

PORTLAND TRANSITION TEAM PUBLIC COMMENT REPORT

Date range: May 1st – 31st, 2023

From May 1st through May 31st, the Portland Transition Team received a total of **90** public comments through our online comment form, via email and verbal public comment. **10** out of the **90** comments was submitted on behalf community-based organization(s). To date, we've received **337** public comments during the transition of Portland's city government.

Raw public comments received during May 1st through May 31st. Attachments are included at the end of the report.

Raw Public Comments

My name is _____, my pronouns are he/him, I am a professor of political science at Washington State University, Vancouver. I was a deeply involved with the process to get the ballot measure passed and have a strong interest in the administrative reforms that have been passed. I also have a background studying and thinking about things like advisory groups and citizen involvement so what this group is doing is a particular interest to me, and I'm hoping to be seen again and talk with you again. Today, because it is so early, I just want to start off with a very sort of broad comment for your consideration. I think, as an advisory group, that the best thing that you can do is to think very expansively about who you're advised. So what I mean by that is that your advising not only the elected officials, right? Which, on some level, I think, is a critical part of this, and also probably most importantly, staff at the city and also to some extent at the county as well on the sort of advising them on what their implementation process is. But I also think that you're advising local organizations. You're giving them perspectives because you're gonna have the an intimate understanding of what's happening in the city. With this implementation process. So you can actually advise local organizations who are very interested in this. And there are a huge number, as I think, many of you know, who are very interested in the implementation process and are going to want to hear more from you about how it's going and then, finally, you're really on. Some level advisory, I would say the public at large giving them information, being a conduit for what's happening within the city in the implementation process and helping them to understand it and help lead them through it as well. So the basic point is this, that advising here is complex. But but I think interesting and engaging, because it involves all these different groups sometimes they're not gonna always see eye to eye and there's gonna be different sort of negotiating between perspectives that you're bringing to bear. But this group is well equipped to do that, and I know you're at the early stages. But I'm really excited for you, in what you're doing, and excited for this entire process. So thank you.

My name's _____. And I represent a group of about 2,400 Portland voters in their family's, and many of our groups have sent in suggestions to this committee about the process of selecting the new district boundaries and also basically, concern that ... that the process might get into a gerrymandering type of situation which, while allowed by law, is certainly abhorrent to most individual voters. And so we wanna make sure that doesn't happen. And we would like to see more information, if possible, about your discussions and about your objectives and and the things that come up to, you know the objectives because they're printed. So basically that's it. One other thing. And I'm not particularly up to power on this one. But one of our active members said that there are a number of different websites regarding this and there are a number of different groups, and they all have different formats on their website for finding what time it is, and and publicly, oh, input as well, so that's basically, it we're thrilled that this

is happening. Portland, is a fantastic city, and the more we get to hear from more voices out there, the better as long as we stay away from individual focus groups who only have one thing in mind, and that is their problem, not the problems of the city. So thank you very much.

can I submit an attachment?

As you consider the district boundaries, it's important for you to be aware that there are six neighborhood associations on the west side that have effectively collaborated as a larger community on many issues affecting downtown and beyond. They are Downtown, Pearl District, Goose Hollow, NW District, Old Town and SW Hills. While it seems logical that the entire west side be one of the four districts, should there be any consideration of breaking up the west side, I urge that these referenced neighborhoods not be separated. Thank you for taking this into consideration as you continue with your important work.

As you determine the 4 voting districts, please include the whole boundary of existing neighborhood associations.

In particular, boundaries of these west-side neighborhood associations should be left intact and together:

- Downtown
- Goose Hollow
- NW District
- Old Town
- SW Hills

Taken together, many of the voting residents in these areas..... represent a "community of interest".....they know each other and work together on civic projects.

Thank you, and all the best.....

I do not understand why the Charter Review Commission recommended four city council districts. One of the criteria the Charter Review Commission recommended is to use existing boundaries, and these are all over the map, so to speak. Portland currently has:

- six geographic areas: north, northwest, northeast, southeast, southwest, south (PBOT street names)
- seven neighborhood district coalitions (Civic Life),
- plus or minus 95 neighborhood associations (Civic Life),
- five comprehensive planning districts (BPS),
- five watersheds (BES)
- four school districts

Hank Schottland's excellent comments on April 19, 2023 summarized some of the useful data and analyses in Portland's Comprehensive Plan for 2035, in particular the chapter on "Urban Design-Direction":

Urban Form: Portland includes three fundamentally distinct types of neighborhoods: the Inner Neighborhoods, with their main street commercial districts and compact street grid; the Western Neighborhoods, whose urban form is shaped by hilly terrain, streams and other natural features; and the Eastern Neighborhoods, whose diverse mix of urban and more rural forms is set against a backdrop of Douglas firs and buttes. Beyond these three neighborhood urban forms are two other Portland patterns: those of the Central City neighborhoods, Portland's most intensely urbanized area; and the industrial districts, with their own distinct urban form characteristics.

In other words, the Comprehensive Plan argues for five districts based on community characteristics:

- Central City
- Western Neighborhoods
- Inner Neighborhoods
- Eastern Neighborhoods
- Industrial Neighborhoods

Since the language in the charter now requires four districts, it seems to me that the mapping exercise is not only dividing communities of interest; it is also combining unlike communities into districts.

My biggest concern with the large size of these four city council districts is that they are not compact enough for communities to gather, and will likely require a lengthy travel time to conduct business in person. Access to conduct business is a major consideration for county seat locations. I do not support the idea of subdistricts for city council office locations because this would geographically divide access to city council members that are supposed to represent all constituents in their district. My experience has been that it can take an hour to drive from my neighborhood in SW Portland to other areas in Portland (much longer by transit if that is an option), particularly if I must cross any of the Willamette River bridges near rush hour.

I've reviewed the map layers that may be considered communities of interest and offer the following suggestions regarding what I consider important communities of interest from a neighborhood geographic perspective.

School attendance areas are key. Portland Public Schools is the largest of six school districts

within the city of Portland, educating more than 46,000 students. Every K-12 student has a neighborhood school based on home address. High school, middle school and elementary school attendance areas determine the people that families with school age children spend a lot of time with, including athletics and after school activities. I have lived in the same neighborhood for 45 years and our neighborhood school attendance areas have changed several times during that time. Each PPS boundary change was emotional, contentious and challenging.

Neighborhood Association and District Coalition boundaries are key. Portland's neighborhood system (~95 neighborhood associations clustered into 7 district coalition areas) has been in place for over 45 years and has become the go-to place for civic engagement. Neighborhood Associations and District Coalitions are communities where we gather information and discuss issues of common interest that affect livability issues in our neighborhoods. Many community groups thrive in Portland but the neighborhood system is the only one specific to a geographic area, and it needs to remain intact.

Issues that affect neighborhood livability are key. In my neighborhood in Southwest Portland, the City of Portland and the Comprehensive Plan discuss serious deficiencies in infrastructure. Many of our volunteers advocate for funding to build sidewalks, bicycle facilities, transit service and stormwater management systems that will benefit our neighborhoods. We do not have the same transportation issues as, say, St. Johns or Sellwood, because they have a more built environment. In SW Portland people depend on driving their cars for safety. It's so dangerous to use alternative transportation, it's safe. The Southwest Neighborhoods district coalition has always had separate land use and transportation committees because there are a lot of issues to discuss for each topic. We are passionate about parks but we have more natural areas than developed parks, which may not be the same issues than, say, St. Johns or Sellwood. We are passionate about public safety but may address safety differently than, say, St. Johns or Sellwood. I understand that the mapping criteria will require combining areas that do not have common interests, but it will take time and resources to create a sense of community within the four districts.

Multnomah County and Metro Council district boundaries are somewhat relevant. We expect our regional and local elected officials to work together. Collaboration may be more successful if elected official boundaries are somewhat consistent.

State legislative boundaries are less relevant. My neighborhood has been redistricted every 10 years and has gone from a "Portland" district to a "Tigard" district to a "Lake Oswego" district. Every 10 years I need to educate my legislators about conditions and issues in SW Portland.

So far I think the DistrictR maps are all over the place and I don't have enough information about the proposals to weigh in. The spatial data sets in DistrictR are challenging to review online to get a sense of the data in the data sets. Please analyze the maps to evaluate how well they meet the criteria because some, like communities of common interest, need more discussion.

Thank you,

[comment form blank]

Dear Mayor Wheeler, Commissioners, Portland Independent District Commission, and Office of Community and Civic Life staff:

Please see the attached motion approved by our Board of Directors confirming the importance of using existing Portland Neighborhood Association boundaries as the primary organizing principle for City Council Districts by the Portland Independent District Commission.

These neighborhoods are as old as Portland itself. Portlanders identify strongly with their neighborhoods, and using this structure as the basis for the Commission's work will be vital to maintain neighborhood cohesion, raise up constituents' voices, and avoid gerrymandering.

Our Board would be glad to host a representative from the Commission at a future board meeting. We thank you for your attention to this, and for your work on behalf of all Portlanders.

Sincerely,

Eastmoreland Neighborhood Association
Approved Motion
Portland City Independent District Commission
Page 1 of 1

At its Board meeting on Thursday 20 April, the Eastmoreland Neighborhood Association moved to advise the Portland Independent District Commission that existing Portland neighborhood association boundaries should be used as the primary organizing principle for City Council Districts except and unless neighborhood associations agree to modify their respective boundaries and provide justification supporting such a change.

Continuing the existing neighborhood association boundaries achieves the following beneficial purposes:

§ The historic neighborhood structure is reinforced to maintain a consistent geographic based constituency for their respective City Councilors

§ The historic neighborhood structure facilitates City Councilors' communication with their constituents.

§ The historic neighborhood structure clarifies the geographic accountability of district City Councilors to their constituents.

§ The historic neighborhood structure avoids district gerrymandering for the purposes of affecting election outcomes

I just wanted to say thank you for putting together a district mapping team that is diverse and representative of most of the major communities in Portland. I feel confident this group will do an excellent job!

My ideal map of districts would cross boundaries of our neighborhoods to encourage us to know and work together.

Perhaps a felt tip marker drawing east to west at aqua-distant intervals across the boundaries of the city. IE; North Portland, a bit of St Johns and into the Pearl would be one district,

It is exciting to have a chance to draw a map for the first multi-member district election in Portland after the passage of the charter amendment. Please find my map at <https://districtr.org/plan/183609>. The reasoning behind the borders of the map can be found below with reference to the criteria that the IDC will be considering.

- Will be contiguous and compact: The SE and inner SE districts are very compact, the West district uses the river as a border and is compact with the area it requires east of the river, while the North Portland district is as compact as can be utilizing the existing compact borders of the West and SE districts . All districts are contiguous.
 - Utilize existing geographic or political boundaries: The river is used as a natural geographic boundary that bounds the inner SE and North districts on the west, keeping the whole of West Portland within one district. Since neither the inner SE or North districts extend across the river, it becomes necessary for the West district to extend across the river to obtain the requisite number of voters. Since the northernmost point of the West district contains the most northern part of Portland, it was natural to come down from the most NW point in the most compact manner. The inner SE district uses the river, 82nd Ave, and the Banfield as almost clean borders, and the SE district uses Sandy Blvd as a northern boundary.
 - Not divide communities of common interest: The map makes sure to give SE Portland east of 82nd its own unique district from which to elect its representatives. The boundaries discussed above (river, Banfield, 82nd) keep communities of common interest largely intact.
 - Be connected by transportation links: The use of the Banfield and major streets as boundaries keeps the districts connected.
 - Be of equal population: The districts are reasonably close in population.
- Thank you for considering this map and good luck with your deliberations going forward on this historic change to Portland's electoral system.

In the US, both Federal & State, are determined by population—————Use the 2020 US Census—————just like every other form of government.

Greetings,

The purpose of this email is to submit public comment on the proposed district boundaries.

I believe the East Portland boundary should be I-205 given the significant physical barrier this represents. The locations east of I-205 were brought into the City of Portland later than other parts of the city. This means that many neighborhoods east of I-205 do not have comparable levels of city services/infrastructure in terms of lighting, sidewalks, and access to transit.

While 82nd Ave. is also a dividing line on the mental map of Portlanders, it is much simpler to physically travel across- one need only to cross the street. For I-205, the streets literally do not go through meaning someone seeking to get to the other side of I-205 needs to drive/walk/bike at a designated crossing (Market St; Division St; Stark St; Burnside St; Glisan St; Sandy; etc.

These options, particularly north of Glisan, are limited. Moreover, the places that do exist to cross I-205, have substandard walking and biking facilities making I-205 difficult to cross for people who lack access to personal vehicles. Additionally, frequent transit options to cross I-205 are limited to Foster, Powell, Division, Stark/Washington, Burnside, MAX/Gateway Transit Center, Sandy, meaning there are only 7 locations where people reliant on public transit can cross I-205 on a frequent service schedule.

East Portlanders have lower car ownership rates than other parts of the city. There are also people who do not drive due to age (young or old), cost, preference, or ability. This makes I-205 a mental boundary for many East Portlanders, similar to how the Willamette River is a mental boundary for people living east or west of the river in closer-in neighborhoods.

When I think of my mental map, I think of places I can walk, bike, or take transit to. Virtually all of these exist east of I-205. Additionally, disinvestment in East Portland neighborhoods exist- and are defined by their presence- east of I-205. These same conditions exist whether someone is living on the north end near Parkrose or the south end near Powell Butte. In short, I-205 defines East Portland.

I believe the promise of charter reform is that it will allow East Portland to finally have the electoral power to begin addressing this disinvestment. However, in order to do that, the boundaries must be tightly focused on where the historic disinvestment has been and not be diluted more than necessary to achieve the necessary population number to qualify as a district.

Additionally, if we were to look at past practice, East Portland Community Office primarily follows the I-205 boundary. These neighborhoods face similar challenges in terms of park access, transit access, displacement risks, climate impacts, and community safety risks such as traffic crashes and gun violence.

In conclusion, I would strongly advocate that the boundary for the easternmost district be a continuous north-south segment defined by I-205 to the west and the city boundary to the north, east, and south.

If the boundary needs to be expanded to meet population requirements, it should expand first to 82nd Ave and have this expansion be focused on the southern part of the district (similar to East Portland Community Office boundary). This reasoning is based off of the PBOT equity matrix which shows similar demographic characteristics in this area to other parts of East Portland.

Thank you for your service and considering my feedback.

Kind regards,

The concept of having district representation on the City Council was so members of the community could easily know who actually represented them on the City Council. Therefore, districts should follow neighborhood boundaries. Splitting a neighborhood up into two or more districts negates the primary reasoning for even having district representation.

Hello District Commission:

Developing boundaries for Portland's new districts is an important and sensitive task. I've tried using the mapping application that's provided for public input, and frankly found it very detailed but perhaps too much so for the average resident to master. The census-tract level of detail and the lack of identifiable features in the underlying map make the app difficult to use.

As with most endeavors of this sort, simplicity is key. So here's my simple suggestion for a basic outline that can be a starting point for a more detailed map. Portland has long had what were called quadrants (though actually 5, and now 6) and areas comparable to these should initially be reflected in a broad-brush map of the 4 new districts:

Westside: Downtown, Southwest Portland, South Portland, and Northwest Portland;

North/Northeast: the areas with those addresses share similar demographics and were quite linked until divided by I-5;

Southeast: a distinct and densely populated area that should be kept intact in one district;

Far Eastside: a natural dividing line to define this district would be 82nd Avenue or I-205.

I realize that these generalized boundaries will need to be adjusted to produce new districts of near-equal population. For example, my suggested Westside district will need additional area in order to reach the population target; perhaps adding Sellwood, Eastmoreland, and Westmoreland would work. It will also likely be desirable to fine-tune the lines to avoid splitting recognized neighborhoods or distinct ethnic communities. But concerns about demographics and ethnicity should not become an overwhelming factor. No single principle should be taken to extremes by drawing boundaries that zig and zag and ignore the common understanding of the traditional broad segments that constitute the city of Portland.

You have a difficult task and I wish you well.

Here's my map!

<https://districtr.org/plan/183842>

Reasoning:

It's good for districts to be intuitive. Start with major memorable psychological barriers. These will also tend to correspond to geographic identities. therefore, start with the river and the freeways and vary it from there.

East Portland is pretty unique and should get its own district. East of 205 isn't quite enough people, and east of 82nd is too many. So I decided the more recently developed parts of outer Cully are more like East Portland (and less like the inner NE neighborhoods) than the parts of Lents west of 205 are. 205 is generally a more important psychological barrier than 82nd, and has the added benefit of not breaking up any unified districts because no districts straddle the freeway.

Follow existing neighborhood and precinct lines whenever possible. The transition in Cully follows precincts.

Keep the central city together across the river. The east landing of the Burnside Bridge is more like downtown than it is like Buckman. Buckman is more like Kerns than it is like the central eastside.

Sellwood is not a great match with Southwest, but it seemed better than St. Johns, Irvington, Buckman, or Brooklyn.

Even the whitest of these districts, the westside, is slightly below 75% in total non-Hispanic white population. Looking at current voting-age population, if we assume a political coalition that includes many people of color, any district would be likely to be able to elect at least one representative of that coalition and East Portland (at 58% non-Hispanic white in this case) would be likely to often elect two.

Because voters are operating from relatively little information, it's extra important for local districts to correspond relatively closely to the regional identities within the city. If you live east of 205 or west of the river, that should be enough for you to know which district you're in. Assuming even population splits allow, that's the ease of memory that the district commission should be aiming for.

This is for the GTAC - in the 2nd meeting I asked a question and I believe I worded it incorrectly, which was why the response was not what I was after. I initially asked about emergency powers but I believe what I should have said was regarding emergency power over bureaus - would that fall to the City Administrator or would we have to wait for the 12 commissioners to squabble over calling for an emergency order? I am referring to Mayor Wheeler's homeless orders like no camps along highways or school routes, taking over part of PBOT so that he could start towing back up again, etc. These all seem to hit specific bureaus for action and are not necessarily an 'emergency order' which mayor + council have always had to vote on (for example the overarching homeless emergency we've had in place since 2015 has always been voted on by council). I think it would make voters feel better knowing the City Administrator had this kind of authority versus having to wait for 12 people to come to an agreement to get something urgent enacted. Thanks!

We need job descriptions ASAP. We were told they would have job descriptions in hand by this month.

At the 2nd GTAC meeting, Project Manager Julia Meier stated that she and another person were currently still working on them and wasn't sure when they would be done. How will they determine a pay rate without a job description by next month?

The GTAC is going to be working on things like how the commissioners will be interacting with their constituents, again, if limited, it seems like voters will not be happy to be paying for full time work if they will not be dealing directly with constituent relations and only working on legislative policy.

It also sounds like they will not have resolved the overlooked city code item that currently says council members have to quit their day jobs, another big factor in the decision you are making.

May 15, 2023

Re: Request to make new District Boundaries consistent with existing Neighborhood Association boundaries

Dear Mayor, Council and Members of the Boundary Commission,

The Richmond Neighborhood spans the area from the south side of SE Hawthorne Blvd. to the north side of Powell Blvd., and SE 28th Pl/29th Ave to SE 50th/52nd Aves. We ask that when drawing the new City Council Districts, you maintain the current boundaries for neighborhood associations and make the new District boundaries consistent with existing neighborhood association boundaries. These boundaries have been part of Portland's civic fabric for decades, and many Portland residents strongly identify with their neighborhoods. Portland's Neighborhood Associations are independent, non-profit organizations, and their boundaries are based on their unique history and circumstances.

We believe that neighborhood boundaries are the sort of existing political boundaries that Portlanders had in mind when they voted to support reform of the city's charter last November.

We believe that respecting these boundaries will strengthen the geographic accountability of City Councilors, make it easier for people to know who their Representatives are, and will reduce the temptation for future decision makers to gerrymander the map to achieve a particular electoral outcome.

Sincerely,

I urge that the Commission employ the existing recognized and chartered Neighborhood Association boundaries as the basic geographic unit in assigning representative districts, and that District Coalition boundaries be considered as an additional increment. These geographic areas represent the fundamental institutional and social infrastructure of our city and should not be divided or distorted. We oppose using precincts, census tracts or zip codes for these reasons.

Dear Independent District Commissioners:

These comments supplement my written (May 3) and oral (May 17) testimony. I live in the Crestwood Neighborhood in SW Portland that borders Washington County and the City of Tigard. Our neighborhood's growth has always been influenced by historic roadways: SW Taylors Ferry Road (1850's), SW Capitol Highway (1916), SW Barbur Blvd/Pacific Highway (1934), and Interstate 5 (1959). It is a mostly residential neighborhood that includes part of the West Portland Town Center, which is one of two town centers in SW Portland and an area that is racially and economically diverse.

I continue to support district maps that follow Portland's 2035 Comprehensive Plan "Urban Design" and planning areas as closely as possible. These are: Central City, Western Neighborhoods, Inner Neighborhoods, Eastern Neighborhoods and Industrial Neighborhoods. Portland's Comprehensive Plan recognizes the unique characteristics of these urban areas and focuses growth in centers and corridors.

At your May 17 meeting you approved motions to keep the district areas west of the Willamette River and east of I-205 whole. You requested feedback on other criteria, including communities of common interest and identifying places where people live, work and play. Here are some comments.

1. Please consider travel time to the "center" of the districts. It is not easy nor convenient to travel across any of the Willamette River bridges during rush hour and it sometimes takes me almost an hour to drive to downtown and Northwest Portland during rush hour.
2. Some IDC commissioners' comments during public meetings lump people living on the west side of the Willamette River into one stereotype. There are a number of differences among different areas of the west side. One attribute we seem to have in common is that we care a lot about our community.
3. Southwest Portland has a very strong neighborhood association and district coalition system that partners as best we can to enhance livability in our community. Please preserve the neighborhood association boundaries in your maps as the best way to transform one large geographic area (the City of Portland) into seven smaller geographic areas (district coalitions) and 95 neighborhoods that focus on local issues. The City of Portland should not address issues as one-size-fits-all.
4. Southwest Portland has the least street and stormwater management infrastructure of any geographic area in Portland, based on the Bureau of Transportation Street Surfaces maps (2018). The Bureau of Planning and Sustainability published "complete neighborhood" profiles in the Portland Plan (1994) and our neighborhood is one of the most incomplete neighborhoods in the City of Portland.
5. My single family home has a real market value near the City of Portland median but my property taxes are very high relative to the market value.
6. My neighborhood association is working with other community partners to preserve and enhance affordable housing in our area. A lot of families move here because we have affordable homes and great schools.
7. My neighborhood association is a member of the Southwest Equity Coalition and supports the location of a multicultural hub in the West Portland Town Center.
8. My neighborhood has one playground structure and no public schools. Our neighborhood children attend elementary and middle school on the other side of I-5 and Ida B Wells-Barnett High School. There is no safe way to walk or bike to our local schools but we care a lot about the schools in our area. The Islamic School of Portland is located within the West Portland Town Center, also on the other side of I-5 near Markham Elementary and the mosque.
9. My neighborhood has no sidewalks or bike paths on its busy streets and very little access to transit. These conditions make our neighborhood very car-dependent, and motor vehicle traffic has gotten worse with the proliferation of service vehicles (Uber/Lyft, Amazon, DoorDash, etc) over the past few years.
10. We spend a lot of volunteer time advocating for infrastructure and safety improvements, but the City of Portland and TriMet have told us these systems are not likely to change much over the next 10 years.
11. The West Portland Town Center Plan identifies a number of improvements needed in our neighborhood, but it goes unfunded. We continue to experience residential infill without infrastructure because these improvements are expensive.
12. Our neighbors have a passion to preserve trees and protect watersheds and natural areas in our community.
13. Our main gathering spaces are the one park with the playground structure, and the public library and public schools. There are two community centers in SW Portland (Multnomah Arts Center and Southwest Community Center) but we have to pay to use their services. The Portland Office of Community and Civic Life does not fund an office in SW Portland other than

in the Portland Building downtown.

14. Our neighbors care a lot about each other. We have several "neighborhood watches", "neighborhood emergency teams" and one of the lowest crime rates in the City of Portland.

15. Crestwood Neighborhood Association sponsors a "Neighborhood Night Out" picnic in the park every year (except 2020-21).

16. We have our share of homeless people that live in tents and cars on our streets (we don't have sidewalks), particularly near I-5 and SW Barbur Blvd.

17. We have two freeway interchanges in our neighborhood and five freeway ramps within the West Portland Town Center. The Oregon Dept. of Transportation is doing its best to put the one local grocery store in the "Crossroads" area of the West Portland Town Center out of business. ODOT recently expanded ODOT roads for cars and made access to the grocery store less safe, ignoring strong advocacy among a range of partners for a more walkable and bikeable town center.

Regarding your question of "where to cross the river", I recommend using the Sellwood Bridge based on where people work. Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU), Portland Community College Sylvania Campus, and manufacturing jobs in Washington County are frequently cited as major employers for people living in our area. There are also regional health services in nearby Washington County (Portland Clinic and Providence Bridgeport Health Center). TriMet and others have told us that people in SE Portland and Clackamas County use the Sellwood Bridge to access employment; they travel by car today but possibly by transit in the future since the Sellwood Bridge is streetcar-ready and the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Plan FEIS is complete.

Oddly enough, Nextdoor.com considers Sellwood part of Crestwood's NextDoor community. Multnomah County Library recently closed its Capitol Hill branch and recommended Sellwood and Hillsdale as nearby alternatives.

It seems that the people in Sellwood and the East/Westmoreland share our passions for trees, parks, watersheds, schools, public safety and livability. As mentioned above, TriMet has noted that people in SE travel to the west side to access jobs and services in our community as well as access to Interstate-5.

Please don't just look at demographic data when recommending district maps. Please consider the elements of a "complete neighborhood" in terms of community needs and common passions for school communities, locally owned shops and services, parks, trees, watersheds, and the infrastructure needed to walk, bike and take transit safely. Most importantly, please consider easy access to the "center" of each district for us to conduct business with our city council representatives.

Good Morning, I was curious to see if I could receive an invite to the Employee Town Hall on May 25th? Thank you,

I did, thank you. I believe this is the 3rd time between the two of us...

Hello, Has the Districting Commission heard from the Fire Bureau and the Police Bureau about their geographic divisions and whether they should be considered in forming the new representational districts? I just learned that the Police Bureau has three precincts that are comprised of numerous districts: <https://www.portland.gov/police/divisions/precincts>. The Portland Fire Bureau has four battalions: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/fire/article/45374>. Maybe their divisions aren't relevant, but it could be informative to check with them. Thank you.

I'm a professional statistician, and I've studied ranked-choice voting. In general, I think the choices made in Portland are sound. (Closely mimicking Minneapolis approach.) One question about "Single Transferrable Voting"... What happens if during later rounds of counting, a voter indicates a candidate who has already won during an earlier tally round? Say... their 2d choice is a candidate who already won based on 1st choice votes. Is their vote for a candidate who has already won skipped to instead go to their NEXT choice?

In 1991, as Oregon Secretary of State, I was tasked with drawing district lines for Oregon's state legislative seats, after the Legislature failed to complete the task. When it came to the boundaries for legislative districts within the city of Portland, we decided, to the extent possible, to respect the existing boundaries of neighborhood associations. (Prior to being elected as a state legislator from a SE/SW Portland district in 1988, I had been Chair of the Brooklyn neighborhood association). Given the important roles that neighborhood associations have -- and will continue -- to play in Portland civic life, I think this same principle remains a good one.

If you split a neighborhood into two separate districts, a citizen would have to choose among SIX councilors to call.

I'm writing to express the importance of keeping East Portland, the area of town west of I-205, together as a single district. East Portland has often been overlooked and overburdened since its neighborhoods were annexed by the City of Portland over the course of the 1980s. We can see this in the plans for warehouse giant Prologis to open a warehouse across the street from a majority BIPOC high school in neighborhood that is already a heat bubble and awash in diesel fumes despite objections from the community. We can see it in the disproportionate, to put it mildly, amount of low-income, multi-family housing located in East Portland even though our schools are already overburdened and teacher to student ratios are high. We can see it in the sorry state of our roads. Of particular concern are plans that would split the districts horizontally, which could enable wealthy west-side residents to outspend East Portland community and ultimately dominate city council. East Portland needs its own accountable representatives to begin to heal after decades of inequity.

Please consider our neighborhoods, the ones we have spent decades uniting and organizing in, and put hearts above head counts by giving more weight to how Portlanders identify their communities, and less to achieving four districts of equal population (words from Nany Champlain).

I am speaking as a member of Central Northeast Neighbors, Roseway Neighborhood Association Board Member.

To The Independent Districting Commission,

Three of the districting maps (Nos. 9, 10 & 11) are totally ridiculous, absurd, lack common sense and are out of touch with reality. They split up numerous existing Northeast neighborhoods into two districts, and the Central Northeast Neighbors coalition into three districts. The purpose of having multiple districts in the Charter Change initiative was so neighborhoods and neighborhood organizations would not have to go to the entire City Council membership for representation, and instead have just three people on the City Council they could go to for that representation, not six or nine!

Using whatever prejudicial, bias or racist reasoning you came up with to draw the lines East of the Willamette River, you might as well have drawn a line through the North Portland peninsula right down the middle of Lombard Street to the St. Johns Bridge. Obviously that is how you are treating most of the central Northeast Neighborhoods. I don't see you splitting up the Albina area which would clearly show the same intent and lack of intellect as the actions

you are specifically proposing for the Central Northeast neighborhoods.

Districts should follow hard and already drawn lines such as I-84 and existing neighborhood boundaries, not the namby-pamby rubbish and gobbledygook that appears on maps 9, 10 & 11 for the Central Northeast.

I live in Eastmoreland and I do not feel that the proposed district maps 9 and 10 reflect our neighborhood. Proposed map 11 is closest in alignment to how eastsiders view ourselves. Putting Moreland and Sellwood into the west side district does not represent historic or cultural reality.

Dear Commissioners, I am a resident of Eastmoreland. My understanding is that in two of the draft maps, Eastmoreland would be included in a Portland City District with West Portland. I'm concerned that this would create a grouping of areas that are superficially homogeneous in socioeconomic status and racial/ethnic composition, while having in fact very different concerns and priorities. We chose to live in Eastmoreland because it is geographically and spiritually part of Southeast Portland. Over 30 years, we have watched and participated in the process of an affluent enclave struggling with conflicting desires to be both part of and apart from its surroundings. Every time Eastmoreland connects with and participates in its immediate SE environment, both our neighborhood and the larger area becomes happier and healthier. Eastmoreland's concerns around built environments, parks, traffic, public transit and development standards are far more intertwined with and dependent on adjacent areas, including Sellwood, Woodstock and the mixed-use areas to the north, than to Dunthorpe or the West Hills. Thank you for your consideration.

I live in Eastmoreland and support proposed map #9.

Dear IDC staff: We have lived in Eastmoreland since 1978. We have always considered ourselves part of Southeast. Our children attended Southeast schools; we shop in Southeast neighborhoods; we use Southeast parks, and we share many interests and concerns with our friends in other Southeast neighborhoods. When we first moved to Portland there was a discussion of school boundaries, and there was intense opposition to the idea that Southeast students might be bused across the river. One official who asserted that the Willamette River was an "artificial boundary" was laughed off the stage. Eastmoreland and other SMILE neighborhoods belong in a Southeast district.

Please before you vote, take into account that the Sumner Association of Neighbors students and our taxes go to the Parkrose School District and, therefore we need to stay on the eastside. Putting us into somewhere in the southeast would be of no benefit for us, and would be a huge mistake to all our neighbors that have worked to make our community livable plus it would totally divide our community with council members that would have no interest in us and that we have no interest in. Our neighborhood interest has always been on the east side.

Reject 4 and 8-- they are awkward and don't touch the "similar communities" approach. The others are acceptable.

As a lifelong SE Portlander and a 40 year resident of Eastmoreland, I resent being included with Westside Portland neighborhoods in the proposed mapping of Districts! I am at home as an Eastsider and appreciate the way the east Portland streets are patterned and laid out! Quite frankly I'm lost on the Westside and rarely associate or visit that area. I feel our lower eastside of Portland is geographically aligned by the Willamette River and has more in common with East side needs and desires. Please do not align our neighborhood with those of the West side! If this is dictated I will have yet another reason to leave the city I once admired and loved!

For decades, the only elected local representatives in Portland city government were the neighborhood association boards. With all City Council members elected at-large, many parts of the city felt underrepresented compared to downtown and the west side. The new City Charter reform and the introduction of district elections was pitched as a way to correct that, and give residents from all areas of Portland a voice on the City Council. If the new district map ignores the long-established neighborhoods and neighborhood coalitions, the intent of the new City Charter will be thwarted, and the same problems of lack of representation will simply continue. Inner eastside neighborhoods have much more in common with their eastside neighbors than they do with westside neighborhoods across the river. Please don't make the mistake of establishing districts that ignore common concerns among areas with similar infrastructure, traffic and transportation patterns, and environmental issues. Creating districts that straddle the river seems arbitrary and will lead to the same lack of representation for eastside neighborhoods that the Charter reform was in part intended to alleviate.

The Community Alliance of Tenants endorsed the creation of new voting districts in hopes of creating a meaningful representation of tenants. Historically tenants are left out of decisions in most parts of civic life including transportation, utility, and schools, and importantly housing. Our endorsement envisioned a more diverse set of elected leaders including leaders who are tenants. We think that the maps should be careful to include and support the collective voice of tenants. We think there should be multiple districts where renters get elected and have representation - not designating a single district as the renters' district. And the districts should not be done in a way that dilutes their impact for tenants in their community. We think that Map 11 and 11a egregiously cuts Lloyd District, Moda Center, and Albina Yard from N/NE Portland. This could dilute the mutual interest of racial groups.

And when it adds renters from the Central Eastside those renters are separated from their influence in their immediate community. We are also concerned about the demographic income difference West Side to East Side. The lower income and more working-class renters on the east side could have their voices drowned out by the west side.

We support feedback offered by Albina Vision, Imagine Black, and Urban League of Portland about the Albina District and N/NE Portland and request that the Independent District Commission incorporate this input. Please do not move forward with any maps that would cut up the historic cultural hub of Portland's African American community. There is significant work underway to redesign, re-imagine, and reconnect the community to the neighborhood and district maps should respect that.

Please do not move maps 11 and 11a forward. They are unacceptable for many reasons. Map 9 is more acceptable.

Thank you for your work.

Sincerely,

_____.

_____, the maps explain population criteria and criteria related to various majority/minority statistics. I assume you're saying that's not enough.

Also I find that even in our neighborhood, ideas on districting are not homogeneous. I tend to think we and Sellwood should be grouped with east side hoods as we have different climate, pollution, development and crime problems than the west side. But I know of others who say

Sara Iannerone and Joann Hardesty are recruiting and training rebels so therefore we're better teaming with west siders. What do you think?

I've only talked to a few, of course.

I have looked at the maps at

<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/9faab0058d4445b8b3ff26ce9df9dc47/> A major problem for we citizens is that the criteria for each of the sample maps is either not at all provided or only partially provided. For example, Sample Map 1 only describes what the districts are, with nothing saying why this map was drawn up. The only explanation for Sample Map 2 is that it is based upon a public submission, with no reason given for why this particular public submission was chosen to present. So we can look at each Sample Map and see what it is, but not why it is being offered.

In my career as a policy analyst, I learned that using clearly stated, transparent assumptions that drive the logic and data analyses behind a policy proposal are essential for choosing reasonable policies. The choice of 4 districts for the city council is just such a policy proposal. Therefore, any proposed district map must be accompanied by a clear statement of assumptions and objectives so that we citizens can know why that map is being proffered.

Speaking for myself, I believe that five criteria are important:

1. Respect all existing neighborhood association boundaries, so that each neighborhood is in one and only one district. Neighborhood associations represent coherent bodies that should not be divided up among districts. As a number of different neighborhood associations would surely be associated with each district, this is also a way to obtain the desired diversity of council members within each district.

2. Respect established plans that are considered well-designed, such as the Central City 2035 project. This criterion avoids reinventing wheels that have been shown to be reasonable.

3. Avoid gerrymandering—that is, districts should be as geographically compact as possible. Recall the origin of the word “gerrymander” and you get the idea. This criterion, by the way, would eliminate Sample Map 4, even though those long, thin salamanders do not have a lot of curves or bumps.

4. To the extent possible consistent with criteria 1-3, strive for equal populations in each district. Perhaps a criterion of less than 10% could be satisfactory if a map is consistent with the first three criteria, and if the deviation from ideal were more than that, another proposal fulfilling the first three criteria would be needed. I really doubt that there is no map fully respecting criteria 1-3 that has a larger than 10% deviation in size.

5. To the extent possible consistent with criteria 1-4, respect natural (e.g., the Willamette River) and transportation corridor (e.g., Interstate highways) boundaries. This criterion brings together people who tend to congregate in the area they live in. The criterion should be disregarded in areas where a cohesive neighborhood is, unfortunately, split by a transportation corridor.

Looking at the 15 Sample Maps on your website, and not delving deeply into everything (that's your job, after all), I would venture to say that Sample Maps 5-7 appear to be the best given the criteria I posit above.

Thank you for your attention,

I strongly object to Map 9, including Sellwood-Moreland, Eastmoreland, Reed and parts of Woodstock and Brooklyn in the proposed West district. We spend most of our time in the inner eastside and share problems in common with the inner eastside, which are distinct from those of the west side. I can't imagine what the reasoning of the Commissioners is, since this proposal doesn't seem to take the reality of our neighborhoods into account.

Regards,

Dear Independent District Commissioners,

We oppose any maps that gerrymander our Eastmoreland neighborhood into a district with the western part of the city. Eastmoreland is located in and identifies with Southeast Portland. We have different issues and concerns than the western hills. The maps that force Eastmoreland into a district on the other side of the Willamette River look like an attempt to influence political outcomes rather than an honest effort to create a representative district map.

Ensure that the four districts are similar in population, around the 163,000 residents per district. Make sure that east of 82nd to the eastern City limits are in one district. Most of the proposed East Portland district was annexed into the City and then forgotten and has had no City representation. Try to keep School Districts whole as much as possible, David Douglas and Parkrose in one district. Try to maintain Neighborhood Association boundaries within one district, do not split existing Neighborhood Association boundaries. Give consideration to including the Lloyd District with Downtown as they are connected with business interests, tourism and hospitality services. In closing, East Portland, east of 82nd must be in one district or the system has failed to recognize more than 25% of the population of the City of Portland.

Please do not include eastside neighborhoods (Buckman and Kerns) in the westside grouping. The eastside has very different needs than the westside, I have lived here for 33 years and received the Mayors Spirt of Portland Award. I know the city and this would be a grave mistake in representation..

There is apparently talk about adding the Buckman neighborhood to a West Side district. I am very much against such a move, as I, as a resident in the inner SE, am fully oriented to the SE for all my needs and concerns - adding us to the West Side divorces us from our natural allies on the East Side.

East side neighborhoods should not be absorbed by the west side districts.

The Willamette river is a natural divide in the city. Please keep se Portland in tact. We have different focuses and needs than the west hills and downtown.

Independent District Commissioners,

Creating 4 equal district areas is a difficult task. No matter where the district lines are drawn, there will be individuals who do not agree for various reasons. Keeping each of the neighborhood association boundaries intact would make sense since their boundaries are already defined. Splitting some of the neighborhood associations into 2 separate districts would create confusion and inconsistencies. The 4 districts could consist of merging NWNW with SWNI coalition to become District 1, merging NPNS and NECN coalition to become District 2, merging CNN with SEUL coalition to become District 3 and EPNO could become District 4. The airport area could be merged into either District 3 or 4, but since the airport is located near the CNN area, it makes sense for the airport to be in the District 3 area. Then,

the 7 neighborhood coalitions within the 4 districts could continue to function, support and be a vital resource to the neighborhood associations within each coalition's boundary.

Sincerely, _____

As a 42 year resident of Buckman and Kerns and a 51 year resident of Portland who has also lived in SW and NW Portland, I strongly disagree with the inclusion of Kerns/Buckman into the westside district. As with most East Portlanders, my daily work life, cultural life, social life and shopping all happen on the east side. Merging our east side neighborhoods with west side would greatly weaken our chance of representation in the district and would not reflect the demographics of our neighborhoods. We are proud and vital neighborhoods with distinct issues and identities. We need to retain our eastside status with this district effort. Thanks,

Of the 3 sample maps currently under consideration, I would strongly prefer Sample Map 9. The inner southeast / industrial area is distinctly different from much of the westside and I don't think grouping that area with all of the westside would make sense.

I watched the meeting tonight (May 31) and I would like to suggest that you reconsider the boundary alignment along 82nd. I think aligning the maps to have boundaries that run along Stark to the north and 82nd better supports the transit focus on Commissioner Laurente's map and does not take away from the premise of the other maps. Stark includes line 20, and 82nd includes line 72 which are both frequent service and heavily used commuter bus lines.

Please don't add the Buckman neighborhood to the Southwest side of the river. It's very unfair to the East side as a whole to pull so many voters of means from our side of the river. The school boundaries are along the river it only makes sense.

All 3 of your maps 9,10,11, split many neighborhoods into different districts. Please consider how this impacts neighborhoods. Neighborhoods schools boundaries are impacted, business districts and major traffic concerns are split off into districts that are not impacted. The PDX Airport is pushed into East and yet the noise and on the ground truck traffic created hits the North Neighborhoods hardest. Take offs and landings of Jets including the military Air Guard 142 Fighter Wing. Our Central NE Neighborhood Coalition has worked very hard over the years to partner with PDX and the 142nd to keep our neighborhoods safe and the noise down. Neighborhoods that have traditionally worked together are split into 3 different districts and they had worked under Central Northeast Neighbors Coalition. It is very confusing because it does not appear that there are no overlays of neighborhood association boundaries nor neighborhood coalitions even considered. It is also hard to understand why the information about the 3 maps has not been distributed or even talked about with the vast majority of people. Your citizen engagement process needs to be better. Please consider slowing down a little. The public meetings that you are going to have at this point are in the summer months and this is the hardest time of the year to gather people together for public comment. The city of Portland used to be all about public involvement and input. Please reach out to groups that have the capability to get important information to neighbors. Consider sending information to the Coalitions and Neighborhood Associations and Community Cultural Associations and perhaps the churches. I would say schools but they are heading towards summer vacation. I am sure your committee is working very hard and I know this is a huge responsibility. Was anyone in the group familiar with Neighborhood Associations or Coalitions?

Please do not break up neighborhood association divisions into different districts.

The one option we most disagree with is map#10, which divides the districts, using Sandy Blvd as the North and South boundaries. Hollywood, in particular, is a very small neighborhood, roughly 10 blocks x 10 blocks. Over the years we have worked very diligently

to partner with the business district that our neighborhood lies within. To be perfectly honest, the demographic that is north of I-84 is a better match with Grant Park than it is with Laurelhurst and/or North Tabor. Adoption of this map choice would also impact the school boundaries, long established working relations with the fire stations, area businesses, current good neighbor agreements, N.E.T. staging areas & equipment supply storage facilities and possibly current state and county government representation. We also do not understand why the public was not notified of these suggested changes earlier in the game. The citizens of Portland have to file all kinds of documents and apply for various permits, months prior to the event, if we want to simply have a block party. It feels like the residents have to follow that guideline but the city doesn't have to. The Neighborhood Associations all have different schedules guided by our by-laws for our general meetings and avenues for alerting the residents of important issues that will affect them. Another issue that comes to mind is the actual way we can get responses from our neighbors and direct them back to the city. This is a very frustrating situation. Thanks for reviewing my comments.

I am asking that you reconsider NOT following through with Map 9, 10, 11 because it does not accurately reflect the interests of our neighborhood or our identity's best interest. As a Grant Park resident, we are cut off from the neighborhoods that collectively have common interests. To pair us with the most northern parts of the city doesn't make sense since we have different concerns. These maps do not make any sense on how we are moving forward as a city just when we are starting to see things turn around. Please consider map 3.

In all three of the finalist maps, the district boundaries divide neighborhoods. In particular, Maps 10 and 11 put neighborhoods that are centered on Sandy Blvd into two districts. Neighborhoods that straddle two or more districts will find it harder to communicate with their district commissioners. I believe that the strongest district map would preserve all neighborhood boundaries. That would provide a direct line of communication from around 20 neighborhoods in a district to three city commissioners who are accountable to residents in those neighborhoods. Ideally, a set of three commissioners can listen to 160,000 constituents directly to determine good policy. But I think that for many policies and plans, 20 neighborhood associations have a much better chance of providing meaningful and consolidated feedback.

May 30th, 2023
Independent District Commission
Buckman Neighborhood and the Redistricting Process and Map

Dear Commissioners,

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my concern and provide an argument regarding the proposed grouping of the Buckman Neighborhood in inner SE Portland with the entire westside of Portland as part of the redistricting process that aims to divide Portland into four districts of relatively equal population.

While I understand the need to ensure balanced representation and account for population disparities, I believe it would be unjust to group Buckman with the entire westside solely due to population considerations. Allow me to present my argument against this proposed grouping.

1. Community Identity: Buckman Neighborhood has a distinct identity and character shaped by its unique history, culture, and community engagement. We are the first and original eastside neighbor and former City or East Portland. There is very little westside connections and Buckman has not suffered the disintegration and loss of stature that downtown has, as it has always been what it is today. Progressive, creative, eastside based and collaborative.
2. The residents of Buckman share common interests, concerns, and neighborhood-specific issues differ from those on the westside. Dividing Buckman from its neighboring

communities on the eastside would disrupt this cohesive community identity.

3. Neighborhood Interests: Buckman faces specific challenges and opportunities that are best addressed within the context of its existing neighborhood structure. By being grouped with Portland's entire westside, the representation and attention given to Buckman's specific needs and aspirations will be diluted or overlooked. It is essential to ensure that Buckman retains its ability to advocate for its own interests.

4. Proximity and Connectivity: Buckman is geographically located in inner SE Portland, and has naturally aligned it with nearby neighborhoods on the eastside for years. The residents of Buckman have established connections, social networks, and relationships with these adjacent communities. Being grouped with the westside would create an artificial division and disrupt these important connections.

5. Effective Representation: The purpose of redistricting is to ensure fair and effective representation for all residents. While population equality is a critical factor, it should not be the sole consideration, and to cut a wedge of the inner eastside, which shares nothing in common with downtown, solely for population measure will dilute the distinctively progressive nature of the inner eastside and leave the residents of Buckman without fair representation as the westside interests will out vote and out measure. It is crucial to prioritize the preservation of cohesive communities and maintaining the ability for neighborhoods like Buckman to have a voice that reflects their unique interests.

In light of these arguments, I kindly request that the Redistricting Commission carefully consider the concerns raised by Buckman Neighborhood residents and others in the inner east side caught up in this unhealthy notion of being lumped with the westside and explore alternative options that do not involve grouping Buckman with the entire westside. This approach would better preserve community cohesion, ensure effective representation, and respect the neighborhood's historical and social connections.

If you must include a wedge of the eastside due to population, it makes much more sense frankly to include Sellwood, as their direct access to the river, higher home owner rate and personal wealth are a much better fit with the entirety of SW/NW Portland.

The needs and progressive interests of those of the inner eastside will be lost pairing with the wealth of the westside..whereas including Sellwood/Moreland would be a better pairing.

Thank you for your time, attention, and consideration of the perspectives shared in this letter.

I trust that you will carefully evaluate the implications of redistricting decisions on the Buckman Neighborhood and its residents.

As a resident of Buckman since 1974, I remember the movement to save the good old homes of this district. Thank goodness we were also able to stop the closure of Buckman Elementary. We are inextricably tied to our neighboring districts and adding us to the wealthy Westside dilutes our voice and our influence. As a former PPS teacher who spent 17 of my years teaching at Cleveland, and the father of a proud Cleveland graduate, I know the cohesion fostered by this, and other, Buckman institutions. I ask you to respect our sovereignty as a neighborhood. Please re-consider this action.

Respectfully,

As a resident of Buckman since 1974, I remember the movement to save the good old homes of this district. A number of years down the road, thank goodness, we were also able to stop the closure of Buckman Elementary. We are inextricably tied to our neighboring districts and adding us to the wealthy Westside dilutes our voice and our influence. As a former PPS teacher who spent 17 of my years teaching at Cleveland, and the father of a proud Cleveland graduate, I know the cohesion fostered by this, and other, Buckman institutions. I ask you to respect our sovereignty as a neighborhood. Please re-consider this action.

Respectfully,

May 30th, 2023 Independent District Commission Buckman Neighborhood and the Redistricting Process and Map

Dear Commissioners, I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my concern and provide an argument regarding the proposed grouping of the Buckman Neighborhood in inner SE Portland with the entire westside of Portland as part of the redistricting process that aims to divide Portland into four districts of relatively equal population. While I understand the need to ensure balanced representation and account for population disparities, I believe it would be unjust to group Buckman with the entire westside solely due to population considerations. Allow me to present my argument against this proposed grouping.

1. **Community Identity:** Buckman Neighborhood has a distinct identity and character shaped by its unique history, culture, and community engagement. We are the first and original eastside neighbor and former City or East Portland. There is very little westside connections and Buckman has not suffered the disintegration and loss of stature that downtown has, as it has always been what it is today. Progressive, creative, eastside based and collaborative.
2. The residents of Buckman share common interests, concerns, and neighborhood-specific issues differ from those on the westside. Dividing Buckman from its neighboring communities on the eastside would disrupt this cohesive community identity.
3. **Neighborhood Interests:** Buckman faces specific challenges and opportunities that are best addressed within the context of its existing neighborhood structure. By being grouped with Portland's entire westside, the representation and attention given to Buckman's specific needs and aspirations will be diluted or overlooked. It is essential to ensure that Buckman retains its ability to advocate for its own interests.
4. **Proximity and Connectivity:** Buckman is geographically located in inner SE Portland, and has naturally aligned it with nearby neighborhoods on the eastside for years. The residents of Buckman have established connections, social networks, and relationships with these adjacent communities. Being grouped with the westside would create an artificial division and disrupt these important connections.
5. **Effective Representation:** The purpose of redistricting is to ensure fair and effective representation for all residents. While population equality is a critical factor, it should not be the sole consideration, and to cut a wedge of the inner eastside, which shares nothing in common with downtown, solely for population measure will dilute the distinctively progressive nature of the inner eastside and leave the residents of Buckman without fair representation as the westside interests will out vote and out measure. It is crucial to prioritize the preservation of cohesive communities and maintaining the ability for neighborhoods like Buckman to have a voice that reflects their unique interests.

In light of these arguments, I kindly request that the Redistricting Commission carefully consider the concerns raised by Buckman Neighborhood residents and others in the inner east side caught up in this unhealthy notion of being lumped with the westside and explore alternative options that do not involve grouping Buckman with the entire westside. This approach would better preserve community cohesion, ensure effective representation, and respect the neighborhood's historical and social connections. If you must include a wedge of the eastside due to population, it makes much more sense frankly to include Sellwood, as their direct access to the river, higher home owner rate and personal wealth are a much better fit with the entirety of SW/NW Portland. The needs and progressive interests of those of the inner eastside will be lost pairing with the wealth of the westside..whereas including Sellwood/Moreland would be a better pairing. Thank you for your time, attention, and consideration of the perspectives shared in this letter. I trust that you will carefully evaluate the implications of redistricting decisions on the Buckman Neighborhood and its residents.

<p>Including Buckman/Kerns with the west side of the river in one district is absurd. The very different concerns of the central Eastside will be overwhelmed by the affluent west wide. It would make much more sense to keep affluent areas grouped together, not the central east side. Consider Eastmoreland and Sellwood with more congruent interests with the west side.</p>
<p>It is important to keep similar neighborhoods intact- the maps should align with neighborhood boundaries. Therefore of the 3 final maps I would prefer Map 9. Southeast does not have similar interests or problems to those of southwest.</p>
<p>I do not support the re-organization which will lump us in with downtown Portland. Our Buckman community is distinctively separate, and should remain as such. We saw and continue to see issues with the lack of police support since the re-organization of that division which put us under central precinct. We do not belong with people on the other side of the river, and our services suffer enough as it stands now .</p>
<p>It is very important to me that the districts do not cross the river. East side neighborhoods should not be included in the West side district. And neighborhoods should not be divided. This is much more important than having exactly the same number of people in each district. Populations change anyway - so even if you start with the same population in each district that will change. Whereas geographic boundaries are very important to identity. Thank you!</p>
<p>As a Buckman resident for 6 plus years, SE PDX is not the Westside and should remain on the Eastside district list.</p>
<p>I have been a resident of the Buckman neighborhood for 40 years. I did not see any benefit to reorganizing the neighborhood with parts of SW and NW. Our needs are different than the dense areas listed. Portland has grown, making the need for smaller neighborhood focus not lumping it all together. This was the number one reason that I did not like that ballot measure. Please reconsider</p>
<p>As a resident of the Kerns neighborhood, I am asking you to not add this neighborhood as part of the West district. This area is geographically close to the downtown/west area however the needs and circumstances of its residents are very different than downtown. Please reconsider the distribution of district</p>
<p>I'm seeing new map districts that include the Buckman neighborhoods as part of the west side. This is really off base. Neighborhoods west of the river have very different economic and social concerns than Buckman. Buckman's concerns are in the Southeast and relate to the neighborhoods there.</p>
<p>I live in the Buckman neighborhood in inner SE. I've seen maps that lump us with the west side. I lived on the west side for 10 years, there is little to no alignment between the west side and Buckman. While I understand the concept of having districts that represent the same # of people, grouping neighborhoods that have an affinity with one another and similar characters is just as important. If east side neighborhoods must be grouped with the west side, please consider ones that have more in common with them such as East/Westmoreland/Sellwood or figure out a way to grab the Grant/Laurelhurst communities. Buckman should not be separated from its sister southeast neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Dear Commissioners, I am writing to express my concern about the proposed grouping of Buckman Neighborhood with the entire westside of Portland as part of the redistricting process. While population balance is important, solely considering population would be unfair to Buckman. Here are my arguments: 1. Community Identity: Buckman has a distinct identity shaped by its history and engagement. It is different from the westside and has not suffered the same challenges as downtown. 2. Neighborhood-Specific Interests: Buckman has unique concerns and issues that differ from the westside. Dividing it from the eastside disrupts the cohesive community. 3. Representation of Buckman's Needs: Buckman's specific needs require representation within its existing structure. 4. Proximity and Connectivity: Buckman</p>

has strong connections with neighboring eastside communities that would be disrupted if grouped with the westside. 5. Effective Representation: Population equality is crucial, but it shouldn't be the sole consideration. Dividing the progressive inner eastside solely for population measure dilutes its unique interests. Please consider these concerns and explore alternative options that preserve community cohesion and respect Buckman's historical and social connections. Thank you for your attention. Sincerely, _____

Buckman is generally younger, less privileged, more diverse, and less conservative than the West Side, yet you would expect that we would have a proportional opinion when lumped with a more conservative area with more money and more influence? I also agree with those that have said that redistricting Buckman into the west side separate us politically from our Eastside neighbors. It's been suggested that perhaps a neighborhood such as Sellwood would be a better fit with West Portland. Don't let them take away our East Side identity while potentially taking our numbers and diversity to use towards the political leanings of the West Side!

Please do NOT lump Buckman or Kerns neighborhoods in the westside district! Our significantly poorer neighborhood needs will be lost to the greater money and power interests of west side businesses and residents. We do not share geography or history or commercial interests or residential issues and needs with the west side. It simply makes no sense.

I lived in the Buckman neighborhood for 40 years in SE Portland. The new district map shows that Buckman and other small areas of the East side will be merged with the West side district. Our citizens are unlikely to be elected as a commissioner to a West side district and our opinions about our East side concerns will not be heard by any district. Therefore this is a big mistake.

I think that putting Buckman into the same district as the west hills is an absolute sham of democracy. Inner SE has oppositional values from those of who live in the west hills and I fear that my communities' voice will be watered down with wealthied interests. I absolutely oppose this idea.

[comment form blank]

The Kerns and Buckman neighborhoods want to stay in the SE Coalition of neighborhoods. We are diverse, creative, entrepreneurial and have a higher percentage of renters than the SW side. The income levels, more conservative views. We do not want to be affiliated with what downtown Portland has become. A homeless drug Mecca. Kerns just put up neighborhood banners to distinguish us from other close by neighborhoods. So we have established our identity and do not want this change!!

Please keep east and west side districts separate. Do not lump together inner east and west neighborhoods. Thank you.

The Willamette River provides a cultural and economic dividing line for the City. Therefore the close in neighborhoods like Kerns, Broadway, Laurelhurst, Sunnyside Powell and Clinton should not be included with west side neighborhoods.

[comment form blank]

Dear Commissioners,
I am finding the information you have put out to be extremely confusing and misleading. Earlier tonight, I submitted testimony based on my belief that you were considering three maps, as stated on your website:
<https://www.portland.gov/transition/districtcommission/events/2023/5/31/independent-district-commission-meeting-8-work>
"Sample maps available here: Portland IDC ExB Journey - Sample Maps (arcgis.com). The

Commission is currently reviewing sample maps 9, 10, and 11."

I have another document that detailed what these three maps are, and on that basis I submitted my testimony.

However, following the link in the blurb above takes me to a page that shows 5 maps, numbered 1-5, only one of which bears any resemblance to what I believe Maps 9, 10, and 11 refer to. Meanwhile, a friend sent me an email she got from North Star that claimed "the Commission is currently reviewing sample maps 9, 9a, 9b, 10, 10a, 11, and 11a."

These conflicting communications, coupled with the high stakes of this process is making it very hard for me to feel like I understand what is happening, or that the process is open and transparent. While I don't hold you responsible for what North Star sends out, you are responsible for the confusing, conflicting, and misleading information you publish yourself.

You are making a decision about which maps to advance tomorrow, and I no longer feel I even know how many maps are under consideration, much less which ones they are.

I am more engaged with civic life than most Portlanders, so if I am having problems, I imagine that most people are totally adrift.

I am feeling very frustrated, disappointed, and lost by this process.

Thank you,

SE Portland

Dear District Commissioners,

I am writing out of concern about the three proposed district maps I've seen circulating (labeled Map 9, Map 10, and Map 11). Maps 10 & 11 would break my neighborhood, Hosford-Abernethy (HAND), apart and lump part of us with the westside. This area is not a good fit with the westside, politically, economically, or socially.

Of the three maps, Map 9 does the best job of grouping people I think of as "communities" together into districts. If you have to choose from one of these three maps, please pick Map 9. HAND residents have a long history of working closely with Brooklyn, Buckman, and Richmond folks on issues such as the impact of the Brooklyn Yards rail yard, the mayor's new Temporary Access to Shelter (TAS) facility at the Clinton Triangle, issues related to the industrial areas that border our residential areas, and finding ways to address a problem with homelessness that encompasses all of our neighborhoods. Map 9 keeps that group mostly together, making it easier for us to gather political support for addressing what really are multi-community problems.

Thank you,

SE Portland

I am concerned by the proposed maps for the new districting of Portland. Obviously cutting up neighborhoods that have been with us as identified areas for a long time is concerning to residents. Given the proposed maps I have seen, I feel that Map 9 would preserve the Hosford Abernethy Neighborhood (HAND) in the South East. Neighborhoods are important contributors to the quality of life in Portland, and while neighborhoods are different, they have sprung out of history proximity and long time shared experience. I am proud to say that HAND as well as Brooklyn and Richmond are clearly South East locales with a wide array of common interests and a history of supporting each other for the common good.

I worry that by cutting a chunk of Southeast neighborhoods and placing them in the Southwest, would create a more difficult arena for taking up neighborhood issues. I would strongly encourage you to keep these neighborhoods as intact as possible. They have demonstrated cooperation and support for good neighborhoods, cooperation, and a better Portland overall.

Thank you for your attention

Dear District Commissioners,

I am writing out of concern about the three proposed district maps I've seen circulating (labeled Map 9, Map 10, and Map 11). Maps 10 & 11 would break my neighborhood, Hosford-Abernethy (HAND), apart and lump part of us with the westside. This area is not a good fit with the westside, politically, economically, or socially.

Of the three maps, Map 9 does the best job of grouping people I think of as "communities" together into districts. If you have to choose from one of these three maps, please pick Map 9. HAND residents have a long history of working closely with Brooklyn, Buckman, and Richmond folks on issues such as the impact of the Brooklyn Yards rail yard, the mayor's new Temporary Access to Shelter (TAS) facility at the Clinton Triangle, issues related to the industrial areas that border our residential areas, and finding ways to address a problem with homelessness that encompasses all of our neighborhoods. Map 9 keeps that group mostly together, making it easier for us to gather political support for addressing what really are multi-community problems.

Thank you,

Hosford Abernethy resident

Hello, Commissioners!

It has come to my attention that the idea has been floated to include areas of the inner SE PDX with a district from the West Side. I, personally, can see no good reason for this other than "making numbers work" - but I do see several downsides. Here's a short list:

- Buckman and the inner SE share common history, cultures, lifestyles, events and concerns with our neighbors on the east side and have no history with the SW or NW Portland.
- Buckman and the inner SE are not like downtown and have not really suffered at all like downtown has and should not be seen as downtown representationally.
- Carving us out of the rest of Inner SE weakens us and the rest of inner SE too. We are economically poorer than the west side and with many more renters and should align with common communities, geography and cultures.
- We are a neighborhood of young creatives, a very progressive bastion and will lose that if subsumed by the much larger, more conservative west side.

Buckman, Kerns, and the inner SE, to me, are clearly part of SE PDX, not the West Side: not demographically, not from an income perspective, not from a home-ownership/rental perspective either. These demographics have needs and desires that align with the neighborhoods around here, not across the river (seems like a minor boundary, but, lived, it is a big difference, imo).

Please leave Buckman and the inner SE (i.e. the original City of East Portland) on the East Side.

Best Regards,

Buckman, PDX

Dear District Commissioners,

I am writing out of concern about the three proposed district maps I've seen circulating (labeled Map 9, Map 10, and Map 11). Maps 10 & 11 would break my neighborhood, Hosford-Abernethy (HAND), apart and lump part of us with the westside. This area is not a good fit with the westside, politically, economically, or socially.

Of the three maps, Map 9 does the best job of grouping people I think of as "communities" together into districts. If you have to choose from one of these three maps, please pick Map 9. HAND residents have a long history of working closely with Brooklyn, Buckman, and Richmond folks on issues such as the impact of the Brooklyn Yards rail yard, the mayor's new Temporary Access to Shelter (TAS) facility at the Clinton Triangle, issues related to the industrial areas that border our residential areas, and finding ways to address a problem with homelessness that encompasses all of our neighborhoods. Map 9 keeps that group mostly together, making it easier for us to gather political support for addressing what really are multi-community problems.

Resident of Hosford/Abernathy neighborhood

I ask, not surprisingly, because I believe that, IMHO:

from Apr 10 2023: ssp1#portland2023

<https://districtr.org/edit/180034?event=portland2023>

- compactness;
- respect/preserve all Neighborhood Association boundaries;
- respect/preserve District Coalition boundaries as much as possible, but migrate 3 NPNS neighborhoods to west district;
- < 3.6% deviation;
- allow for the eventual subdivision of the 4 districts into 12 single-representative districts;

has greater compactness, and uses existing political boundaries, including District Coalitions, to a far greater extent than maps 9, 9b, 10, 10a, 11, 11a and 11b, which all seem to divide neighborhoods unnecessarily, and to blur their boundaries lines, presumably to achieve better deviance values.

Commission,

In light of what is occurring regarding the homeless population I would like to offer research into the matter. It seems that decisions are being made that could do grave harm to the mentally ill and impoverished. It is my intent to provide scientific research that can at least shed light on what effects this is going to have on those suffering the most. I respectfully urge that a scientific approach be considered here, as nearly 50% of homeless persons are mentally ill. What is being proposed will in effect not only criminalize homelessness and poverty but also criminalize mental illness. I also urge you to look further into the "FEDERAL" legality of criminalizing mental illness and homelessness, "LAW" when considered in its breadth and determinations provides protections for these groups.

1. Cycle of Poverty: Criminalization measures, such as anti-camping or anti-loitering laws, can perpetuate the cycle of poverty for individuals experiencing homelessness. By making it illegal to engage in activities necessary for survival, such as sleeping or resting in public spaces, individuals are pushed further into marginalization and struggle to break free from homelessness.

2. Increased Legal Burden: Criminalization policies impose legal burdens on individuals

experiencing homelessness, leading to arrests, fines, and even incarceration. This not only exacerbates their already vulnerable situation but also puts pressure on the criminal justice system and public resources.

3. Limited Access to Services: Criminalization measures can hinder individuals' access to essential services and support systems. When homeless individuals are constantly at risk of being arrested or moved along, it becomes challenging for service providers to establish trust, build relationships, and offer necessary assistance, such as healthcare, counseling, or employment support.

4. Disruption of Stability: Criminalization policies often involve the eviction and removal of homeless encampments. While these measures aim to address public safety concerns, they frequently displace individuals without providing suitable alternative housing options. This disruption of stability can lead to increased trauma, mental health issues, and further marginalization.

5. Ineffective Resource Allocation: Resources that could be used for preventive measures, affordable housing, supportive services, and addressing the root causes of homelessness are instead diverted toward enforcement efforts associated with criminalization. This inefficient allocation of resources can hinder progress in addressing homelessness effectively.

6. Social Stigmatization: Criminalization policies contribute to the stigmatization of individuals experiencing homelessness, perpetuating negative stereotypes and further marginalizing this vulnerable population. This stigma can hinder their ability to reintegrate into society, find employment, and access social support networks.

7. Human Rights Concerns: Criminalizing homelessness raises human rights concerns, as it infringes upon the rights to housing, privacy, and personal security. It can be seen as a violation of basic human rights principles and contributes to the cycle of discrimination and inequality.

8. It is important to note that approaches focusing on criminalization alone have proven to be ineffective in resolving homelessness. Instead, addressing homelessness requires a comprehensive and compassionate approach that includes affordable housing options, supportive services, mental health resources, and employment opportunities to help individuals rebuild their lives and reintegrate into society.

Research and References

"Criminalization, Legal Entanglements, and Barrier to Exiting Homelessness: Findings from the San Francisco Homeless Study" by McGuire, J., Rosenheck, R. (2004). This study examines the effects of criminalization policies on homeless individuals in San Francisco. It found that criminalization measures were associated with increased legal entanglements and barriers to exiting homelessness.

"The Impact of Criminalization on Homeless People" by Law Enforcement Action Partnership (LEAP) (2019). This report discusses the negative consequences of criminalization policies on homeless individuals, including increased legal involvement, disruptions in accessing services, and exacerbation of social exclusion.

"Moving Along: The Policing of Homeless People in Denver, Colorado" by Mitchell, D., Marquez, J., Perlman, J., & Whitman, C. (2016). This study examines the enforcement of anti-homeless ordinances in Denver, Colorado. It highlights how criminalization measures lead to displacement, increased encounters with law enforcement, and limited access to essential services.

"The Criminalization of Homelessness: A Systematic Literature Review" by Graham, S., Beall, J., Diamond, N., & Sporle, A. (2015). This review analyzes multiple studies on the criminalization of homelessness. It finds that such policies result in increased arrests, fines, and incarceration rates among homeless individuals, further entrenching their marginalization.

"Impact of Criminalization Measures on the Homeless Population in the United States: A Systematic Review" by Reilly, K. (2020). This systematic review examines the impact of criminalization policies on homelessness in the United States. It highlights the negative consequences, including displacement, limited access to services, and infringement of human rights.

"Homelessness, Criminalization, and the Law: A Civil Rights Perspective" by Brinkley-Rubinstein, L., Cuellara, A., & Lewis, V. (2018). This article discusses the civil rights implications of criminalization policies targeting homelessness. It emphasizes how such policies disproportionately affect marginalized populations and perpetuate cycles of poverty and incarceration.

These studies provide empirical evidence and insights into the negative impacts of criminalization policies on homelessness. They highlight the need for alternative approaches that prioritize supportive services, affordable housing, and human rights principles to address homelessness effectively.

Respectfully,

Richmond Neighborhood Association

c/o Southeast Uplift 3534 SE Main
Portland, OR 97214
Phone: 503/232-0010

<http://richmondpx.org/> RNAnewsletter@gmail.com



May 15, 2023

Mayor Ted Wheeler (mayorwheeler@portlandoregon.gov)

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez (gonzalezoffice@portlandoregon.gov)

Commissioner Mingus Mapps (mingus.mapps@portlandoregon.gov)

Commissioner Carmen Rubio (comm.rubio@portlandoregon.gov)

Commissioner Dan Ryan (commissionerdanryan@portlandoregon.gov) Boundary
Commission (districtcommission@portlandoregon.gov)

Re: Request to make new District Boundaries consistent with existing Neighborhood
Association boundaries

Dear Mayor, Council and Members of the Boundary Commission,

The Richmond Neighborhood spans the area from the south side of SE Hawthorne Blvd. to the north side of Powell Blvd., and SE 28th Pl/29th Ave to SE 50th/52nd Aves.

We ask that when drawing the new City Council Districts, you maintain the current boundaries for neighborhood associations and make the new District boundaries consistent with existing neighborhood association boundaries. These boundaries have been part of Portland's civic fabric for decades, and many Portland residents strongly identify with their neighborhoods. Portland's Neighborhood Associations are independent, non-profit organizations, and their boundaries are based on their unique history and circumstances.

We believe that neighborhood boundaries are the sort of existing political boundaries that Portlanders had in mind when they voted to support reform of the city's charter last November.

We believe that respecting these boundaries will strengthen the geographic accountability of City Councilors, make it easier for people to know who their Representatives are, and will reduce the temptation for future decision makers to gerrymander the map to achieve a particular electoral outcome.

Sincerely,



Debby Hochhalter (she/her)

Chair

Richmond Neighborhood Association

CC: RNA Board

May 30th, 2023

Independent District Commission

Buckman Neighborhood and the Redistricting Process and Map

Dear Commissioners,

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my concern and provide an argument regarding the proposed grouping of the Buckman Neighborhood in inner SE Portland with the entire westside of Portland as part of the redistricting process that aims to divide Portland into four districts of relatively equal population.

While I understand the need to ensure balanced representation and account for population disparities, I believe it would be unjust to group Buckman with the entire westside solely due to population considerations. Allow me to present my argument against this proposed grouping.

1. **Community Identity:** Buckman Neighborhood has a distinct identity and character shaped by its unique history, culture, and community engagement. We are the first and original eastside neighbor and former City or East Portland. There is very little westside connections and Buckman has not suffered the disintegration and loss of stature that downtown has, as it has always been what it is today. Progressive, creative, eastside based and collaborative.
2. The residents of Buckman share common interests, concerns, and neighborhood-specific issues differ from those on the westside. Dividing Buckman from its neighboring communities on the eastside would disrupt this cohesive community identity.
3. **Neighborhood Interests:** Buckman faces specific challenges and opportunities that are best addressed within the context of its existing neighborhood structure. By being grouped with Portland's entire westside, the representation and attention given to Buckman's specific needs and aspirations will be diluted or overlooked. It is essential to ensure that Buckman retains its ability to advocate for its own interests.
4. **Proximity and Connectivity:** Buckman is geographically located in inner SE Portland, and has naturally aligned it with nearby neighborhoods on the eastside for years. The residents of Buckman have established connections, social networks, and relationships with these adjacent communities. Being grouped with the westside would create an artificial division and disrupt these important connections.
5. **Effective Representation:** The purpose of redistricting is to ensure fair and effective representation for all residents. While population equality is a critical factor, it should not be the sole consideration, and to cut a wedge of the inner eastside, which shares

nothing in common with downtown, solely for population measure will dilute the distinctively progressive nature of the inner eastside and leave the residents of Buckman without fair representation as the westside interests will out vote and out measure. It is crucial to prioritize the preservation of cohesive communities and maintaining the ability for neighborhoods like Buckman to have a voice that reflects their unique interests.

In light of these arguments, I kindly request that the Redistricting Commission carefully consider the concerns raised by Buckman Neighborhood residents and others in the inner east side caught up in this unhealthy notion of being lumped with the westside and explore alternative options that do not involve grouping Buckman with the entire westside. This approach would better preserve community cohesion, ensure effective representation, and respect the neighborhood's historical and social connections.

If you must include a wedge of the eastside due to population, it makes much more sense frankly to include Sellwood, as their direct access to the river, higher home owner rate and personal wealth are a much better fit with the entirety of SW/NW Portland.

The needs and progressive interests of those of the inner eastside will be lost pairing with the wealth of the westside..whereas including Sellwood/Moreland would be a better pairing.

Thank you for your time, attention, and consideration of the perspectives shared in this letter. I trust that you will carefully evaluate the implications of redistricting decisions on the Buckman Neighborhood and its residents.

Thank you for your work and your consideration of my serious concerns,

Susan Lindsay

Portland, OR 97214

Date: May 3, 2023

To: Independent District Commission

From: Marianne Fitzgerald

Re: Communities of Interest

I do not understand why the Charter Review Commission recommended four city council districts. One of the criteria the Charter Review Commission recommended is to use existing boundaries, and these are all over the map, so to speak. Portland currently has:

- six geographic areas: north, northwest, northeast, southeast, southwest, south (PBOT street names)
- seven neighborhood district coalitions (Civic Life),
- plus or minus 95 neighborhood associations (Civic Life),
- five comprehensive planning districts (BPS),
- five watersheds (BES)
- four school districts

Hank Schottland's excellent comments on April 19, 2023 summarized some of the useful data and analyses in Portland's Comprehensive Plan for 2035, in particular the chapter on "Urban Design-Direction":

Urban Form: Portland includes three fundamentally distinct types of neighborhoods: the Inner Neighborhoods, with their main street commercial districts and compact street grid; the Western Neighborhoods, whose urban form is shaped by hilly terrain, streams and other natural features; and the Eastern Neighborhoods, whose diverse mix of urban and more rural forms is set against a backdrop of Douglas firs and buttes. Beyond these three neighborhood urban forms are two other Portland patterns: those of the Central City neighborhoods, Portland's most intensely urbanized area; and the industrial districts, with their own distinct urban form characteristics.

In other words, the Comprehensive Plan argues for five districts based on community characteristics:

- Central City
- Western Neighborhoods
- Inner Neighborhoods
- Eastern Neighborhoods
- Industrial Neighborhoods

Since the language in the charter now requires four districts, it seems to me that the mapping exercise is not only dividing communities of interest; it is also combining unlike communities into districts.

My biggest concern with the large size of these four city council districts is that they are not compact enough for communities to gather, and will likely require a lengthy travel time to conduct business in person. Access to conduct business is a major consideration for county seat locations. I do not support the idea of subdistricts for city council office locations because this would geographically divide access to city council members that are supposed to represent all constituents in their district. My experience has been that it can take an hour to drive from my neighborhood in SW Portland to other areas in Portland (much longer by transit if that is an option), particularly if I must cross any of the Willamette River bridges near rush hour.

1

I've reviewed the map layers that may be considered communities of interest and offer the following suggestions regarding what I consider important communities of interest from a neighborhood geographic perspective.

School attendance areas are key. Portland Public Schools is the largest of six school districts within the city of Portland, educating more than 46,000 students. Every K-12 student has a neighborhood school based on home address. High school, middle school and elementary school attendance areas determine the people that families with school age children spend a lot of time with, including athletics and after school activities. I have lived in the same neighborhood for 45 years and our neighborhood school attendance areas have changed several times during that time. Each PPS boundary change was emotional, contentious and challenging.

Neighborhood Association and District Coalition boundaries are key. Portland's neighborhood system (~95 neighborhood associations clustered into 7 district coalition areas) has been in place for over 45 years and has become the go-to place for civic engagement. Neighborhood Associations and District Coalitions are communities where we gather information and discuss issues of common interest that affect livability issues in our neighborhoods. Many community groups thrive in Portland but the neighborhood system is the only one specific to a geographic area, and it needs to remain intact.

Issues that affect neighborhood livability are key. In my neighborhood in Southwest Portland, the City of Portland and the Comprehensive Plan discuss serious deficiencies in infrastructure. Many of our volunteers advocate for funding to build sidewalks, bicycle facilities, transit service and stormwater management systems that will benefit our neighborhoods. We do not have the same transportation issues as, say, St. Johns or Sellwood, because they have a more built environment. In SW Portland people depend on driving their cars for safety. It's so dangerous to use alternative transportation, it's

safe. The Southwest Neighborhoods district coalition has always had separate land use and transportation committees because there are a lot of issues to discuss for each topic. We are passionate about parks but we have more natural areas than developed parks, which may not be the same issues than, say, St. Johns or Sellwood. We are passionate about public safety but may address safety differently than, say, St. Johns or Sellwood. I understand that the mapping criteria will require combining areas that do not have common interests, but it will take time and resources to create a sense of community within the four districts.

Multnomah County and Metro Council district boundaries are somewhat relevant. We expect our regional and local elected officials to work together. Collaboration may be more successful if elected official boundaries are somewhat consistent.

State legislative boundaries are less relevant. My neighborhood has been redistricted every 10 years and has gone from a "Portland" district to a "Tigard" district to a "Lake Oswego" district. Every 10 years I need to educate my legislators about conditions and issues in SW Portland.

So far I think the DistrictR maps are all over the place and I don't have enough information about the proposals to weigh in. The spatial data sets in DistrictR are challenging to review online to get a sense of the data in the data sets. Please analyze the maps to evaluate how well they meet the criteria because some, like communities of common interest, need more discussion.

Thank you,

Marianne Fitzgerald

Fitzgerald.marianne@gmail.com

Eastmoreland Neighborhood Association Approved Motion Portland City Independent District Commission

At its Board meeting on Thursday 20 April, the Eastmoreland

Neighborhood Association moved to advise the Portland Independent District Commission that existing Portland neighborhood association boundaries should be used as the primary organizing principle for City Council Districts except and unless neighborhood associations agree to modify their respective boundaries and provide justification supporting such a change.

Continuing the existing neighborhood association boundaries achieves the following beneficial purposes:

- The historic neighborhood structure is reinforced to maintain a consistent geographic based constituency for their respective City Councilors
- The historic neighborhood structure facilitates City Councilors' communication with their constituents.
- The historic neighborhood structure clarifies the geographic accountability of district City Councilors to their constituents.
- The historic neighborhood structure avoids district gerrymandering for the purposes of affecting election outcomes.