

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Ernie Bonner Collection

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

9-25-1977

Letter to Marcie Window

Ernest Bonner

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_bonner



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Bonner, Ernest, "Letter to Marcie Window" (1977). *Ernie Bonner Collection*. 53.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_bonner/53

This Memo is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ernie Bonner Collection by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Sept. 25, 1977

TO: Marcie Linder
FROM: Emie B.

* Your memo to Jan Childs really pisses me off.

Let me take it paragraph by paragraph

Paragraph 1:

I fail to see why you wonder "what's it all for."
Larry Lubin said we should come and see what they have done. I went to see. That's what it's all for. I WAS not referring to the purpose of the meeting - but the WORK of the neighborhood committees

Paragraph 2:

You note that "...each of the neighborhoods have developed relatively clear goals statements...
That is not true. Brooklyn and Kerns and Hysford-Abernethy gave absolutely no indication that they had goal statements. Rose Tuttle admitted their draft policies (or goals) were in some cases her own. She, herself, would not say they were neighborhood goals. Carl Glanzman did not indicate that he had goals ~~which~~ in all areas of concern that were neighborhood approved. Jim Andrews admitted they had had 13 responses to ~~some~~ hundreds of matters in Burtman goals.

Brooklyn slow verbalized about statement encroachment
HAND Handed theirs in before meeting

FOR YOU TO SAY THAT THEY ALL HAD

~~What~~ are
neighborhood
goals?

NEIGHBORHOOD GOALS IS FOR YOU TO KNOW WHAT
YOU SEE AS WELL AS WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW.
GOALS THEY CAN WRITE ARE NOT NEIGHBORHOOD
GOALS! GOALS THE NEIGHBORHOOD ASS'N
ADOPTS ARE NOT NEIGHBORHOOD GOALS!

HAND
gave me
A copy
of their
statement
see attached -- I also gave you A copy A while ago

And how do you explain your statement when
Korns and Howard-Alernathy were not even
represented! Do they have goals and ~~do~~ are
they adopted, and have neighborhood residents
approved those goals?

To say that "... each of the neighborhoods have
developed relatively clear goals statements..."
is so clearly ridiculous that I wonder why
you would make such a statement.

You also note that "... Buckman and Sellwood
have essentially complete land use plans for their
neighborhood..." HOW CAN YOU SAY THAT?
NOT EVEN CLAUZMAN AND ANDREWS WOULD
SAY THAT! ?

Clauzman's "plans" for Sellwood include basically
plans for traffic and transit improvement. He is
close to proposals for land use, but probably

would not agree w/ you that he has a "complete land use plan."

Jim Andrews and his colleague (Dennis?) do not purport to have a complete land use plan. They indicated they are still searching for alternatives to the one we saw produced by Don MacGillivray. They know they do not have a complete land use plan. HOW CAN YOU SAY THEY DO! CAN YOU NOT SEE? DID YOU NOT LISTEN?

And, finally, if you mean to demonstrate something by noting that 2 neighborhoods (out of 7) have complete land use plans, you have only made others' point: we are doing a City plan. If 5 neighborhoods do not have plans, that is the important thing to note — not that 2 neighborhoods do.

Paragraph 3:

You note "... I can't see any evidence that we in the Bureau care beans about any of the work that has been done."

I take special offense at that statement. I want you to write down for me a list of all the things "we in the Bureau" could do which would constitute "evidence" that we care about what has been done. I want this done by Oct. 15 and I want copies furnished to Denny as well as to me.

In the second sentence, you note "Did any of us even request copies of the statements which had been prepared for this meeting?" My only response to that is another question: Did you, Marcie, request copies of statements made? If not, why not?

YOU HAVE AS MUCH RESPONSIBILITY FOR SEEING TO IT THAT COPIES WERE REQUESTED AS ANYBODY! YOU ARE NOT A PETULANT OBSERVER. YOU ARE EITHER A PARTICIPANT OR YOU ARE NOTHING!

~~For the first sentence, you do your smart little~~

I yes
have
copies -
But I
understand
my responsibility
had been replaced
by JAN.

In the last sentence of the paragraph, you outrage yourself.
I want you to give me a detailed factual listing of the specific events and the particular comments that lead you to make that general charge.

I want this done by Oct. 15 and I want copies sent to every person you sent your memo to.

If you cannot prove to my satisfaction the general validity of that last sentence, I will ask for you to make a full retraction of it to everyone who got your memo. You SAID it ~~was~~!

Paragraph 4:

You note that a resolution to the debate over city-wide vs. neighborhood options had "~~not~~ ~~yet~~ ~~been~~ developed. But you do not go to the right place for your documentation. The Planning Commission advises, the City Council decides. The City Council adopted a process for planning. If you return to those minutes you will find that it was ~~not~~ the inclination of City Council to have ~~anything to do with~~ the neighborhood association in any lead role in the planning process. In fact, if anything, the Council wanted to diminish their importance from that recommended by the Planning Commission. IT IS TIME YOU QUIT FIGHTING THAT DEBATE. IT IS SETTLED. THE PROCESS IN WHICH WE ARE ENGAGED IS WHAT

THE CITY COUNCIL AND THE MAYOR WANT!
WE CAN ALL MAKE IT EASIER ON EVERYBODY
IF WE WORK TOGETHER. I AM TIRED OF
FIGHTING THAT ISSUE. I AM AFRAID YOU
CANNOT QUIT FIGHTING IT. IT IS BEST
WE GO OUR SEPARATE WAYS.

Paragraph 5:

It is true that the current process is not what
people were led to expect a year ago. But it
isn't what I expected a year ago either. It
is what people have been led to expect for
the last 3 months. IF YOU WOULD TRY
TO UNDERSTAND WHAT THAT PROCESS IS
YOU WOULD NOT HAVE SO MANY CONTINUING
COMPLAINTS ABOUT IT.

And the comment about the T-shirts was a
really cheap shot!

Paragraph 6:

WE SHOULD NOT WATCH CARL GLANZMAN!
WE SHOULD GET BUSY WITH PLANNING!
GOD!

GENERAL:

I would have to say, frankly, that I was more upset by your memo than I have been in some time. It is full of errors of fact. It is full of innuendo. It is just exactly the kind of childish, cheap shot, kind of response to things that the Bureau of Planning should avoid at all costs. I could not always avoid it with the district work you have done in the past. **BUT I WILL NOT HAVE IT IN THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. PERIOD.**

I cannot trust you to operate effectively in comprehensive planning as long as you have such an attitude. You do not understand what the comprehensive plan is. You do not understand the need to accept decision and go on. You seem determined to maintain the fight over districts in the comprehensive plan.

I am in the process of talks about your assignment after Oct. 15. It ~~may~~ not be to the Comprehensive Planning Section.

cc: Jan Childs

September 22, 1977

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jan Childs
District Response Division

FROM: Marcie Window *MW*

SUBJ: Meeting with SE Coalition - Reflections for
our File

The main question I came away from the SE Coalition meeting was "What's it all for?"

People have obviously already put in a lot of work on what they believe to be a comprehensive planning effort. Last spring they were instructed to start identifying and preparing a map of the issues and problems in their areas. Richmond, Buckman, and HAND have already sent out questionnaires and Sunnyside is on its way. Each of the neighborhoods have developed relatively clear goals statements, and Buckman and Sellwood have essentially produced complete land use plans for their neighborhoods.

But frankly, I can't see any evidence that we in the Bureau care beans about any of the work that has been done. Did any of us even request copies of the statements which had been prepared for this meeting? We've admitted we don't want to deal with existing problems, and there have been enough references to the "Fourth Option" being a political pacifier that I can no longer take seriously.

Last year there was a debate over how the Comprehensive Plan should develop - Building up from the neighborhood level or starting with City wide options and applying them onto smaller areas. The resolution to this debate was supposedly a compromise position of trying to work at each level simultaneously, "the City-wide land use policy options being developed concurrently with the neighborhood land use plan options" (Planning Commission Minutes, March 22, 1977).

I think what, in fact, has happened is that we have reverted to the standard form of citizen participation where the City develops its options and goes to the people for feedback. We are not asking citizens to contribute the familiarity they have with an area to help us actually formulate an option, nor do the Three Options we have

developed reflect any neighborhood identified goals. (We're hoping the two will coincide farther down the road.)

The current process for citizen involvement is not what people were led to expect a year ago. It is our responsibility to make the current process as clear as possible and not put people through a lot of illusionary hoops. (The next time we print T-shirts, they should say "Official City Responder".)

The SE Coalition, unlike many other districts, has a unique combination of people with planning skills as well as long time neighborhood activists. In the past they have been able to mobilize a lot of visible support for the activities they have been involved in. But from my perception they no longer have access to skilled organizers who know how to both coordinate and instigate the kind of support necessary to successfully wage a campaign for a Fourth Option.

Internally also they seem to be suffering from a lack of unity with Sellwood. If anyone is going to create problems in S.E. it will be Carl Glanzman. I can't figure out exactly where he is coming from, but I think we should watch his activities.

This meeting made me aware of how necessary it will be for us to have a very tight structure to our workshops. If attention is to be focused on the options we are proposing we will need not only a brief and clear summary of each; but also specific questions for people to answer concerning each option.

MW:sa