiring NA be notified of any City policy likely to affect the livability of their neighborhoods, there was never any serious attempt to notify neighborhoods of the Code Committee’s work and its significance. The fact that Civic Life did not choose to use an open, public recruitment process before selecting CC members meant that many interested groups were unaware the work of Code revision had begun. The Committee began to meet in November 2018. Yet a number of neighborhoods were surprised to learn such a committee existed when they, as part of the public, were invited to a conversation for English speakers in February to discuss what civic engagement meant to them. Other NA had no awareness of the effort until the Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods organized a meeting on June 6th and invited Director Rhee to discuss the Code Change process. Soon after, Southeast Uplift also organized a Q&A session primarily for their board. Others remained unaware until June 25th when they were told about a June 26th meeting where the Code Committee was expected to adopt new Code language. This occurred despite the fact that Civic Life maintains a website with e-mail addresses for the 94 NA. Outreach efforts have continued over the summer but only to share the completed work.

Staff commendably worked hard to reach out to key ethnic groups of non-English speakers, houseless individuals, etc. As CC members it was frustrating to us that although results of these conversations were summarized on line, there was no opportunity for us to discuss how these ideas and concerns might be reflected in any improvements to the community engagement structure the CC might recommend.

b) Lack of Comprehensive Orientation. The 25-member Code Committee was a wonderfully diverse group of community members representing a broad cross section of age, occupations, religion, race, ethnicity and life experience. However, there was a lack of familiarity with the current community involvement system. Only 5 members...
mentioned any experience or familiarity with neighborhood associations and only 2 or 3 had any in-depth experience with the NA system as a whole.

Some CC members also were unaware of Civic Life’s past and current work with the DCL partners and other non-geographic community groups. The absence of a shared understanding of City engagement efforts made the lack of adequate orientation materials all the more critical.

Relevant documents that the Committee did not receive or was not made aware of include: Public Involvement Principles, the Neighborhood Standards (as adopted by resolution in 2005), the Community Connect Report 2008, Chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan (Community Involvement), the 2016 Auditor’s Report on ONI.

CC orientation did include coaching from the City Attorney on member responsibilities and the work of writing code language. It included a helpful overview of Portland’s changing demographics, population projections, etc., based on the City’s 2035 Comprehensive Plan, and what our new Code must do to serve our growing, changing community.

There was almost no conversation about the role of the Standards in helping NA to do a better job at what they have been charged to do. Instead of exploring the necessary role of place-based partners in any improved system, the focus was on the privileges and power of NA and how they would continue to be misused unless the Standards were removed. The rich, nearly 50-year, history of valuable contributions from the neighborhood system was never mentioned to the Committee. For a brief history of the Neighborhood System, which people have come from all over the world to study, please see Appendix A.

c) **Inadequate Record of Committee’s Work.** Meeting minutes were originally limited to a one sentence description under each agenda heading with no sense of the rich discussions that often occurred. For example, there was no mention of one member’s request during Meeting 5 that a conversation be held with neighborhood representatives to see how the Standards had worked for them and whether they could be improved or should be abolished. Comments from the public were not summarized or even mentioned in the minutes. Thus, non-Committee members seeking to follow the work of the committee were hampered in their ability to understand what was being discussed and the reasoning behind any decisions. (The minutes have now been somewhat expanded in response to an Ombudsman Complaint that they do not comply with Oregon’s Open Meetings law.)

In summary, the process failed to produce a complete set of Code recommendations. Given the wealth of talent in the room, the 8-month Code Committee process was a missed opportunity for building connections and a deeper understanding of our community’s unmet needs. In Meeting 6, due to a lack of a quorum and the inability to conduct other business, the Committee took the opportunity to listen to NA representatives describing what their associations do, and their suggestions for how things could be improved. Had the process involved NA as key stakeholders from the beginning perhaps more of the lessons they have learned in their efforts to engage their neighbors could have been shared with the CC. However, instead of leading to a deeper understanding among those engaged in this work, the Code Change process has led unfortunately to further divisiveness in our community.

**Conclusion**

The 2016 Auditor’s Report and the 2008 Community Connect are valuable resources and should have been central tools in the effort to rewrite chapter 3.96. Inexplicably, these reports were largely ignored. At times the tone of the CC discussion reflected negative, stereotyped views of NA and their members. These views may have served to discount the concerns of Neighborhood Associations regarding open meeting rules and other ONI Standards that help NA function effectively. Neighborhood Association boundaries are drawn to give all Portlanders the opportunity to participate in the NA system, but NA are not meant to be the only path to engagement. By not carefully considering what many NA view as necessary for their continued effectiveness, as the CC would do for other grassroots groups, City staff and members of the 3.96 Committee are failing to advance the proposed mission statement of Civic Life.

We strongly agree that it is very important to give other grassroots organizations an equal voice in City governance. There is a well developed structure for communication between NA and the City. This network can be expanded where appropriate to include more groups as one avenue for increased engagement. Civic Life has a critical role to play in supporting collaboration and cross-organization learning and mentorship among all community groups wishing to participate.

In sum, we cannot support this draft code language because we do not view it as complete. We believe this draft report serves to significantly limit the very goals of increased community engagement that it set out to expand. Further, the process used to produce this draft report is seriously flawed and contradicts the mission statement of Civic Life. We believe that we all need to work hard to improve all aspects of community engagement and participation. We need to be especially vigilant in increasing access for groups that have been historically excluded. This process and report, having the opportunity to take on this urgent task, has failed to advance us in this mission. We can do better and need to recommit to a process that can produce more complete results consistent with the values and high ideals of our city.

**APPENDIX A**

Community Involvement History and Legacy
ONI was founded to recognize and facilitate Neighborhood Associations' participation in City government. Neighborhood Associations rose out of grassroots activism here in Portland. In the early years of land use planning, urban renewal and slum clearing were threats to low income neighborhoods, communities of color, and immigrants. Building freeways was thought of as a solution to everything, even at the cost of tens of thousands of housing units. The car was paramount. Downtown was dying as people moved to the suburbs. Historic buildings were torn down and replaced by parking lots. Portland's air quality was bad from the traffic and congestion. Unchecked development was killing our City.

In the 1970’s Neighborhood groups successfully fought the Mt. Hood Freeway and a huge parking garage where Pioneer Place now stands. Neighborhoods Activists blocked the expansion of Harbor Drive, which separated downtown from the river. The Harbor Drive freeway was removed and replaced with Waterfront Park. The Mt. Hood freeway would have cleared a large section of the east side for hundreds of blocks. Hospital expansion in NW Portland was clearing hundreds of units of low cost housing until neighborhood activists successfully fought for a Hospital Master Plan to preserve housing. The Downtown Plan, adopted in 1972, outlined a path to the walkable downtown we have today. However, neighborhoods in the path of I-5, I-405 & the Legacy Hospital expansion were not as successful in saving their neighborhoods. These neighbors were predominantly people of color.

In 1973 Oregon adopted the nation’s first comprehensive land use planning strategy. Urban growth boundaries were established around cities to preserve farmland and forests and to concentrate development in urban areas. Every jurisdiction within the state was required to produce a land use plan that allowed for development of housing, industry, commerce, transportation infrastructure, and preservation of open space for agriculture, forestry, and recreation. Citizens were tasked with creating these plans with support from their respective jurisdictions. Neighborhood groups under various names are responsible for shaping our City as well as our State. Neighborhood Associations were one of the first places women’s voices could be heard on equal footing with men’s.

Neighborhood associations are still very much active in land use planning and all other issues of livability within their geographic boundaries, including transportation, safety, air quality, and access to open space. NA also partner with other groups and NA where there is mutual benefit. The Pearl District NA with OTCT formed a Joint Task Force on Homelessness. They are working with private developers on the successful opening of the Navigation Center under the Broadway Bridge. NA also worked with the Clean Air Initiative to get proper pollution controls in place for Bullseye Glass & other industrial polluters, and continue to independently monitor air quality in their neighborhoods. NA partnered with communities of color to lobby for State legislation to reduce the amount of diesel particulate in our environment as well as to plan for interjurisdictional transfer of “orphan highways” like 62nd Ave & Powell Boulevard from State to City control.

Access report here: https://www.portlandoregon.gov/civic/article/736690
Office of Community and Civic Life

What Portland Wants

Watch the student documentary here: https://youtu.be/ka-cM26OoTw

Committee Changes Code to Improve Civic Engagement

City of Portland hopes to involve more people in decisions about their neighborhoods

Read article here: https://www.portlandoregon.gov/civic/article/734908
The Office of Community & Civic Life (Civic Life) has begun the process of updating City Code Chapter 3.96 that defines the work of the Bureau. An updated code will create a framework for civic engagement in the City of Portland that includes a unified set of community-responsive practices.

Our brief 8 question survey is one engagement opportunity for community to provide input. We seek your input on how civic engagement in Portland can better reflect the many ways communities would like to engage, deliberate, and communicate with their government. Let’s get started:

1. Civic Engagement to me is...

2. If civic engagement to you can be better expressed through a photograph, drawing or other media, please upload it below.

Choose File  No file chosen

3. What activities have you done in the last 12 months? (Click all that apply.)

- Voting
- Advocacy
- Lobbying
- Organizing
- Volunteering
- Taking a Survey
- Demonstrations
- Registering others to vote
- Participating in a Focus Group
- Attending a City Council Meeting
- Providing testimony at City Council
- Serving on a City Advisory Committee
- Serving on a Non-Profit Board or Committee
- Being active with a Community or Neighborhood Group
- Other activities that meet your definition of civic engagement:

4. How interested are you in engaging with your communities?

- Extremely interested
- Very interested
- Somewhat interested
- Not so interested
- Not at all interested

5. The Office of Community & Civic Life connects the people of Portland with their government and each other. How interested are you in engaging with the City of Portland?

- Extremely interested
- Very interested
- Somewhat interested
- Not so interested
- Not at all interested

Using your definition of civic engagement, please answer the following questions:
6. What should the City of Portland provide to all communities?

7. What are the unique things your community needs from the City of Portland?

8. How could the City of Portland Office of Community & Civic Life build a better relationship with you?

Demographic Information (optional)

Completion of this section is not required and is therefore completely voluntary. This information helps us gain a better understanding of the types of audiences that we may not be engaging. The City will treat this information as confidential to the fullest extent allowed by law.

1. What is your zip code?

2. How long have you lived in Portland?
   - Less than one year
   - 1 to 5 years
   - 6 to 10 years
   - More than 10 years
   - Prefer not to disclose

3. What is your age?
   - Under 18
   - 18-24
   - 25-34
   - 35-44
   - 45-54
   - 55-64
   - 65-74
   - Over 75
   - Prefer not to disclose

4. Do you have any American Indian/Alaska Native tribal affiliation?
   - Yes
   - No
5. Which of the following describes your racial or ethnic identity? Please check all that apply.

- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Middle Eastern/Northern African
- Asian
- African American or Black
- Hispanic/Latino
- Prefer not to disclose
- White
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Prefer not to disclose
- Other (please specify)

6. Do you live with a disability or identify as a disabled person?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to disclose

7. What is your gender? Please check all that apply.

- Female
- Transfeminine
- Transgender
- Male
- Transmasculine
- Prefer not to disclose
- Gender expansive (e.g., non-binary, agender, gender fluid)
- Two Spirit
- Prefer not to disclose
- Other (please specify)

8. What is your sexual orientation? Please check all that apply.

- Queer
- Bisexual
- Asexual
- Gay
- Pansexual
- Prefer not to disclose
- Lesbian
- Heterosexual
- Prefer not to disclose
- Other (please specify)

9. What is your highest education level attained?

- No schooling complete
- Nursery or Preschool through grade 12
- High school graduate or equivalent
- Associate's degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Some college
- Prefer not to disclose

10. Which best describes your current housing? Please check all that apply.

- Rent
- Duplex
- Car, Van, RV, or Boat
- Own
- Condo
- In Transition
- Apartment
- Shelter
- Houseless
- House
- Mobile home
- Prefer not to disclose
- Other (please specify)
### Access full presentation here:
https://www.portlandoregon.gov/civic/article/727743

### Gathering Perspectives & Adding Voices

**March 21, 2019**

### Raw Data - A Survey of Civic Life - Results

**A Survey of Civic Life**

**Civic Engagement to me is...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>938</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Tags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mar 13 2019 11:13 AM</td>
<td>11:13 AM</td>
<td>Active participation in the life of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mar 13 2019 11:12 AM</td>
<td>11:12 AM</td>
<td>Partnership with the city administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mar 13 2019 11:05 AM</td>
<td>[unreadable]</td>
<td>Changes in legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mar 13 2019 11:04 AM</td>
<td>11:04 AM</td>
<td>Changes in legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mar 13 2019 11:00 AM</td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>Changes in legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mar 13 2019 10:58 AM</td>
<td>10:58 AM</td>
<td>Active participation in community life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mar 13 2019 10:57 AM</td>
<td>10:57 AM</td>
<td>Participation in community life of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mar 13 2019 10:54 AM</td>
<td>10:54 AM</td>
<td>Don't be silent! Do something!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mar 13 2019 10:51 AM</td>
<td>10:51 AM</td>
<td>Attending events, meetings, Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 03:05 PM</td>
<td>03:05 PM</td>
<td>Engagement of citizens in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 03:03 PM</td>
<td>03:03 PM</td>
<td>Engagement with the city administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 03:02 PM</td>
<td>03:02 PM</td>
<td>Civic duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 03:00 PM</td>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>Not indifferent participation in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 02:54 PM</td>
<td>02:54 PM</td>
<td>When my opinion matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 02:52 PM</td>
<td>02:52 PM</td>
<td>Changes in legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 02:50 PM</td>
<td>02:50 PM</td>
<td>Ability to receive information from the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 02:48 PM</td>
<td>02:48 PM</td>
<td>Changes in the legislation, voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 02:46 PM</td>
<td>02:46 PM</td>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 02:44 PM</td>
<td>02:44 PM</td>
<td>Receive more information, improve livi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 02:41 PM</td>
<td>02:41 PM</td>
<td>Active participation in community life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 02:33 PM</td>
<td>02:33 PM</td>
<td>Voting, cultural events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 02:31 PM</td>
<td>02:31 PM</td>
<td>Elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 02:29 PM</td>
<td>02:29 PM</td>
<td>Personal involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 02:27 PM</td>
<td>02:27 PM</td>
<td>Taking part in decisions and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 02:02 PM</td>
<td>02:02 PM</td>
<td>To attend meetings and add burning it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mar 12 2019 01:58 PM</td>
<td>01:58 PM</td>
<td>Feasible personal involvement and ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mar 06 2019 11:02 AM</td>
<td>11:02 AM</td>
<td>It is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mar 06 2019 11:01 AM</td>
<td>11:01 AM</td>
<td>It is very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mar 06 2019 11:00 AM</td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>It is something good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mar 06 2019 10:59 AM</td>
<td>10:59 AM</td>
<td>It is something that is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mar 06 2019 10:58 AM</td>
<td>10:58 AM</td>
<td>It is something good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mar 06 2019 10:57 AM</td>
<td>10:57 AM</td>
<td>It is something good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mar 06 2019 10:55 AM</td>
<td>10:55 AM</td>
<td>It is something that is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mar 06 2019 10:54 AM</td>
<td>10:54 AM</td>
<td>Something good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mar 06 2019 10:53 AM</td>
<td>10:53 AM</td>
<td>It is something which is very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mar 06 2019 10:44 AM</td>
<td>10:44 AM</td>
<td>It is very important matter that the cor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mar 06 2019 10:42 AM</td>
<td>10:42 AM</td>
<td>It is a good idea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2005 Code Change Committee

The current Chapter 3.96 adopted by City Council in 2005. It was developed by the Guidelines, Review, Empowerment and Assessment Team (GREAT) committee.

April 2001-August 2004

https://www.portlandoregon.gov/civic/article/122091

Moshe Lenske, Woodstock Neighborhood Association (GREAT Co-Chair)

Patricia Gardner, Pearl District Neighborhood Association (GREAT Co-Chair)

Kathy Bambeck, Bridlemile Neighborhood Association

Nancy Chapin, Alliance of Portland Neighborhood Business Associations

Catherine Crawford, University Park Neighborhood Association (stepped off committee in 2003)

Leonard Gard, Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc.

Raymond Hites, Lents Neighborhood Association

Stanley Lewis, Downtown Community Association

Michael O'Malley, Irvington Community Association

Jerry Powell, Goose Hollow Foothills League

Charles Shi, “communities beyond neighborhood boundaries” (stepped off committee in 2003)

Mark Sieber, Neighbors West Northwest

William Warren, Central Northeast Neighbors (stepped off committee in 2004)

CHAPTER 3.96 - OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD INVOLVEMENT

(Chapter replaced by Ordinance No. 179418, effective August 12, 2005.)

Sections:
3.96.010 Purpose.
3.96.020 Definitions.
3.96.030 Neighborhood Associations.
3.96.040 Functions of District Coalitions.
3.96.050 Responsibility of City Agencies.
3.96.060 Responsibilities of the Office of Neighborhood Involvement.

3.96.010 Purpose.

This chapter creates a framework by which the people of the City of Portland may effectively participate in civic affairs and work to improve the livability and character of their Neighborhoods and the City. This Chapter sets out the basis for City recognition of Neighborhood Associations, District Coalitions, and the responsibilities and benefits accruing thereto. This chapter also sets out the basis for city acknowledgement of Business District Associations and the responsibilities accruing thereto. This chapter also creates the Office of Neighborhood Involvement and sets out its functions, duties and responsibilities. Nothing in this Chapter shall limit the right of any person or group to participate directly in the decision making processes of the City Council or of any City agency.

3.96.020 Definitions.

As used in this Chapter the following terms have the meanings given them in this Section.

A. Neighborhood: A geographically contiguous self-selected community.

B. Neighborhood Association: An autonomous organization formed by people for the purpose of considering and acting on issues affecting the livability and quality of their Neighborhood, formally recognized by the Office of Neighborhood Involvement, and subject to Chapter 3.96.

C. District Coalition: An organization which supports participation services for Neighborhood Associations and everyone within a geographically defined area, and is subject to Chapter 3.96.

1. Non-Profit District Coalition: An independent non-profit corporation directed by a board which is primarily composed of representatives from its member Neighborhood Associations.

2. City--Staffed District Coalition: An office partially or fully staffed by City personnel to provide neighborhood services as advised by the participating Neighborhood Associations.
D. **Business District Association:** An autonomous non-profit organization with membership guidelines in its bylaws formed by people in business within a defined geographic boundary for the purpose of promoting the general well-being of their business community. A Business District Association is subject to Chapter 3.96.

E. **Office of Neighborhood Involvement:** An agency of the City of Portland, whose purpose is to facilitate citizen participation and improve communication among citizens, Neighborhood Associations, non-profit District Coalitions/City-staffed District Coalitions, City agencies, and other entities. The Office of Neighborhood Involvement is subject to these Standards.

F. **City agency:** Includes all departments, bureaus, offices, boards and commissions of the City of Portland.

G. **Standards:** Regulations adopted by City Council that govern Neighborhood Associations, District Coalitions, Business District Associations and the Office of Neighborhood Involvement.

### 3.96.030 Neighborhood Associations.

A. **Minimum Standards for Neighborhood Associations.** To receive and maintain formal recognition, Neighborhood Associations shall meet the Standards for neighborhood public involvement.

B. **Functions of Neighborhood Associations.** A Neighborhood Association may engage in, but is not limited to the following:

1. Make recommendation(s) concerning a particular action, policy or other matter to any City agency on any topic affecting the livability, safety and economic vitality of the Neighborhood, including but not limited to land use, housing, community facilities, human resources, social and recreational programs, traffic and transportation, environmental quality and public safety; and,

2. Assist City agencies in determining priority needs of the Neighborhood; and,

3. Review items for inclusion in the City budget and make recommendations relating to budget items for Neighborhood improvement; and,

4. Undertake projects and activities deemed appropriate by the Neighborhood Association; and,

5. Cooperate with other Neighborhood Associations and ONI to create District Coalitions.

C. **Responsibilities of Neighborhood Associations.**

### 1. Neighborhood Associations shall abide by the Standards established by the Office of Neighborhood Involvement.

2. Neighborhood Associations shall make a reasonable effort to include affected City agencies in planning activities which affect Neighborhood livability.

D. **Benefits to Neighborhood Associations.**

1. Any Neighborhood Association meeting the minimum requirements established by 3.96.030, upon request, is entitled to formal recognition and benefits from the Office of Neighborhood Involvement pursuant to the adopted Standards.

2. If a Neighborhood Association fails to meet the minimum requirements of 3.96.030, the Office of Neighborhood Involvement may, pursuant to the adopted Standards, suspend partial or all benefits to that Neighborhood Association and may ultimately revoke formal recognition of that Neighborhood Association.

### 3.96.040 Functions of District Coalitions.

A District Coalition shall:

A. Provide training and orientation, information and support services to Neighborhood Associations within the areas of Neighborhood Associations served;

B. Facilitate communication between people and government;

C. Promote public participation within the areas of Neighborhoods served on issues of livability, safety and public policy;

D. Promote, encourage and support the participation of members of diverse communities within the areas of Neighborhoods served;

E. Administer contracts or memorandums of understanding and operate the District Coalition in accordance with the adopted Standards; and

F. Abide by the Standards established by the Office of Neighborhood Involvement.

### 3.96.050 Responsibility of City Agencies.

A. City agencies shall notify all Neighborhood Associations affected by planning efforts or other actions affecting the livability of the Neighborhood(s).

B. City agencies shall include affected Neighborhood Associations and District Coalitions in planning efforts which affect neighborhood livability.
C. Notice of pending policy decisions affecting neighborhood livability shall be given to the Neighborhood Association(s) affected at least 30 days prior to final action on the decision by a City agency. If said 30 day period may injure or harm the public health, safety, welfare, or result in a significant financial burden to the City, this notice provision shall not apply.

3.96.060 Responsibilities of the Office of Neighborhood Involvement.
(Amended by Ordinance Nos. 186216 and 187359, effective September 30, 2015.) There is hereby established and created an Office of Neighborhood Involvement which shall consist of a Director and such other employees as the Council may from time to time provide. In order to facilitate participation and improved communication between the public, Neighborhood Associations, Business District Associations, District Coalitions and the City, the Office of Neighborhood Involvement shall:

A. Assist Neighborhood Associations, District Coalitions and others in planning and developing programs for public involvement, crime prevention, dispute resolution and budget review;
B. Act as an information clearinghouse and resource to Neighborhood and Business Associations, other groups and the public;
C. Notify interested persons of meetings, hearings, elections and other public participation events of the Office of Neighborhood Involvement neighborhood system;
D. Enter into, monitor, administer contracts, and memorandums of understanding for Neighborhood Associations through District Coalitions;
E. Promote and facilitate open communication and notification from City agencies to Neighborhood Associations, District Coalitions, and Business District Associations, promote and facilitate communication amongst City agencies about public involvement best practices and policy;
F. Support and promote public involvement within the Neighborhood Association framework;
G. Adopt and revise such Standards as are deemed necessary for the implementation of this Chapter and for orderly public involvement in City government through Neighborhood Associations and District Coalitions. In so doing, the Office of Neighborhood Involvement shall seek representation from Neighborhood Associations, District Coalitions, Business District Associations, diverse community interests, city agencies that engage in considerable public involvement activities, and other interested people as necessary;
H. Pursuant to the adopted Standards, formally recognize a Neighborhood Association and/or acknowledge a Business District Association. If a Neighborhood Association or Business District Association fails to meet the minimum requirements of chapter 3.96, the Office of Neighborhood Involvement may suspend partial or all benefits and may ultimately revoke formal recognition of a Neighborhood Association or acknowledgement of a Business District Association;
I. Promote, encourage and support diverse and multicultural public involvement;
J. Establish open and fair grievance procedures for Neighborhood Associations, District Coalitions, and the Office of Neighborhood Involvement;
K. Establish open meetings and public records standards for Neighborhood Associations and District Coalitions;
L. Administer and enforce City Code Title 18, Noise Control; and
M. Other duties as assigned to the Office by Council.