



Independent District Commission

Independent District Commission Meeting

August 9, 6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Minutes

Attendance

Commissioners					
Name	Present	Absent	Name	Present	Absent
Amanda Manjarrez	X		Melody Valdini	X	
Arlene Kimura	X		Neisha Saxena	X	
David Michael Siegel	X		Paul Lumley	X	
DaWayne Judd	X		Marta Hanson	X	
Joshua Laurente	X		Ransom Green III	X	
Kari Chisholm	X		Sharon VanSickle-Robbins	X	
Lamar Wise	X		Steve Fleischman	X	

Staff Present			
Sofia Alvarez-Castro, City of Portland	Kimi Shigetani, Flo Analytics	Alex Brasch, FLO Analytics	Katie Gavares, City of Portland, PSU intern
Autumn Carter, NEX Strategies			

Welcome

Co-Chair Laurente welcomed everyone. Sofia provided Zoom logistics and information on how to access interpretation. Co-Chair Judd provided an overview of the meeting agenda.

Mapping Workgroup Presentation of New Maps

Autumn reviewed the approach, roadmap and forms of voting to get to a final map then opened the floor for questions.

- Is part of this process to make a motion a second and then we vote on weather to have a vote to get to the final vote or is it a vote to have a vote.
 - Autumn stated that there would be a motion to have a vote when the body is ready that would need a second and a simple majority to establish what map you are voting on. It would trigger a final vote, and that would require 9 or more affirmative votes. Voting is done by roll call, nay, yea or abstain.

Recap of Mapping Motions

Autumn led the commission through a recap of the mapping motions that the commission has taken April 10th through May 31st.

Working Group Report Out

Co-Chair Laurente led the workgroup report out with their objectives, reflections and themes from the workgroup. Co-Chair Laurente with through the areas being changed to the Alder Draft Map and Alder v4 from the workgroup conversation. Then they took questions about the map updates.

- Question around the city planning group request around the first change, so we understood the rationale on that change.
 - Autumn: That's a separate question around the airport area. We have not heard back from them on this request on what they were asking for.

Co-Chair Lurenente reviewed areas being changed the Maple Draft Map vs Maple v3. Comm. Chisolm, added in that alder and maple are identical, besides what part of the eastside is joined with the westside. They then discussed the map and workgroup conversation that was had.

- Concern that 4 and 5 needed more conversation and there was alignment around changes 1 through 3 for Maple. Change 4 creates a deviation that was outside their realm of what makes sense. On change 5 contention is around the Southeast Neighborhood and where we have the river.
- If you make the change with 4 - Roseway and not 5 - Hosford-Abernathy, the deviation jumps to 6.7%. The Hosford change was from Hosford neighborhood during public comment. There was consensus around moving forward with the versions AlderV4 and MapleV3.
- Didn't think was consensus on the maps, but around having the conversation around the maps. A process question on how we want to move forward. The maps don't reconcile easily and would like to request some of the other changes, how to promote collaboration by bringing neighborhoods together and what that does with population deviation.
- With change number 3, it looks like one census block it is not filled in in the Roseway neighborhood. Did the workgroup talk about the Montavilla comments? Is it on the list of things to discuss later?
 - Autumn – There was hesitancy around making substantial changes that required a level of deliberation, to not get ahead of the group around impacting boundaries, so questions around having the whole group look at certain neighborhoods and looking at consolidation of assesses between the maps.
- None of these changes to alderV4 or mapleV3 widened the population deviation, they actually narrowed the deviations.
- It might be helpful to have a straw poll around which map folk are leaning towards with one map for the live mapping.
- Idea to do straw poll now, with the understating is that we can do as many straw polls as needed.
- Thoughts around hearing more of the folks in the workgroup and their reflections as opposed to the more technical presentation of the maps with high level changes.
- Recognizing that Alder and Maple are exactly the same, with the expectation of where we cross the river, then lets make the changes on both maps with Alder and Maple. And we can work round the other shifts that need to happen, then we can get to the east bank of the Willamette question.
- Concern that it impacts each map differently with deviation on each map. Its more getting a sense of where people are leaning.
- Recognizing that at the beginning, we talked about what we had voted on and those decisions continue to live today and the one that's not on the slide, is that historic Albina would stay in the North/Northeast map. Is that correct?

- Autumn – there was consensus around that, but no formal motion around that decision.

Autumn led the conversation around thoughts, issues, tensions that people have and areas of focus to dive into.

- The heart of the matter is where we cross the river and tonight our time would be best spent talking about the differences in the two maps before we potentially have to vote next week.
- Second the suggestion given where we are in the process, if we have a straw poll before and then after the discussion, it will help us to get to a point around map changes.
- Wanting to have further conversation around the Montavilla neighborhood and Jade district boundary.
- Would like to have the bigger conversation about the philosophical big picture, then once we have a general direction, having the conversations about the smaller details.
- Concern that one if the changes is to make Hosford-Abernathy whole and keeping it with Buckman and only being half the equitation since people were saying: don't make us a westside district.
- Agreement around the conversation about which part of the eastside should be included in the westside. Would like to have the conversation before the straw poll. The comments are votes, but are added to our best judgement.
- There is no way that we aren't going to disappoint a community on the eastside of the river. Needing to make a decision that best satisfies all the criteria to the best of our ability and is responsive to the degree we can be what we heard from the public.

Autumn asks if members have a preference for alder/maple, is there any opposition to that? The group then discusses.

- Would like to hear from a proponent of each of the maps prior to the straw poll.
 - Autumn: I would be hesitant to put a commissioner "assigned" to a map.
- Would either of the co-chairs do it or being asked individually, we have considered it and given what we know in the process, where is the preference.
- Seconding the piece around advocates for specific maps and not doing that. Needing a process that allows everyone to participate and to speak to that position or not leaning one way or the other. Recognizing that we do need a certain number of people to vote on a map to get to a decision.
 - Autumn, could use a round robin style of straw poll that allows people to speak to each map, instead of just raised hands.
- Question around how many neighborhood bounders are affected vs number of people that are impacted? Are we pushing equal numbers of people, is the impact to a neighborhood higher with one or the other? That would help me process better where I would come from in decision making.
- Both maps meet the criteria, and fine with both of the maps.
- Adding to the question that it depends on the population AND the composition of the neighborhoods – the level of wealth and voter turnout rates as well.
 - Autumn: the mapping exercise won't be just drawing lines but can spend time in different data overlays.

Autumn suggests the group take time in a round robin to talk about the different maps and the items you are wrestling with. Then take time to see where we are and then get into the live mapping. Group does a round robin discussion.

- Questions around where we cross the river, Maple 3 makes sense, like Hosford/Abernathy with Buckman/kerns more than Sellwood for the westside. Likes the workgroup edits and would encourage the committee to focus on the criteria.
- Prefers the alder map, wants multiple voices in determining what happens in the central city plan, prevents asset packing, leaves the development of OMSI in the hands of neighborhood decision makers, not concerned around eastside voices from Sellwood-Moreland neighborhood voices not being heard, the composition of Sellwood-Moreland matters and that they are wealthy and voters that won't be ignored. Worry that Buckman, Hosford Abernathy and will be disenfranchised by having lower voter turnout and less wealthy area.
- Prefers the Alder map, has strong opposition to Maple because of asset packing, feels in alignment with what they have heard in the community engagement work.
- Prefers Maple with central city area and OMSI development in regard to asset packing. Wants to have a district where lots of renters in the district it's important that renters have the ability to have a voice.
- Preference with Alder, interested in Maple and learning more. Not interested in having this go to city council.
- Preference with Alder, wants good faith attempts to address all the challenges in the maps. Slightly more concerned on the maple map with the new changes. Incorporating more neighborhoods, doesn't address the development of central city, does think its important to have renter representation.
- Preference with Alder, having resources and demonstrated of voter representation is a good indicator of capacity. Agrees with the idea of renter representation but did not hear uniformity around renter representation and alignment with renter community on the west side vs. east side and the type of renters. Received from Central Eastside Business Association that they did not support Maple and being included in the central city.
- Preference for Alder and that the baseline both meet the criteria approved. Could see supporting either map because they are the best possible maps we could put forward. Prefers central city shared by all three districts to encourage collaboration and uniting Portland.
- Preference for Alder because of the asset packing conversations we have had. They have been a renter and was previously on C4 board of CAT. Wants to acknowledge their letter. Its organizing conundrum candidates in that wealthier candidates will then run and overpower renters' voices.
- To the process, would be great to see of the metrics of the maps, to look at renter population over the areas where there is tension, socioeconomic numbers and would help him inform opinion on straw point. Would like to see the mapping overlays with the data.
- While not a voting member, the Alder map seems to be the one due to assets distribution, cross city collaboration with the central city in three districts. Question around renters has been a large conversation with maple map. Maple 3 west district would have 59% renter and Alder4 west district would have % 54 renters and SE district would have 47% renters, and that means two renter possible districts and shifted the thinking in favor to support for Alder.
- Would like to pick one map as a committee and not to send it to city council.
- Supports both maps, leans towards Alder because of community of common interests' themes.
- Leaning towards Alder due to the renter block and voter turnout in those areas that will vote. Renter preponderance is a very strong statement and don't want to ignore the data.

FLO Analytics shows the data of renters in the different districts in neighborhoods and the overlap of draft maps.

- Is there an overlay of household income?
 - Yes, Flow then shows the overlay of household incomes, poverty levels, median household income.

Autumn leads a discussion after looking at the map overlays on where the group is now.

- Based on the comments earlier, the group seems to be favoring Alder map and less so in favor of Maple map. Wondering if we can eliminate a map.
- Thinks we should consider the Alder map the base map and make adjustments from there. That the next week's agenda is moving to accept the Alder map as the map.

Commissioner Chisholm makes a motion: to eliminate the Maple map and use Alder V4 as the base map going forward for consideration.

- Motion from: Commissioner Chisholm
Second: Commissioner Saxena
- Discussion,
 - is it Alder 3 or Alder 4?
 - Autumn: We would be using Alder V4 as the base map moving forward for consideration and discussion.
- Using modified consensus, is there any opposition as presented?
- Seeing no opposition, motion passes – going forward the base map will be Alder4.

Commissioner Chisolm makes a motion: to call for a vote in the agenda next week, to vote on the revised version of Alder v4.

- Motion: Commissioner Chisholm
- Second: Commissioner Siegel
- Discussion:
 - I think it would be great before we do that vote, if we review the summary statistics for that map to validate all the expectations, questions and concerns with regard to the map.
 - Would it be friendly to table the motion to look at the data first?
- Motion tabled to the end of the evening.

Autumn reviews what they would like to look at in Alder4 to focus on for the revisions. Summary Statistics, not just the overlays, but the analysis and final statistics by district, not just by neighborhood and the question around the Montavilla district and Jade district, Rose City and Hollywood for consideration. Discussion on what they wanted to look at next after checking on if the group wanted more discussion.

- Looking at the layers for homeowner vs. renter, poverty numbers, race and ethnicity all.
- Data is pretty evident; the economics are more of an issue in the movement than the actual population numbers and that's something to consider.
- For the data request, to look at the portion of Sellwood that's represented in Alder, if it's possible based on voting age population, what percentage does it represent when it's joined with the Westside?
- Looking at voter participation as well.

- Flo Analytics: can show voter turnout by precinct in web map and overlay it with neighborhoods.
- One of the tasks for next week, is to identify which numbers, and that will drive which districts have 2 or 4 year terms. No rules and requirements about how we number them, the charter commission recommended that the two with lowest turnouts be the ones on presidential years.
 - Flo Analytics: we would need some time to run the data on that.

FLO Analytics led the Commission through data the draft map Alder 4 on households renter occupied vs owner occupied, ratio of income to poverty levels. Discussion, thoughts, and reflections on the maps. Are there any requestions to look at boundaries of this map?

- After listing to public hearings, 20% of people on the westside are experiencing poverty and similar to North/Northeast and Eastside of Portland, tells you something about the composition of the entire westside.
- SMILE Community session received voter turnout from Buckman and Sellwood voter participation was 90% in 2020 and 80% in 2022

Flo Analytics led the Commission through average household income and median household information, voter turnout by precinct and neighborhoods in 2020 and 2022. Then the group discussed the data they were looking at.

- While this is household income, it does not correlate to who is voting.
- That income number tells you why East Portland has been underrepresented for decades. Really proud that we have an East Portland district.
- Appreciations to the group around this and that this is the opportunity for east Portland to have representation.
- Each district has assets, what are the appropriate assets for each district and for community members to take pride in and development of those assets and to be shared across the city.
- Request to zoom in on Montavilla.
- As we think about numbering and which districts are being elected at presidential years and given an opportunity during higher turnout elections.
- Could we save these versions, so that we can access them later with the summary statistics?

Any other data the group would like to see?

- You wanted voting age population in total and see what percent the eastside part would be in the voting age population, there's the % of voter age population by age, what would it represent on the westside.
- Being able to quantify them, will help with the rationale.
 - Flow analytics: West district is 141,000 population, if you add in Sellwood and Moreland – 23624, is about 14% of the population of the Westside district.
 - Are you requesting voter age population, 18 or older – are you requesting number of people who have voted?
 - Full weighted impact would be who turned out to vote from those communities, in addition to voter age population.
- Criteria on what decisions are made is population based on the census.

Autumn moves the conversation to a discussion on neighborhood boundaries, starting with Montavilla.

- Montavilla is split in Alder, and when you add in the Jade District – is split on 82 and they preferred to be split. Montavilla would like to be made whole and checked in with the Jade district, to move the boundary from Mill Street to Division Street. It would add 1745 people to the inner Southeast District and the deviation goes to 4.999%.
- The deviation is under 5%.
- Montavilla feedback as you characterized it as the neighborhood boundary and they didn't think of themselves as an inner eastside district, neutral on it, but not the main piece of feedback.
- Is it more advantageous to have more people in a district, does it disadvantage in terms of voting?
- That's what deviation is for, to ensure one person one vote.
 - FLO Analytics - That's why we are aiming for equal districts, if you have a lower population district, that means they have a little more voting power.
- There were comments in the neighborhood, from that area, because it cut through a park grade school and don't want the neighborhood cut up.
- East county organizers spend time in Montavilla and if we want to put it in an eastside district.
- Appreciations to reaching out to the community on that conversation.
- Is 4.999% ok? It's close to 5%?
 - FLO Analytics: The number we want to be under is 10% and we can pull the numbers for that, but the important part is below 10, but also want to respect neighborhood boundaries and public input.

Commissioner Chisholm makes a motion: to change the SE boundary from Mill St down to Division St.

- Motion: Commissioner Chisholm
- Second: Commissioner VanSickle-Robbins
- Using Consensus, is there any opposition to move the boundary? Seeing none, motion passes and Division Street will be the new boundary.

Autumn asks the Commission are there specific requests to look at any other boarder?

- Interested in looking at options of Rose city park, but not certain it would be helpful with deviation.
- What would it look like if we pulled in Rose City park into NE?
 - Flo Analytics: doing that raises the overall deviation to 7.6%
- I retract the change then, if the deviation is that high.
- Could you smooth out districts along the highway?

Moving to motion that was tabled earlier in the evening. Motion is: to have a vote at the next meeting based on the current base map (Alder 4).

- Motion: Commissioner Chisholm
- Second: Commissioner Manjarrez
- Using consensus voting, is there any opposition? Hearing none, motion passes and that will be our core agenda.
- To clarify, we are still waiting to hear back about the port property?
 - Yes, we will hear back and we will prepare data requests and plan to use next meeting with any final revisions and deliberate and then plan to have the first vote.

- What remains after we vote on a final map is to number the districts and to have a memo to the future conversation? Do we need to meet on the 21st?
 - Appreciate the give back of time, next week we want to understand the themes and will likely need the time to approve the write up and will table that to see how far we get.
 - Can evaluate how much time we need after the next meeting.
- In the interim, to give some thought over lessons learned, what we got out of the process and come with bullets or thoughts on this and what information or timing do we need to do it more effectively.
- Thanks to the staff and committee for the discussion tonight. To encourage attendance in person for next week's vote.

Next Steps

The next meeting will be August 16, from 6:00 – 9:00 p.m.

Meeting adjourned, 8:52 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted,
Nicole Forbes, Transition Project Coordinator

Meeting Chat

18:08:44 From Victor (interpreter) to Sofia Alvarez, City of Portland(Direct Message) : Can you assign us as interpreters please? 🙏

18:10:31 From Sofia Alvarez, City of Portland to Victor (interpreter)(Direct Message) : Sorry just did it

18:15:25 From Sofia Alvarez, City of Portland : apologies, slide sharing is very slow today

18:18:43 From Comm. Chisholm : Alder 4 is here:
<https://districtr.org/edit/192215?event=portland2023>

18:21:33 From Comm. Siegel : Thanks, Comm Chisholm...that helped.

18:21:50 From Comm. Chisholm : The other issue is in the Cully neighborhood, not Sunderland.

18:22:21 From Comm. Chisholm : Maple 3 is here:
<https://districtr.org/edit/192228?event=portland2023>

18:32:38 From Comm. Hanson : That's helpful, thank you

18:32:50 From Alex Brasch | FLO Analytics | he/him : Unassigned census blocks (2) between I-205 and I-84 noted. No population in either. Thanks Commissioner Hanson.

18:32:57 From Comm. Hanson : Thanks, Alex!

18:42:08 From Sofia Alvarez, City of Portland to Hosts and panelists : No formal motion on Albina

18:52:25 From Comm. Saxena she/her : I see the merits of both maps

18:54:02 From Comm. Chisholm : Or everyone could discuss their own views, rather than just a hand-raise.

18:58:56 From Alex Brasch | FLO Analytics | he/him : We can work to supply those numbers. I will post in the chat and can elaborate if needed

19:01:47 From Sharon Robbins : Alex has created tables for both maps with a lot of the relevant data

19:01:53 From Alex Brasch | FLO Analytics | he/him : Agreed, Autumn. We can certainly view the variables mentioned by you and Commission Valdini.

19:13:14 From Alex Brasch | FLO Analytics | he/him : The number of neighborhood organizations is not the best metric to comparison the difference between Alder and Maple, because the neighborhood orgs in the SE are more fragmented.

That said, the Alder map has the following neighborhood orgs that are on the east side of the Willamette in the "west" district:

- 1) SELLWOOD-MORELAND IMPROVEMENT LEAGUE
- 2) REED
- 3) EASTMORELAND/REED
- 4) EASTMORELAND/ARDENWALD-JOHNSON CREEK
- 5) EASTMORELAND
- 6) ARDENWALD-JOHNSON CREEK/WOODSTOCK
- 7) ARDENWALD-JOHNSON CREEK

19:13:58 From Alex Brasch | FLO Analytics | he/him : The Maple map has the following neighborhood orgs that are on the east side of the Willamette in the "west" district:

- 1) KERNS
- 2) HOSFORD-ABERNETHY NEIGHBORHOOD DISTRICT ASSOCIATION
- 3) BUCKMAN COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

19:14:42 From Comm. Saxena she/her : Thanks, Alex!

19:15:52 From Alex Brasch | FLO Analytics | he/him : In Alder, the area to the east of the Willamette that is in the "west" district has a total population of ~23,625. In comparison, Maple has a total population of ~18,778.

19:16:55 From Alex Brasch | FLO Analytics | he/him : Note that I am referring to Draft Map Maple, which includes roughly half of the Hosford-Abernethy neighborhood, west of SE 12th Ave.

19:17:21 From Sharon Robbins : What are the numbers for Maple 3 and Alder 4?

19:17:43 From Comm. Hanson : Alder 4: <https://distrctr.org/edit/192215?event=portland2023>; Maple 3: <https://distrctr.org/edit/192228?event=portland2023>

19:19:36 From Comm. Saxena she/her : same

19:19:41 From Comm. Chisholm : same same

19:20:56 From Alex Brasch | FLO Analytics | he/him : Commissioner Robbins, if you are referring to the population of the areas east of the river in the "west" district for Alder 4 and Maple 3, the value I included above for Alder is representative of Alder 4 because the correction of omitting Brooklyn from the area is question and the slight aesthetic change seemed likely.

19:22:13 From Alex Brasch | FLO Analytics | he/him : Including all of Hosford-Abernethy in the area that would be part of the "west" district, as reflected in Maple 3, would increase the population to ~25,854.

19:30:29 From Sharon Robbins : Are you talking about overlays or the tables that Alex has been working on (which I think are easier to consume)

19:31:44 From Comm. Judd : It would be great to see the overly of the latest versions of Alder and Maple to highlight the points of variation and discussion the data layers.

19:43:30 From Sharon Robbins : In Alder 4, the average household income of Sellwood/Westmoreland/Eastmoreland/Reed matches the whole west district (\$127k) and their median household income is actually \$6k higher than the whole district (\$94k)

19:44:36 From Alex Brasch | FLO Analytics | he/him : We also have tables of information for those that better digest the data in a different (non-map) way.

19:46:45 From Sharon Robbins : Can you clarify its Alder 3?

19:49:44 From Comm. Fleischman : Thank you Comm. Chisolm for moving us forward with these resolutions.

19:49:56 From Sharon Robbins : I'd also like to see the voter participation numbers

19:49:56 From Comm. Laurente : +1
19:50:12 From Comm. Hanson : +1 Comm. Fleischman!
19:50:12 From Comm. Chisholm : As they say, the only skill required to succeed in politics is the ability to count.
19:51:09 From Comm. Siegel : All great arguments and critical thought. Thank you all.
19:59:47 From Sharon Robbins : I think we should be looking at Alder 4
20:13:38 From Comm. Judd : Alex, Please save these layers as maps and stats for future reference and ease of access for commissioners. Thanks!
20:16:23 From Sofia Alvarez, City of Portland : City Attorney will also be present at next weeks meeting and can talk more about numbering, if needed
20:20:06 From Comm. Siegel : Having these statistics will help with our overall storytelling and rationale/justification.
20:28:47 From Comm. Manjarrez : Can we look at the maps while we talk through this?
20:28:53 From Comm. Manjarrez : Alder 4
20:29:03 From Comm. Hanson : <https://districtr.org/edit/192215?event=portland2023>
20:29:07 From Comm. Hanson : Here's Alder 4
20:29:18 From Autumn Carter - Facilitator : Alex, can you pull the map up to show Montavilla?
20:29:28 From Comm. Hanson : Alex will have neighborhood boundaries so that's def better!
20:33:33 From Comm. Saxena she/her : Are we shifting into the East Portland district?
20:38:29 From Alex Brasch | FLO Analytics | he/him : Also, I can confirm that making the change that is being discussed (i.e., using Division as the boundary) would increase the overall deviation, to 4.999%
20:53:08 From Comm. Siegel : You all rock!
20:53:37 From Comm. Hanson : Seriously! Great work, everyone!
20:54:00 From Sharon Robbins : Proud of the collaborative effort and grace by all!
20:54:06 From Sofia Alvarez, City of Portland : Alex and Kimi- Thank you for all the work!!
20:54:07 From Comm. Chisholm : Huge props as always to our interpreters, who are doing an amazing job translating our technical conversations
20:54:08 From Comm. Manjarrez : Agreed, incredible work! It was nice to hear everyone's voice and perspective. It felt like a great way to close