

<b>Page 1: [1] Comment [1]</b>	<b>Brynne Hovde</b>	<b>8/13/19 2:09 PM</b>
Acknowledging that people in Oak Park live here for a variety of reasons - including lodging (shelter), refuge (can be peace of mind, can be physical or emotional safety, etc) and acceptance demonstrates that Oak Park is a place that meets a variety of basic needs. Shelter and refuge are needs for every person and quite likely the base reasons many of us live here. Misinterpreting this statement as only applicable to people experiencing homelessness overlooks the universal commonality in our basic needs and reasons for living where we live.		
<b>Page 1: [2] Deleted</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>8/13/19 1:59 PM</b>
break down systems of oppression and achieve a society where race no longer determines one's outcomes, and where everyone has what they need to thrive.		
<b>Page 1: [3] Comment [2]</b>	<b>Brynne Hovde</b>	<b>8/14/19 1:38 PM</b>
In this context, "systems of oppression" refers to the actual forms of oppression that are experienced by individuals: racism, sexism, homophobia, etc. This is being conflated with "systemic oppression", which examines institutions and systems such as policing, financial services, healthcare, etc.		
<b>Page 1: [4] Comment [4]</b>	<b>Brynne Hovde</b>	<b>8/14/19 1:44 PM</b>
<p>These categories are not cherry picked or random - these are well-documented, academically backed lines of social identity. Social identities are the ways in which people identify that have impact (at an individual and macro level) in how they receive resources, access and achieve same outcomes as others not in their group.</p> <p>By this frame, the CRC acknowledges that criminal history/record belongs on this list. However, political affiliation does not impact (big picture) how one person or group receives resources and achieves success.</p>		
<b>Page 1: [5] Comment [5]</b>	<b>Brynne Hovde</b>	<b>8/14/19 1:44 PM</b>
"are often" is more accurate		
<b>Page 1: [6] Deleted</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>8/13/19 1:59 PM</b>
We acknowledge intersectionality which is the compounding effect of multiple overlapping forms of discrimination that many in our community experience.		
<b>Page 1: [7] Comment [6]</b>	<b>Brynne Hovde</b>	<b>8/14/19 1:48 PM</b>
The CRC feels strongly that acknowledging the experiences of those who are marginalized in multiple ways is crucial to our position as an equitable community. We must demonstrate understanding that a gay man's experience is not the same as a gay, Black man's experience nor the same as a gay, Black, disabled, trans man's experience. If we only examine systems of oppression in a vacuum, we do a disservice to the large portion of our community that experience these overlapping marginalized identities.		
<b>Page 1: [8] Comment [7]</b>	<b>Brynne Hovde</b>	<b>8/14/19 1:49 PM</b>
<p>The CRC is dismayed to mandate consensus in a statement such as this.</p> <p>This reads as if those who are oppressed must work to convince oppressors of their oppression. No historical civil rights or step forward for equity was achieved through consensus.</p>		
<b>Page 1: [9] Comment [8]</b>	<b>Brynne Hovde</b>	<b>8/14/19 1:51 PM</b>
The CRC questions what specifically the board is hoping to preserve? We invite more specificity here, as "best of the past" is resonant of "making America great again". If we are committed to preserving the community's architecture, let's name that specifically.		

There is much about the past that might not be in everyone's definition of "best".

**Page 1: [10] Comment [9]** **Brynne Hovde** **8/14/19 1:56 PM**

The edits to this paragraph read as if designed to omit people from the process. The CRC recommends an acknowledgement that it takes intentionality and specificity to include voices that have been historically left out of the conversation. We are confused by the deletion of "all". We feel this statement should be an ideal, so why would we default to "some" instead of "all"?

**Page 1: [11] Deleted** **Author** **8/13/19 1:59 PM**

all

**Page 1: [11] Deleted** **Author** **8/13/19 1:59 PM**

all

**Page 1: [12] Comment [10]** **Brynne Hovde** **8/14/19 1:57 PM**

This wording is specific in that it mirrors a common definition of inclusion. Inclusion must be intentional in order to be successful.

**Page 1: [13] Comment [11]** **Brynne Hovde** **8/14/19 1:58 PM**

This is the 2nd part of a common definition of inclusion. If we won't name the lines of difference (example above in our list of social identities), what are we even talking about?

**Page 1: [14] Comment [12]** **Brynne Hovde** **8/14/19 1:59 PM**

We are unclear on this change and feel "authentically" is a more accurate word choice.

**Page 1: [15] Comment [13]** **Brynne Hovde** **8/14/19 2:01 PM**

This is a cornerstone of an equitable system. The opposite of shared and collective power is power-hoarding, which is what helps sustain these systems of oppression we are committed to dismantling. This does not render the Village of Oak Park a communist society. This provides an ideal of how we can include more stakeholders in conversations and decisions that hold weight in our community.

**Page 1: [16] Comment [14]** **Brynne Hovde** **8/14/19 2:06 PM**

The changes to this paragraph are troubling because we know that "access" isn't enough. We also know that being present doesn't equate to having a voice. Access and participation are different ideas.

**Page 1: [17] Deleted** **Author** **8/13/19 1:59 PM**

access,

**Page 1: [17] Deleted** **Author** **8/13/19 1:59 PM**

access,

**Page 1: [17] Deleted** **Author** **8/13/19 1:59 PM**

access,

**Page 1: [17] Deleted** **Author** **8/13/19 1:59 PM**

access,

**Page 1: [18] Comment [15]** **Brynne Hovde** **8/14/19 2:07 PM**

This sentence is unclear to us.