

Portland State University

**PDXScholar**

---

City Club of Portland

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

---

9-20-1991

# Study of Racial and Ethnic Relations in Portland: Report of the Social Associations/Citizen Participation Subcommittee

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_cityclub](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub)



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

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.), "Study of Racial and Ethnic Relations in Portland: Report of the Social Associations/Citizen Participation Subcommittee" (1991). *City Club of Portland*. 454.

[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_cityclub/454](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub/454)

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in City Club of Portland by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

## City Club of Portland

**Study of Racial and Ethnic Relations in Portland**

Report of the

**SOCIAL ASSOCIATIONS/CITIZEN  
PARTICIPATION SUBCOMMITTEE**

September 20, 1991

	Page
I. Summary of Report	84
II. Introduction and Background	85
III. Discussion	92
IV. Conclusions	102
V. Recommendations	104
VI. Appendix	106
A. Survey Charts	106
B. Persons Interviewed	111

This report is one of six such reports prepared by subcommittees of the City Club's *Study of Racial and Ethnic Relations in Portland*. The six reports address the relationship between Portland's white majority and members of the community's African-American, Asian, Hispanic, and Native American minority groups. The other five subcommittee reports have been prepared by subcommittees on (a) health and welfare, (b) housing, (c) law enforcement and the administration of justice, (d) education, and (e) employment. For copies of, or information regarding, the other five subcommittee reports, contact the City Club of Portland, 317 SW Alder, Portland, Oregon 97204; (503) 228-7231.

## Study of Racial and Ethnic Relations in Portland

Report of the

### SOCIAL ASSOCIATIONS/CITIZEN PARTICIPATION SUBCOMMITTEE

#### I. SUMMARY OF REPORT

The Social Associations/Citizen Participation Subcommittee of the City Club's *Study of Racial and Ethnic Relations in Portland* addressed three basic topics. First, the Subcommittee addressed the participation of members of four racial and ethnic minority groups in local government in the City of Portland and in Multnomah County, including citizen advisory committees, neighborhood coalition boards, and elected officials. Second, the Subcommittee reviewed the participation of members of the four minority groups in the general memberships and on the boards of directors of Portland private and nonprofit community organizations, including civic, cultural/educational, business, service, religious, athletic, and environmental groups. Third, the Subcommittee examined the role and effectiveness of the joint City of Portland-Multnomah County Metropolitan Human Relations Commission in addressing racial and ethnic relations issues.

The Subcommittee's principal findings include:

- There is no agreed set of standards for evaluating minority participation in Portland government committees and community organizations. A set of standards for effectively evaluating such minority participation includes • the percentage of minorities participating in committees and organizations overall compared to the percentage of minorities in the local population • the participation rate of minorities across the spectrum of committees and organizations • the participation rate of each minority group • majority attitudes about minorities and • the extent to which diversity is embraced and advocated and racial and cultural sensitivity is the norm.
- An adequate "talent pool" of all minorities exists in Portland to provide qualified representation on government committees and in community groups. Organizations that have inadequate minority representation likely have failed to recruit or have done so ineffectively.
- While overt racism does not appear to play a role in the lack of minority participation in Portland organizations, "tokenism", "cultural insensitivity", and institutional "business as usual" do play significant roles. The majority leadership of Portland—and each of us living and working here—must become proactive on this issue if real progress is to be made.
- Minorities are significantly under-represented on City of Portland citizen advisory committees and on the boards of Portland private and nonprofit community organizations.

- Relatively high percentages of minorities serve on Multnomah County and joint City of Portland-Multnomah County citizen advisory committees.
- In Portland, more minorities serve on local government social service committees than on the major local government planning and spending committees.
- The City Club has failed to address effectively the issue of minority participation in its own affairs, and should set up a special Cultural Diversity Task Force to remedy this shortcoming.
- Although it is the Portland community's one public body intended to address racial and ethnic relations issues, the joint City-County Metropolitan Human Relations Commission plays a limited role.

## II. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

**Scope of Study.** The Subcommittee was charged with analyzing the participation of African-Americans, Asians, Hispanics, and Native Americans in Portland local government and in Portland private and nonprofit community organizations. The Subcommittee also was directed to examine the role and effectiveness of the joint City of Portland-Multnomah County Metropolitan Human Relations Commission in addressing racial and ethnic relations issues.

With respect to minority participation in Portland local government, the Subcommittee studied citizen advisory committees of the City of Portland, including City coalitions of neighborhoods, citizen advisory committees of Multnomah County, joint citizen advisory committees of the City of Portland and Multnomah County, and elected officials in Portland and Multnomah County.<sup>1</sup>

With respect to minority participation in Portland private and nonprofit community organizations, the Subcommittee studied the major organizations in the city—including civic, cultural/educational, business, service, religious, athletic, and environmental groups. The Subcommittee reviewed minority participation in the general memberships of these organizations, where applicable, as well as on their boards of directors.

The Subcommittee's research involved written surveys mailed to local government committees and private and nonprofit organizations, followed by interviews with representatives of some of the committees and organizations surveyed as well as City of Portland and Multnomah County officials and Portland minority business and professional people. Further details regarding the Subcommittee's research are contained in the Appendix.

**Prior City Club Study.** The 1968 City Club report *Problems of Racial Justice in Portland* included a chapter addressing citizen participation in Portland local

---

1. The Subcommittee did not examine minority participation in for-profit business organizations. The Subcommittee also did not analyze minority participation in local government committees or private and non-profit community groups within the purview of one of the other subcommittees of this overall study—i.e., public welfare, housing, criminal justice, education, and employment committees and groups. The report of this Subcommittee, therefore, should be understood as an analysis of minority participation in Portland local government committees and community groups of a general nature or of various types, but excluding for-profit businesses and those types of committees and groups within the scope of study of the other subcommittees. For the specific committees and groups analyzed by this Subcommittee, see the Appendix.

government. The main conclusion of that chapter was that "neglect of citizen involvement" constituted a basic and common factor in the problem areas affecting African-Americans in the city. Given particular attention in the chapter was the City of Portland's "failure to recognize and use the potential of the Human Relations Commission."

The Club's 1968 study did not include an in-depth analysis of participation of African-Americans in Portland private and nonprofit community groups. However, the report indicated that this omission was a short-coming in the study and recommended that the Club's Board of Governors consider appointing a new committee to research that topic. Noting that its report had broken down Portland's racial problem into traditional institutional categories of education, housing, employment, welfare, and law enforcement, the 1968 study committee observed:

But noticeably lacking from this categorization is a vast and pervasive field where prejudice and apathy do exist and yet have not received any known investigation. It is the field of social association. There are myriad clubs, lodges, fraternities, orders and other private social institutions within the city, be their ostensible purpose athletic, educational, religious, mystic, civic or business, which are nevertheless socially oriented. We are all aware that all too many of these groups follow racist policies and practices.

#### A. AVAILABILITY OF DATA REGARDING MINORITY PARTICIPATION

To provide background data for its work, the Subcommittee initially attempted to compare the numbers of minorities participating on local government committees and in private and nonprofit community groups in Portland to the numbers of minorities in Portland's population. The Subcommittee learned, however, that such data on minority participation in Portland did not exist. No official, organization, or group collected or maintained such information. As a result, the Subcommittee itself collected the data in late 1989 and the first half of 1990.

For purposes of comparison, the Subcommittee used the data set out in Table 1 for the numbers of minorities in the local population in 1990.<sup>2</sup>

TABLE 1  
Numbers of Minorities in the Populations of Portland and Multnomah County (1990)

Population	CITY OF PORTLAND		MULTNOMAH COUNTY	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Total	437,319 <sup>3</sup>	100%	583,887 <sup>3</sup>	100%
White	362,503	83%	497,700	85%
Minorities	74,248	17%	85,553	15%
African-Am	32,842	8%	34,415	6%
Asian	22,641	5%	26,626	5%
Hispanic	13,874	3%	18,390	3%
Native Am	4,891	1%	6,122	1%

2. The data in Table 1 were prepared by City Club staff, based on the 1990 U.S. Census. The Census Bureau defines African-Americans, Asians, and Native Americans as members of racial groups. The Census Bureau defines Hispanics as persons of Hispanic origin, based on ancestry, nationality, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person's parents or ancestors; Hispanics can be of any race.

3. In Table 1, the population of "White" persons plus the population of "Minorities" does not equal the "Total" population for either the City of Portland or Multnomah County, because the "Total" population in each case includes a small number of persons classified by the U.S. Census Bureau as "Other Minorities"—i.e., persons who are not White, African-American, Asian, Hispanic, or Native American.

## B. CITY OF PORTLAND CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The Subcommittee collected data regarding minority participation on 23 City of Portland citizen advisory committees in 1989-90. These data are set out in detail in the Appendix. The breakdown by racial and ethnic group of the 272 total members of the 23 City committees examined is set out in Table 2.

**TABLE 2**  
Racial/Ethnic Distribution of Combined Memberships of 23  
City of Portland Citizen Advisory Committees (1989-90)

<u>Members</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Total	272	100%
White	243	89%
Minorities	29	11%
African-Am	23	8%
Asian	3	1%
Hispanic	0	0%
Native Am	3	1%

Comparing the data in Table 2 with population data for Portland, minority membership on the 23 City citizen advisory committees examined was less than the percentage of minorities in the City's population. Whereas minorities comprised 17 percent of the population of Portland, minorities comprised only 11 percent of the members of the City's citizen advisory committees. This disparity was actually greater for most of the City's committees. When data from the board of directors of the Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods is excluded (because that board was 45 percent minority), minorities comprised only 7 percent of the 243 total members of the 22 remaining committees.

Most of the 23 City citizen advisory committees examined either had no minority members or only one minority member. Ten of the 23 committees had no minority members. These were:

Building Code Board of Appeals, Design Review Committee, Historical Landmarks Commission, Investment Advisory Council, Pioneer Courthouse Square, Inc. (board), Central Northeast Neighbors (board), East Portland Neighbors (board), Neighbors West/Northwest (board), Southeast Uplift Neighborhood (board), and Southwest Neighborhood Information (board).

Eight of the 23 City committees examined had only one minority member. These were:

Budget Coordinating Advisory Committee, Development Commission, Energy Commission, Exposition-Recreation Commission, Planning Commission, Planning Variance Committee, Water Quality Advisory Committee, and North Portland Citizens Committee (board).

Among the memberships of the 23 City committees examined, there were only three Asians, no Hispanics, and three Native Americans.

There was minimal minority membership on Portland's neighborhood coalition boards, which were established to address neighborhood-oriented citizen issues. Of the seven coalition boards in the City, only two had minority membership: Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods, with 13 minorities out of 29 members

(45 percent), and North Portland Citizens Committee, with 1 minority out of 16 members (6 percent). There was no minority representation on the other five coalition boards: Central Northeast Neighbors, East Portland Neighbors, Neighbors West/Northwest, Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Program, and Southwest Neighborhood Information.

### C. MULTNOMAH COUNTY CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The Subcommittee gathered data regarding 12 Multnomah County citizen advisory committees in 1989-90. See Appendix. The breakdown by race and ethnic group of the 146 total members of the 12 County committees examined is set out in Table 3.

**TABLE 3**  
Racial/Ethnic Distribution of Combined Memberships of 12  
Multnomah County Citizen Advisory Committees (1989-90)

<u>Members</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Total	146	100%
White	111	76%
Minorities	35	24%
African-Am	21	14%
Asian	3	2%
Hispanic	5	3%
Native Am	6	4%

Minority membership on the 12 County citizen advisory committees examined was significantly greater than the percentage of minorities in the County's population. While minorities comprised only 15 percent of the population of the County, minorities comprised 24 percent of the members of the County citizen advisory committees.

While every one of the County committees had at least one minority member, nearly half of the County committees had only one minority member. These were:

Cable Regulatory Commission, Citizen Budget Advisory Committee, Citizen Involvement Committee, Investment Advisory Board, and Parks Advisory Committee.

### D. JOINT CITY OF PORTLAND-MULTNOMAH COUNTY CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The Subcommittee gathered data regarding five joint City of Portland-Multnomah County citizen advisory committees in 1989-1990. See Appendix. The breakdown by race and ethnic group of the 93 total members of the five committees examined is set out in Table 4.

**TABLE 4**  
Racial/Ethnic Distribution of Combined Memberships of Five Joint City of  
Portland-Multnomah County Citizen Advisory Committees (1989-90)

<u>Members</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Total	93	100%
White	54	58%
Minorities	39	42%
African-Am	17	18%
Asian	15	16%
Hispanic	4	4%
Native Am	3	3%

Minority membership on the five joint City-County citizen advisory committees examined was much greater than the percentage of minorities in the City-County population. Although minorities comprised only 15 to 17 percent of the City-County population, minorities comprised 42 percent of the members of the joint City-County citizen advisory committees.

Four of the five joint City-County committees had two or more minority members. The Metropolitan Youth Commission (currently Youth Today, Inc.) had only one minority member.

#### E. PORTLAND PRIVATE AND NONPROFIT COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS: GENERAL MEMBERSHIPS

The Subcommittee requested minority participation information from 37 private and nonprofit community organizations in Portland. Of these 37 organizations, 31 responded with the requested information. The remaining six organizations, the Al Kader Temple, Arlington Club, OSPIRG, Portland Golf Club, Waverley Country Club, and YMCA of Columbia/Willamette, did not provide the requested minority participation information despite the Subcommittee's repeated requests.<sup>4</sup>

Of the 31 private and nonprofit organizations which did provide the Subcommittee with requested survey information, 26 had general memberships (members-at-large) as well as boards of directors. See Appendix. Of these 26 organizations with general memberships, more than half did not maintain data regarding the racial and ethnic makeup of their general memberships. The 14 organizations without such data were:

City Club of Portland, Portland Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, Portland Rose Festival, Portland Downtown Lions Club, Friends of Washington Park Zoo, Oregon Art Institute, Oregon Historical Society, Oregon Museum of Science & Industry, Oregon Symphony Association, Portland Opera Association, Multnomah Athletic Club, Audubon Society of Portland, 1000 Friends of Oregon, and Sierra Club (Columbia Group).

The remaining 12 organizations which did maintain data regarding the racial and ethnic makeup of their general memberships were:

Portland Saturday Market, Association for Portland Progress, Portland Jaycees, University Club, Kiwanis Club of Oregon, Knights of Columbus, Royal Rosarians, Rotary Club of Portland, Boy Scouts of America (Columbia Pacific Council), Girl Scouts of America (Columbia River Council), League of Women Voters, and World Affairs Council of Oregon.<sup>5</sup>

4. The Arlington Club and the Waverley Country Club expressly refused to provide the minority participation information requested by the Subcommittee. The Al Kader Temple, OSPIRG, Portland Golf Club, and YMCA of Columbia/Willamette failed to respond to the Subcommittee's information requests. Newspaper articles in 1989 and 1990 indicated that the Arlington Club, Waverley Country Club, and Portland Golf club had no African-American members. "New era knocking on [Arlington] club's doors", *Oregonian*, December 3, 1989; "Minorities scarce at Portland golf clubs", *Sunday Oregonian*, August 5, 1990.

5. For those 12 Portland private and non-profit community organizations which maintained data regarding the racial and ethnic makeup of their general memberships, minorities comprised significantly less than the percentage of minorities in the Portland population. Overall, minorities comprised 8 percent of the 43,752 total general members of the 12 organizations. Averaging by organization, minorities comprised 5 percent of the general memberships of the 12 organizations.



## E. PORTLAND PRIVATE AND NONPROFIT COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS: BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

The data collected by the Subcommittee regarding the boards of directors of the 31 private and nonprofit community organizations in Portland that responded to the Subcommittee's survey request are set out in detail in the Appendix. The breakdown by race and ethnic group of the 846 total board members of the 31 organizations examined is set out in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**  
Racial/Ethnic Distribution of Combined Memberships of  
Boards of Directors of 31 Portland Private  
and Nonprofit Community Organizations (1989-90)

<u>Members</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Total	846	100%
White	793	94%
Minorities	53	6%
African-Am	30	4%
Asian	14	2%
Hispanic	6	0.7%
Native Am	3	0.4%

Minority membership on the boards of directors of the 31 organizations examined was substantially less than the percentage of minorities in Portland's population. Whereas minorities comprised 17 percent of the City's population, minorities comprised only 6 percent of the board members.<sup>6</sup>

Most of the boards of directors of the 31 organizations examined had either no minority members or only one minority member. Nine of the 31 organizations had boards with no minority members. These were:

League of Women Voters, Knights of Columbus, Portland Downtown Lions Club, Rotary Club of Portland, Portland Saturday Market, Multnomah Athletic Club, Audubon Society of Portland, Sierra Club (Columbia Group), and University Club.

Eleven of the 31 organizations had boards with only one minority member. These were:

City Club of Portland, Kiwanis Club of Portland, Royal Rosarians, Friends of Washington Park Zoo, Oregon Historical Society, Oregon Museum of Science & Industry, Oregon Shakespeare Festival/Portland, Oregon Symphony Association, Portland Opera Association, 1000 Friends of Oregon, and Association for Portland Progress.

Although some categories of the 31 community organizations examined had greater minority membership on their boards than other categories, no category

6. Representatives of one community organization with whom the Subcommittee spoke suggested that the minority memberships on the boards of directors of some organizations should be compared to the percentage of minorities in the population of the Portland metropolitan area or of the state of Oregon as a whole, rather than to the percentage of minorities in the population of the city of Portland, because those organizations are metropolitan or state-wide in scope. Without analyzing the validity of this perspective, the Subcommittee notes that minority membership on the boards of the 31 organizations examined (at 6 percent) was less than the percentage of minorities in the 1990 population of the metropolitan area of Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas counties (11 percent) and also less than the percentage of minorities in the 1990 population of the state of Oregon (9 percent). Source: 1990 U.S. Census.

had minority board membership equal to the percentage of minorities in Portland's population (17 percent). See Appendix and Table 6.

**TABLE 6**  
 Minority Participation on Boards of Directors  
 of 31 Portland Private and  
 Nonprofit Community Organizations (1989-90)

<u>Category of Organization</u>	<u>Percentage of Minorities on Boards of Directors</u>
Civic	6%
Cultural/Educational	5%
Business	9%
Service	3%
Athletic	0%
Religious	13%
Environmental	3%

Only six Hispanics and three Native Americans served on the boards of directors of the 31 organizations examined.

## G. ELECTED OFFICIALS REPRESENTING PORTLAND AND MULTNOMAH COUNTY

For another indicator of minority participation in government in Portland, the Subcommittee gathered information regarding minorities elected to public office during the 20-year period from 1970 through 1989 on the Portland City Council and the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners, as well as in the Portland delegation of the Oregon Legislative Assembly. The results are as follows:

**City Council.** From 1970 through 1989, 16 persons served on the Portland City Council. Two of those persons, or 12 percent, were minorities (Charles Jordan and Richard Bogle, both African-American). The City Council had no minority member for five of the 20 years (1970-74) and one minority member for 15 of the 20 years (1975-89). No minority has served as the Mayor of Portland.

**County Board.** Nineteen persons served on the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners from 1970 through 1989. Two of those 19 Commissioners, or 10 percent, were minorities (Gladys McCoy, an African-American, and Caroline Miller, an Hispanic). The County Board included no minority members for nine of the 20 years (1970-78), one minority for five of the 20 years (1979-80, 1985-86, and 1989), and two minorities for six of the 20 years (1981-84 and 1987-88). Gladys McCoy, an African-American, served as Board Chair from 1987 through 1989.

**State House.** During the 20 years from 1970 through 1989, 58 persons served in the State House of Representatives from districts wholly or partially in the City of Portland. Two of those 58 House members, or 3 percent, were minorities (William McCoy and Margaret Carter, both African-American). The Portland delegation of the House included no minority members for 12 of the 20 years (1970-72 and 1976-84), and one minority member for eight of the 20 years (1973-75 and 1985-89).

**State Senate.** From 1970 through 1989, 36 persons served in the State Senate from districts wholly or partially in the City of Portland. One of those 36 Senators, or 3 percent, was a minority (William McCoy, an African-American). No minorities served in the Portland delegation of the Senate for six of the 20 years (1970-75), and one minority served for the remaining 14 years (1976-89).

**Summary by Minority Group.** Of the six minority elected officials who served on the Portland City Council, on the Multnomah County Board, or in the Portland delegations of the State House and Senate from 1970 through 1989, five were African-American (Jordan, Bogle, Gladys McCoy, William McCoy, and Carter), one was Hispanic (Miller), and none was Asian or Native American.

### III. DISCUSSION

#### A. THE STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING MINORITY PARTICIPATION IN A COMMUNITY

During the course of its work, the Subcommittee became aware that there is no accepted set of standards by which to evaluate the quantity or quality of minority participation in Portland—or in other communities or even society in general. Indeed, only a few of the Subcommittee's interviewees had well-developed ideas about how to evaluate minority participation in local government committees and community groups. None of the committees or groups themselves had specific policies or goals which articulated a clear vision of the extent to which, and how, minorities should participate in their decision-making and programs.

Most people the Subcommittee interviewed talked about minority participation in terms of the numbers, or percentages, of minorities participating in organizations—as committee appointees, organizational members, or board members. From this perspective, the obvious measure of minority participation is a comparison of the number or percentage of minorities in an organization with the number or percentage of minorities in the community's population. Implicit in this view were notions of fairness and the right to proportional representation. With a representative number of minorities participating, this view holds, power is shared, the decision-making process inevitably involves greater consideration of minority issues and concerns, and resources and programs ultimately are administered to serve the entire community better. Without a representative number of minorities participating—not necessarily on every committee or board, but on the whole—a community is failing on the issue of minority participation, the Subcommittee was told.

Other persons interviewed indicated that a simple comparison of the number of minorities participating with the number of minorities in the community is an inadequate, and even questionable or undesirable, approach to evaluating minority participation. This perspective had many facets. Some believed such an approach equates to racial quotas—which are offensive to those concerned about "reverse discrimination" and which also are troublesome to those who do not want arbitrary ceilings placed on the numbers of minorities participating. Others expressed concern that relying solely on the proportional numbers of minorities participating ignores the *quality* of the participation experienced by minorities—including the practical reality of how much real impact a small (albeit proportional) number of minorities can have on an organization's decision-making if the majority does not consider minority perspectives. The relatively small number of minorities in Portland's population often was cited by persons expressing this concern.

The Subcommittee also was told that while exclusion based on race and acts of blatant racial bigotry by an organization are easy to identify and condemn, other more subtle race-based attitudes also must be addressed because they are far more

common and in some ways more troublesome due to their insidious nature. In this way, "cultural insensitivity", "tokenism", institutional "business as usual", and quiet noninclusion based on race—even if without conscious intent—should be viewed as reflecting racist attitudes. These kinds of attitudes, in their varying degrees and forms, the Subcommittee heard, make a community an uncomfortable and even hostile place for minorities. Such attitudes also deny minorities full participation in community life regardless of how good the numbers of minorities participating might look.

Some suggested to the Subcommittee that evaluating minority participation strictly according to "the numbers" is particularly inappropriate with respect to those committees and groups whose focus is on issues or programs of special relevance to minorities. From this perspective, organizations aimed at addressing minority concerns should have even greater minority participation than proportional representation would suggest. In response, however, others argued that such an approach is precisely the wrong one because it results in those organizations which address minority concerns being administered by committees and boards comprised primarily of minorities who are poorly integrated into the community's political power structure. In this way, the argument ran, a form of "ghetto-ization" occurs in which minorities fail to share in the allocation of community resources and minority issues continue to be addressed inadequately.

Yet another concern expressed about relying solely on "the numbers" was that it emphasizes the wrong thing—race. According to this perspective, we all should try to become truly "color-blind" and move beyond thinking about each other in terms of skin color. One counter argument to this was that race and racism are facts of life and we simply must focus on the minority participation rate in order to address the realities of the society in which we live. A related point was that we not only should consider the overall minority participation rate, but also should review the participation rates of the individual minority groups. Otherwise, the Subcommittee was told, relatively higher participation rates by one or more minority groups might mask relatively lower participation rates by other minority groups.

Finally, the Subcommittee heard that our society should *not* attempt to become "color-blind" because our racial heritages—and more specifically the cultural heritages which correlate with our racial heritages—present opportunities for richness and diversity in our lives which we should celebrate and strive to maintain for the benefit of us all.

## **B. ASPECTS OF MINORITY PARTICIPATION IN PORTLAND**

### **1. Formal Qualifications for Participation**

The various organizations examined by the Subcommittee utilize a variety of methods to select their members. For no group examined, however, were participants explicitly excluded based on race or ethnicity. Some membership requirements, such as high dues, may indirectly reduce minority participation, but the Subcommittee found no indication that racial or ethnic exclusion was the motive for any such requirement.

City and County citizen advisory committee members generally are appointed by the Mayor or the County Board Chair and approved by the respective governing

body. Although some committee seats have specific restrictions under governing charters or ordinances, generally the Subcommittee found that political connections, community affiliations, and related attributes determine appointments.

City neighborhood coalition board members and the County's Citizen Involvement Committee members are chosen through elections held by existing neighborhood boards. Neighborhood political connections, therefore, play the key role in determining membership in those organizations.

The Subcommittee heard disagreement regarding the factors which determine the level of minority involvement as political candidates. Everyone agreed that the party structures have not traditionally included substantial minority participation. The evidence from representatives of both political parties was that they are pursuing greater minority participation. However, some members of the minority community vigorously disputed this assertion. Resolution of the dispute might be a moot point since the Subcommittee also heard evidence that the parties play only a minor role in who is elected.

Membership in private and nonprofit community organizations often requires only the ability to pay membership fees and dues. In some instances, however, these fees and dues can be hundreds and even thousands of dollars. In addition to fees and dues, some organizations require a particular professional, occupational, or other status. Several organizations also require sponsorship by one or more existing members. Some require the consent of the general membership.

Membership on the boards of private and nonprofit community organizations almost always requires nomination by a special committee and approval by the existing board; sometimes approval by the full membership is required as well. The Subcommittee consistently heard that board members are commonly chosen from among persons who have personal wealth to contribute or the ability to generate contributions.

## **2. The "Talent Pool" of Minorities**

Representatives of committees and organizations with low minority participation most often excused or explained their record by saying that there are not enough qualified minorities to join their groups. Some maintained that those minorities with the necessary attributes already were over-committed or interested only in minority-oriented organizations and activities.

This explanation was strongly disputed by virtually all minorities with whom the Subcommittee talked as well as representatives of organizations with successful minority recruiting records. These individuals stated that there are many minorities in our community who are both capable and interested in participating. Persons with this view did not deny that some minorities are over-committed and that some are less enthusiastic about participation in non-minority oriented activities. They maintained, however, that the available "talent pool" of minorities is not lacking in qualified or interested individuals. A case in point is the success of the current Multnomah County Board Chair, an African-American, in increasing the numbers of minorities who serve on County citizen advisory committees.

### 3. Techniques for Recruiting Minorities

The Subcommittee learned that common elements were present when organizations were successful in recruiting minorities. Organizations with relatively high minority participation were those that had (1) made an explicit commitment to increase minority participation, (2) made special efforts to recruit minorities, (3) made direct contacts with minority communities, and (4) recruited one-on-one.

The Subcommittee repeatedly was told that once a sincere commitment is made to increase minority involvement in an organization, success in recruiting one or two minorities who meet the organization's member "profile" will open the door to greater minority participation. Such an approach allows the organization to enter the minority "network". Directly involving minority staff in recruiting also has been an important aspect of success.

Organizations that have not employed these recruiting techniques generally had low rates of minority participation. Private and nonprofit community organizations with high membership fees, or with boards made up of financially well-to-do individuals, employed virtually none of the methods discussed above.

Representatives of several organizations expressed a concern that special efforts to involve minorities would threaten their group's "identity". Representatives of the City Club made that comment about this organization. (See section 10, below.) Another civic organization's executive director put it this way: "We are not a social welfare organization!"

### 4. Tokenism

The Subcommittee was told that a critical obstacle to increasing and retaining minority participation is what was loosely described as "tokenism". As explained to us, a sense of isolation often is felt by an individual involved in a group or organization in which he or she is the only minority. In many of these instances, the minority suspects that his or her participation is desired not truly to diversify the membership or to broaden the organization's perspective, but merely to avoid the appearance of exclusion.

The Subcommittee heard from white majority representatives of several organizations that their groups had tried to include minorities but had failed. They cited the minorities' apparent lack of interest and perceived discomfort with the group's activities. Conversely, the Subcommittee heard from representatives of groups that maintained a relatively high level of minority participation, and from minorities themselves, that minorities become and stay involved where they feel welcome—where they are not the only minority and especially where they are not the only member of their particular racial or ethnic group. The Subcommittee was told that this was especially true where minorities had an active role in the leadership of the organization.

Exceedingly few of the committees and community groups the Subcommittee examined, even those with significant minority participation, had been chaired by minorities or had otherwise placed minorities in leadership positions in organizations.

## 5. Cultural Insensitivity

The Subcommittee heard numerous comments identifying "cultural insensitivity" as a barrier to minority participation in the organizations examined. This phenomenon was described as manifesting itself in a variety of forms and is difficult to define, but it relates to the experiences minorities frequently have when participating in groups dominated by white majority members.

The Subcommittee often heard that lack of sensitivity regarding some minority groups' difficulty with the English language is a barrier to full participation. Less specific, but also cited often, was the white majority's lack of understanding of, or impatience with, some minorities' "world view". The Subcommittee was told that majority members commonly fail to understand and appreciate that behavioral patterns and values regarding group dynamics are culturally defined. Examples given involved such factors as the role of authority, approaches to reaching consensus, and social interaction necessary to conducting business.

The Subcommittee heard repeatedly that organizations wishing to retain minority participation must become aware of, and sensitive to, cultural factors. The Subcommittee was told by representatives of numerous government committees and community groups that "cultural sensitivity training" conducted by human relations personnel or consultants can play an important role in increasing organizational awareness and sensitivity regarding cultural factors.

## 6. Minority Participation on Social Service vs. "Big Picture" Government Committees

The Subcommittee heard testimony that while minorities are relatively well represented on many local government committees relating to social services, few minorities are selected for service on the so-called "big picture" committees—i.e., those committees charged with major planning and spending decisions that determine the long-term future direction of the community. According to this view, membership on the "big picture" committees is essentially limited to a relatively closed group of white, usually male, civic leaders.

The Subcommittee's data do not totally support this interpretation. In recent years, minorities have consistently served on the Portland Planning Commission, the Portland Development Commission, and the Economic Development Advisory Committees for both the City of Portland and Multnomah County. Moreover, during the last ten years there has been sustained minority membership on what are perhaps the ultimate "big picture" committees, the City Council and the County Board.

On the other hand, the highest percentages of minority membership on local government committees have tended to be on social service committees. There also is evidence of "tokenism" regarding minority membership on the "big picture" local government committees in Portland, in that no more than one minority member has tended to serve on the committees at any given time and those persons serving have been almost entirely from one minority group.

## 7. Acknowledging Racism: A Two-Level Phenomenon?

White majority representatives of most committees and organizations examined tended to speak about racism in Portland solely in terms of the Skinhead, white supremacy problem—i.e., Portland's serious racial problem "out in the streets" and among fringe groups. Examples given included the beating death of Mulugeta Seraw, hate crimes committed in the city, and various racial incidents involving Skinhead youth at Portland locations such as downtown sidewalks, Tri-Met vehicles, and fast-food restaurants. This perspective involved little or no acknowledgement of racism operating within the mainstream Portland community, including local government committees and private and nonprofit organizations.

Other white majority representatives, and virtually all minorities with whom the Subcommittee spoke, however, viewed racism as a two-level phenomenon. At one level is the overt, blatant, and often violent Skinhead, white supremacy type of prejudice. But at a second level, the Subcommittee was told, is a more covert, subtle problem involving social and cultural insensitivity and ignorance rather than explicit racial bias. This second type of racism was said to result in tokenism and inhibition of the involvement of minorities who do participate (see sections 4 and 5, above), but also in minorities not participating at all. This second type of racism was characterized as *noninclusion rather than exclusion*—i.e., mainstream "institutional racism" which manifests itself as "business as usual".

Those with this second perspective believed that the institutional racism of noninclusion and "business as usual" pervades mainstream society in Portland, and explains the lack of higher levels of minority participation in local government committees and community groups. Indeed, the Subcommittee met with groups of successful minority business and professional people who spoke with strong feeling and in unequivocal terms regarding the continuing existence of institutional racism in professional, business, and community life in Portland.

During its interviews generally, the Subcommittee heard numerous anecdotes of racial insensitivity and institutional racism operating in mainstream Portland society. Some examples include:

- The racial undertones of the dispute concerning the naming of Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard.
- The comment by the Mayor of Portland to a group of African-Americans that if he had a "suntan" he could better relate to their concerns, and the Mayor subsequently receiving indications from citizens of their approval of his "suntan" comment.
- The Portland Art Museum's most controversial recent exhibit, by far, being a 1988 photographic exhibit by Robert Colescott depicting the mixing of races, which resulted in the director of the Oregon Art Institute receiving racially-oriented protest calls at home and a patron threatening to remove the Institute from her will.
- A white woman being complimented on her having an African-American teenage foster child, then being asked by the older white woman offering the compliment "But you don't take her into restaurants, do you?"



- A middle-income white man appearing at the door of his African-American neighbors' home on Halloween night dressed as a Ku Klux Klansman.
- A lawyer who represents Native American tribes being told by another Portland lawyer that the second lawyer was not willing to share available office space with the first lawyer because the second lawyer did not want any "drunken Indians" around his downtown law offices.

### **8. A Failure of Majority Leadership?**

Those who expressed concern about the level of minority participation in Portland committees and community groups, and especially the minorities with whom the Subcommittee spoke, tended to share a conviction that there has been a failure of leadership on this issue on the part of white majority leaders. This criticism extended to the Reagan administration's indifference or hostility to racial issues, as well as to Portland's political, corporate, and civic leaders and their failure to make racial issues generally, and minority participation specifically, a priority. While some local community leaders were regarded as having made important contributions to increasing minority participation, the general perspective was that Portland's white majority leadership must become proactive on this subject if the situation is to improve.

The goal of Portland's leaders should not be simply to increase the numbers of minorities participating in local government and community organizations, the Subcommittee was told, but to go beyond "the numbers" to foster true community-wide appreciation and pride in the racial and cultural diversity of Portland's citizenry. With a new vision and genuine commitment, the argument was made, Portland's white majority leadership could change this community's image from a hotbed of white supremacy to a culturally rich, multi-racial modern urban center where full inclusion is the norm and diversity is celebrated and advocated for the richness it adds to life.

### **9. An Obligation of Each of Us?**

The Subcommittee did hear that there are reasons to be encouraged regarding minority participation and embracing of diversity in Portland. It was pointed out that the City Council candidate who opposed the naming of Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard was soundly defeated by Portland voters. The fact that racial minorities are currently serving on both the Portland City Council and Multnomah County Board was mentioned, as well. And the recent \$12.5 million verdict returned by a Multnomah County jury against Tom Metzger in favor of the family of Mulugeta Seraw also can be cited as an indication of intolerance of racism in the Portland community.

The Subcommittee often heard from those interested in increasing minority participation and fostering appreciation of diversity in Portland that, in the final analysis, this issue must become everyone's problem and placed on everyone's agenda if we are going to make real progress. From this perspective, the ultimate answer lies in all of us in Portland taking individual responsibility to address this issue in our local institutions—as parents, neighbors, co-workers, employers, committee members, members of community groups and boards, public officials, and voters.

## 10. Minority Participation in the City Club

By design, representatives of the City Club were the first individuals the Subcommittee interviewed. What the Subcommittee learned from the interview, as well as from the Club's survey response, was enlightening.

The Club did not collect data regarding the numbers of minorities in its general membership. The Club's representatives with whom the Subcommittee spoke indicated discomfort regarding requesting such information from members. The Club had only one minority on its 14-member board. None of its staff was a minority, and the minority employment issue apparently had not been addressed at any time within memory. While the Club's membership committee apparently did attempt to recruit minorities for the organization's general membership in 1984-85, that effort did not produce significant results. The Subcommittee was told that minority recruitment for the general membership had been discussed again recently among Club board members and staff, but that no formal decision had been made and no special effort undertaken.

Club representatives offered two basic reasons for the Club's record regarding minority involvement. First, they expressed the concern that changes in organizational procedures to attract more minorities would threaten the Club's long-standing "identity" as a downtown Portland-based public affairs research and education organization. Second, they indicated that minority recruitment was difficult because the Club's core membership is drawn from the downtown Portland business and professional community, which was presumed not to be populated by significant numbers of minorities. In fact, subcommittee chairs for *this study* were encouraged to recruit minorities to join the Club so that the subcommittees would involve minorities.

In numerous instances during the course of its research, persons the Subcommittee interviewed—especially minorities—pointed out the irony of the City Club conducting a study of minority participation in community organizations when its own record is questionable. Many of these individuals felt that the City Club should "put its own house in order" on this subject if it hopes to credibly advocate greater minority participation in other Portland institutions.

## D. METROPOLITAN HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

The Subcommittee specifically was asked to review the role of the Metropolitan Human Relations Commission (MHRC) in addressing racial and ethnic relations in the Portland community. MHRC is a joint City of Portland-Multnomah County agency consisting of fifteen members—seven appointed by the City Council, seven appointed by the County Board, and one appointed by the fourteen City and County appointees. Resources for MHRC's budget are provided equally by both jurisdictions. The City established the first predecessor body to MHRC in 1949, by an ordinance creating a Mayor's Intergroup Relations Commission. MHRC has existed in its present form as a joint City-County commission since 1969.

In its 1968 report *Problems of Racial Justice in Portland*, the City Club cited the City's "failure to recognize and use the potential of the Human Relations Commission" as a primary example of the City's neglect of citizen participation. Specific

findings in the 1968 report regarding the then-existing Human Relations Commission can be categorized as follows:

Role: “[The Commission’s] enabling ordinance does not fully contemplate the comprehensive responsibilities and areas of concern which should today be receiving attention from the Commission.”

Structure, Political Support, and Autonomy: “[T]he agency is structurally inadequate to its task and has not received meaningful support from the City’s elected officials. The Commission and its staff personnel are appointed by and responsible and accountable to the Mayor. They do not have the autonomy to act with independence, objectivity, and suitable aggressiveness in matters affecting municipal government and particularly the Mayor’s office.”

Staffing and Budget: “The Commission has a staff consisting of a single Director. \*\*\* He has been burdened with routine duties \*\*\* which effectively block the Director from establishing effective rapport with the recipients of government service.”

Now, over 20 years later, the Subcommittee has learned that these same types of problems identified in the 1968 report still limit the effectiveness of the community’s one public body intended to address racial and ethnic relations issues. The specifics have evolved to some extent, but the same basic categories of problem areas remain, as follows:

Role: MHRC has a broad mission to address human rights issues concerning all groups subject to discrimination, including racial and ethnic minorities. It also has numerous specific responsibilities in such areas as research, reporting, education, mediation, and facilitation of communication and cooperation. Nonetheless, MHRC’s role is limited. It does not have legal authority to bring enforcement actions in response to acts of discrimination or prejudice, as do other similar commissions in cities such as Salem, Tacoma, and Seattle. And while MHRC has prepared annual reports on employment of minorities in City and County government, it has not gathered data or reported on minority participation in local government citizen committees or private and nonprofit community organizations.

Structure, Political Support, and Autonomy: The Subcommittee heard testimony that the joint City-County status of MHRC has resulted in it being poorly integrated into the political structure of both governments. A County Commissioner has been the liaison to the County Board, but a Mayoral staff representative has served as liaison to the City Council. Testimony clearly indicated that MHRC lost respect and credibility amongst the local political leadership in the 1980s, although the change in MHRC’s executive director in 1989 appeared to have resolved this problem. Evidence indicated that MHRC was most effective during periods when the Mayor strongly supported the agency and nominated major political figures in the community to sit on the Commission. The

periods of 1972-78 and 1978-80, when Neil Goldschmidt and Connie McCready served as Mayor, respectively, were referenced in this regard.

Staffing and Budget: The Subcommittee learned that MHRC's staffing and budget levels have been unstable over the years, and declining overall. No consistent approach has been maintained regarding whether to perform research with in-house staff or private consultants, and during certain periods the executive director has had little staff support to effectively perform his or her function. These phenomena have reflected MHRC's credibility problems with the City Council and County Board. The Commission's budget levels from 1980-81 to 1989-90, set out in Table 7 below, readily demonstrate the ambivalence of the City Council and County Board regarding MHRC and its value to the Portland community.

**TABLE 7**  
Annual Budgets of  
Metropolitan Human Relations Commission (1980-1990)<sup>7</sup>

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>
1980-81	\$259,945	1985-86	\$276,712
1981-82	\$291,788	1985-87	\$241,198
1982-83	\$332,527	1987-88	\$200,000
1983-84	\$130,070	1988-89	\$223,597
1984-85	\$218,266	1989-90	\$213,618

It seems particularly significant to the Subcommittee that while the per capita budget of MHRC for 1989-90 was \$0.37, the per capita budgets for similar agencies in cities such as Eugene, Seattle, and Tacoma were from two to over ten times greater. See Table 8.

**TABLE 8**  
Per Capita Budgets of Human Relations  
Agencies in Selected Cities (1989-90)<sup>8</sup>

<u>CITY</u>	<u>PER CAPITA BUDGET</u>
Tacoma, WA	\$4.36
Seattle, WA	2.41
Eugene	.65
Portland (MHRC)	.37

The disparity between the per capita budget of MHRC and the per capita budgets of the Seattle and Tacoma human relations agencies is explained in part by the fact that the Seattle and Tacoma agencies have authority to prosecute human relations law violations, whereas MHRC does not. This factor does not explain the disparity between the per capita budget of MHRC and that of the Eugene human relations agency, however, since the Eugene agency also does not have enforcement authority.

7. Source: MHRC staff.

8. Source: City Club staff telephone survey.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

### Conclusions about the standards for evaluating minority participation in Portland

1. There is no agreed set of standards for evaluating minority participation in Portland local government and private and nonprofit community organizations.

2. Considering the various individual approaches advocated and applied, the following constitutes a set of standards for effectively evaluating minority participation in local government committees and community groups in Portland:

- *The percentage of minorities participating in local government committees and community groups overall compared to the percentage of minorities in the community's population.* This is readily measurable, and is a useful and sometimes telling indicator. If the percentage of minorities participating overall does not at least approximate the percentage of minorities in the community's population, then the community has inadequate participation on this basis alone.
- *The participation rate of minorities across the spectrum of government committees and community organizations.* Comparing only the overall percentages can be misleading. Lack of participation in certain groups, or mere "token" involvement, is unacceptable—especially as to those groups with the authority or clout to influence community decision-making. Also undesirable is "overrepresentation" of minorities in groups responsible for "minority issues" or "minority programs", because such groups become isolated from the majority power structure.
- *The participation rate of each minority group.* Comparing the overall percentages also can be misleading if members of particular minority groups do not participate or have only "token" involvement. The overall participation rate of each minority group should at least approximate the percentage of that group in the local population.
- *Majority attitudes about minorities.* A complete evaluation of minority participation must move beyond "the numbers" to consider majority attitudes about minorities, especially when minorities constitute a small percentage of the community's population. Claims of racial superiority and acts of blatant racial bigotry reflect obvious racist attitudes. But "tokenism", "cultural insensitivity", and institutional "business as usual", though often occurring without conscious intent, also reflect majority attitudes that can deny minorities full participation in community life—even if they have proportional and wide-spread representation in the community's organizations.
- *The extent to which diversity is embraced and advocated, and racial and cultural sensitivity is the norm.* The final standard for evaluating minority participation is the extent to which the community's organizations embrace and advocate racial and cultural diversity as a community asset and make racial and cultural sensitivity an accepted part of their decision-making processes.

### Conclusions about minority participation in Portland local government committees and community organizations

3. Minorities are significantly under-represented on City of Portland citizen advisory committees, including the City's neighborhood coalition boards.

4. Minorities are statistically well represented on Multnomah County and joint City-County citizen advisory committees, although the absolute number of minorities who serve on these committees is small. The greater representation of minorities on County-related committees is due primarily to appointments made by the current County Board Chair, an African-American.

5. Minorities are over-represented on Portland local government social service committees, and there is evidence of "tokenism" regarding minority involvement on the major local government planning and spending committees.

6. Minorities are significantly under-represented on the boards of directors of Portland private and nonprofit community organizations.

7. Asians, Hispanics, and Native Americans participate in Portland local government committees and community groups at particularly low rates.

8. An adequate "talent pool" of all minorities exists in Portland to provide qualified representation on local government committees and in private and nonprofit community groups. Organizations that have inadequate minority representation likely have failed to recruit or have done so ineffectively.

9. Overt, blatant racism does not appear to play a role in the lack of adequate minority participation across the spectrum of local government and community organizations in Portland. "Tokenism", "cultural insensitivity", and institutional "business as usual", however, do play significant roles in diminishing minority participation in these organizations.

10. Portland's majority leadership has not embraced and advocated racial and cultural diversity as a community asset nor made racial and cultural sensitivity an accepted part of the decision-making of the community's government committees and private and nonprofit organizations.

11. The City Club has failed to address effectively the issue of minority participation in its own affairs.

### **Conclusions about the Metropolitan Human Relations Commission**

12. As the Portland community's one public body intended to address racial and ethnic relations issues, the joint City-County Metropolitan Human Relations Commission (MHRC) should serve a critical function.

13. Despite its broad mandate, MHRC plays a limited role. Considering the authority of similar agencies in other cities to prosecute human relations law violations and the need for gathering the kind of data compiled by the Subcommittee in this report, MHRC's responsibilities could be expanded in such ways to serve its purposes better.

14. MHRC is not well integrated with the political leadership of the City and County. This has served to limit MHRC's effectiveness.

15. The funding and staffing levels of MHRC have been unstable and declining, reflecting the ambivalence of the City and County political leadership regarding MHRC's value. The fact that per capita spending for MHRC is dramatically less

than per capita spending for similar agencies in other cities suggests that this community is not allocating adequate resources to this agency.

## V. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Board of Governors of the City Club should form a special "Cultural Diversity Task Force" to identify ways to improve minority participation in this organization. The Cultural Diversity Task Force should examine minority membership recruiting, minority appointment to Club boards and committees, minority staffing, and racial and cultural insensitivity in Club decision-making and programming.

2. The Portland City Council and Multnomah County Board should adopt resolutions to enhance minority participation in City, County, and joint City-County citizen advisory committees. The resolutions should require the Council and Board to:

(a) make appointments to the committees such that the percentage of minorities appointed overall at least approximates the percentage of minorities in the community; and

(b) make appointments such that minorities are fully represented on all committees (including the major planning and spending committees) and are not over-represented on committees responsible for "minority issues" or "minority programs" (such as certain social service committees); and

(c) make appointments such that the overall participation rate of *each* minority group at least approximates the percentage of that group in the local population; and

(d) appoint a representative number of minorities as committee chairs; and

(e) appoint only individuals who, by virtue of their backgrounds, public statements, or responses to inquiries, are known to be personally committed to embracing and advocating racial and cultural diversity and making racial and cultural sensitivity an accepted part of committee decision-making; and

(f) require all committee officers and staff to complete cultural sensitivity training; and

(g) in the case of the City, direct the Office of Neighborhood Associations to implement an action plan for increasing minority participation on the boards of directors of the City's neighborhood coalitions.

3. The City Council and County Board also should commit to maintaining a viable Metropolitan Human Relations Commission. The Council and Board should:

(a) ensure that some of MHRC's members are well connected to the political leadership of the majority community; and

(b) consider expanding MHRC's authority to include prosecution of human relations law violations; and

(c) direct MHRC to prepare periodic reports on minority participation in Portland local government committees and private and nonprofit community groups; and

(d) provide MHRC with a stable budget and staff component at levels adequate for the agency to perform its function.

4. The board of directors of each Portland private and nonprofit community organization should adopt and implement a minority participation strategy for the organization. The strategy should:

(a) establish a goal of the percentage of minorities in the organization's general membership and on the organization's board at least approximating the percentage of minorities in the Portland community; and

(b) provide for minorities to participate fully in all aspects of the organization's affairs—as officers, committee chairs, members of all committees, etc.; and

(c) provide for full participation by members of *all* minority groups; and

(d) require all officers, committee chairs, and staff to complete cultural sensitivity training.

5. Portland's majority leadership—in government and in the private and nonprofit sectors—should review and to the extent necessary take specific steps to modify the structures, decision-making processes, and programming of the institutions they control so that those institutions embrace and advocate racial and cultural diversity as a community asset and make racial and cultural sensitivity an accepted norm of community life.

6. Because real progress on this issue will require personal commitment, each of us living and working in Portland—in our individual capacities and institutional roles—should accept the responsibility to *take action* to improve minority participation in this community and to engender community pride in our racial and cultural diversity.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanne Wray Bracken  
Jackson Burgess  
Jacquelan J. Harper  
Robert Phillips  
LeRoy W. Wilder  
Marlene Bayless Mitchell, Co-Chair  
James A. Zehren, Co-Chair

Approved by the Research Board  
August 14, 1991. Approved by the  
Board of Governors August 26, 1991.  
Passed by the membership  
September 20, 1991.



## VI. APPENDIX

### A. SURVEY CHARTS

The charts on the pages that follow set out the survey data the Subcommittee collected in late 1989 and early 1990. The data in the charts indicate the absolute numbers and percentages of minorities participating in the following capacities in the following kinds of groups:

1. Members of City of Portland citizen advisory committees
2. Members of Multnomah County citizen advisory committees
3. Members of joint City of Portland-Multnomah County citizen advisory committees
4. Members of the boards of directors of the following categories of private and nonprofit community organizations in Portland:
  - a. civic
  - b. cultural/educational
  - c. business
  - d. service
  - e. athletic
  - f. religious
  - g. environmental

**CITY OF PORTLAND  
CITIZENS ADVISORY  
COMMITTEES**

	MEMBERS										
	T O T A L	M I N O R I T Y	M I N O R I T Y	A F F I C I A N	A F F I C I A N	A S I A N	A S I A N	H I S P A N I C	H I S P A N I C	N A T I V E	N A T I V E
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Budget Coordinating Advisory Committee	19	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%
Building Code Board of Appeals	5	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cable Regulatory Commission	7	2	28%	2	28%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Design Review Committee	7	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Development Commission	5	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Economic Development Advisory Committee	16	2	12%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%
Energy Commission	9	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Exposition-Recreation Commission	5	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Historic Landmarks Commission	7	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Investment Advisory Committee	3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Pioneer Courthouse Square, Inc. (board)	11	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Planning Commission	9	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Planning Commission Variance Committee	14	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Portland Cable Access Television (board)	15	2	13%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Urban Forestry Commission	9	2	22%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	1	11%
Water Quality Advisory Committee	9	1	11%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%
Central Northeast Neighbors (board)	12	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
East Portland Neighbors (board)	16	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Neighbors West/Northwest (board)	21	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods (board)	29	13	45%	13	45%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
North Portland Citizens Committee (board)	16	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%
Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Program (board)	12	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Southwest Neighborhood Information (board)	16	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>

**MULTNOMAH COUNTY  
CITIZENS ADVISORY  
COMMITTEES**

	MEMBERS										
	T O T A L	M I N O R I T Y	M I N O R I T Y	A F F I C I A N	A F F I C I A N	A S I A N	A S I A N	H I S P A N I C	H I S P A N I C	N A T I V E	N A T I V E
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Board of Equalization	9	2	22%	1	11%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%
Cable Regulatory Commission	5	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Citizen Budget Advisory Committee	10	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%
Citizen Involvement Committee	23	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Community Children & Youth Services Commission	15	5	33%	2	13%	1	7%	1	7%	1	7%
Council on Chemical Dependency	20	8	40%	4	20%	0	0%	1	5%	3	15%
Expo Center Advisory Committee	5	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Investment Advisory Board	3	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Parks Advisory Committee	7	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Planning Commission	9	2	22%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%
Library Advisory Board	15	5	33%	2	13%	1	7%	1	7%	1	7%
Strategic Planning Functional Committees	25	6	24%	6	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4%</b>

**JOINT CITY OF  
PORTLAND-MULTNOMAH  
COUNTY CITIZEN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

Portland/Multnomah Commission on Aging	25	21	84%	8	32%	10	40%	1	4%	2	8%
Metro Arts Commission	16	3	19%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%
Metro Community Action (board)	30	5	17%	3	10%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%
Metro Human Relations Commission	15	9	60%	3	20%	3	20%	2	13%	1	7%
Metro Youth Commission*	7	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>

\* Currently Youth Today, Inc.

**PORTLAND PRIVATE AND NONPROFIT COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS**

DIRECTORS										
T	M	M	A	A	A	A	H	H	N	N
O	I	I	F	F	S	S	I	I	A	A
A	N	N	R	R	I	I	S	S	T	T
L	O	O	I	I	A	A	P	P	I	I
	R	R	C	C	N	N	A	A	V	V
	I	I	A	A			N	N	E	E
	T	T	N	N			N	N		
	I	I	-	-			I	I	A	A
	E	E	A	A			C	C	M	M
	S	S	M	M						
#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

**CIVIC**

Boy Scouts (Columbia Pacific Council)	65	2	3%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
City Club of Portland	14	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Girl Scouts (Columbia River Council)	40	4	10%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	2	5%
League of Women Voters	17	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Portland Rose Festival	99	7	7%	4	4%	3	3%	0	0%	0	0%
World Affairs Council of Oregon	15	2	13%	0	0%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.8%</b>

**CULTURAL/EDUCATIONAL**

Artquake	53	2	4%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%
Friends of Washington Park Zoo	18	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%
Interstate Firehouse Cultural Center	10	5	50%	3	30%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%
Oregon Art Institute	26	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
Oregon Ballet Theatre	46	2	4%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oregon Historical Society	40	1	2%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
Oregon Museum of Science & Industry	18	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oregon Shakespeare Festival/Portland*	19	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oregon Symphony Association	45	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Portland Opera Association	40	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Portland Saturday Market	9	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

\* Portland Advisory Council

**BUSINESS**

	(EXPRESSLY REFUSED)										
Arlington Club											
Association for Portland Progress	21	1	5%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%
Portland Jaycees	20	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%
Portland Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce	51	6	12%	4	8%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%
University Club	7	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

## PORTLAND PRIVATE AND NONPROFIT COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

D I R E C T O R S										
T O A L	M I O R	M I O R	A F I C	A F I C	A S I A N	A S I A N	H I S P A N I C	H I S P A N I C	N A T I V E	N A T I V E
#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

### SERVICE

Kiwanis Club of Portland	18	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Portland Downtown Lions Club	15	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Royal Rosarians	17	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%
Rotary Club of Portland	11	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Totals	61	2	3%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%

### ATHLETIC

Multnomah Athletic Club	12	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Portland Golf Club	(DID NOT RESPOND)										
Waverly Country Club	(EXPRESSLY REFUSED)										
YMCA of Columbia/Willamette	(DID NOT RESPOND)										
Totals	12	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

### RELIGIOUS

Al Kader Temple	(DID NOT RESPOND)										
Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon	47	8	17%	5	11%	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%
Knights of Columbus	16*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Totals	63	8	13%	5	8%	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%

\* These "directors" are officers.

### ENVIRONMENTAL

Audubon Society of Portland	18	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1000 Friends of Oregon	15	1	0.7%	1	0.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
OSPIRG	(DID NOT RESPOND)										
Sierra Club (Columbia Group)	4	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Totals	37	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**B. PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

The following are the persons interviewed by the Subcommittee, listed chronologically (by organization) according to when they were interviewed during the course of this study. The titles and organizational affiliations are listed as they were *at the time of the interviews*.

1. **City Club of Portland:** James Harris, Board member; Nina Johnson, Executive Director
2. **Boy Scouts of America, Columbia Pacific Council:** Douglas S. Smith, Jr., Scout Executive
3. **Multnomah County Community Child & Youth Services Commission:** Norm Monroe, Commission member; Michael Morrissey, County Youth Program Manager
4. **Girl Scouts of America, Columbia River Council:** Grace Raymore, Executive Director; Joyce Astrop, Program Director
5. **League of Women Voters:** Cheri Unger, President; Louise Questad, Second Vice-President; Leanne McColl, Action Committee
6. **Metropolitan Human Relations Commission:** Rick Bauman, Multnomah County Commissioner, Ex-Officio MHRC member; Steve Moskowitz, Assistant to Portland Mayor Clark, Ex-Officio MHRC member; Carolyn Leonard, MHRC Chair; Jeannette Pai, MHRC Executive Director; Russell Peyton, former MHRC Executive Director
7. **Metropolitan Arts Commission:** Pat Wong, Commission member; Bill Bulick, Executive Director
8. **Royal Rosarians:** Tony Pasion, Prime Minister; Larry Cervarich, Prime Minister-Elect; Worth Caldwell, Victor Greb, and Jeff Metzker, former Prime Ministers
9. **Oregon Symphony Association:** Phil Bogue, Board member; Peggy Schwarz, Director of Concert Operations; Evelyn Nagel, Director of Development
10. **Portland Opera Association:** William McCormick, Chair of Board; Robert Bailey, General Director
11. **Multnomah County Citizen Involvement Committee:** Dennis Payne, Committee Chair; John Legry, Executive Director
12. **Rose Festival Association:** Dennis Payne, Board Member; Rolf Glerum, Immediate Past President; Gene Leo, Executive Manager
13. **Oregon Museum of Science and Industry:** Marilynne Eichinger, President; Jan Paul Dabrowski, Director of Science Programs Department
14. **Rotary Club of Portland:** Orval O. Hager, President; Alwyne A. Huges, Executive Director
15. **Oregon Historical Society:** Samuel T. Naito, Board member; William J. Tramposch, Executive Director; Karen Broenneke, Educational Director; Ilene Fitzsimons, Public Relations
16. **1000 Friends of Oregon:** David P. Miller, Chair of Board; Henry Richmond, Executive Director
17. **Interstate Firehouse Cultural Center:** Sue Busby, Executive Director; Ed Edmo

18. **Metropolitan Community Action:** Steve Rapp, Executive Director; Jo Ann Davich, Refugee Program Administrator; Vammath Chea, Project Director
19. **City of Portland Planning Commission:** Lawretta Morris, Past President; Robert E. Stacey, Jr., Acting City Planning Director
20. **Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon:** Katherin Lingas, President; Rev. Willie Smith, President-Elect; Rev. Rodney Page, Executive Director
21. **World Affairs Council of Oregon:** William Fronk, President; Charlotte T. Kennedy, Executive Director
22. **Oregon Art Institute:** Kay Corbett, Board member; Dan L. Monroe, President and CEO; Erin Boomer, Director of Administrative Services
23. **Northeast Neighborhood Coalition:** Rachel Jacky, Office of Neighborhood Associations; Edna Robertson, Northeast Neighborhood Coordinator; Avel Gordly
24. **Multnomah Athletic Club:** Kenneth D. Stephens, President; Steve R. Tidrick, General Manager
25. **Religious Organizations:** Rabbi Joshua Stampfer, Nevah Shalom; Dr. Allan Hamilton, Foursquare Church; Helen Peterson, Associated Congregation of Four Winds; also participating: Robey Clark, Christine Lowrey, and Joyce Nelson
26. **Association for Portland Progress:** Ron Gould, Chair; Ruth E. Scott, President and CEO
27. **University Club:** Rockne Gill, President; John Elmore, General Manager
28. **Portland Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce:** Vern Ryles, Chair of Board; Don McClave, President
29. **Portland Development Commission:** Doug McGregor, Commission member; Pat LaCrosse, Executive Director; Spencer Benfield, Director of Operations
30. Multnomah County Board Chair Gladys McCoy, and Staff Assistant Judy Boyer
31. **Multnomah County Democratic Party:** Roger Auerbach, Chair; State Senator William McCoy; State Representative Margaret Carter
32. City of Portland Commissioner Dick Bogle
33. **Multnomah County Republican Party:** Tim Nashif, Chairman; State Representative Randy Miller; Greg Smith; Chad Debnam
34. City of Portland Superintendent of Parks Charles Jordan
35. City of Portland Mayor J.E. (Bud) Clark, and Assistant Gail E. Washington
36. **Portland Minority Business and Professional Community (Session I):** Enid Boles, William Naito, Juan Prats, Humberto Reyna
37. **Portland Minority Business and Professional Community (Session II):** George Azumano, Amelia Lanier, Dr. Phyllis S. Lee, Victor Merced, George Richardson, Lina Garcia Seabold, Sherry Sheng, Joil Southwell
38. **Portland Minority Business and Professional Community (Session III):** Sam Brooks, Kurt Englestad, William Hilliard, Ed Kawasaki, Dr. E. L. Khoo, Dr. Fay Lee, Samuel T. Naito, Dr. Matthew Prophet, William Ray, Yoon S. Shin

Notes



Notes