

SGNA Board Meeting - 2026-06-15

Meeting Details

Date and Time: 2026-06-15 7-8:30pm

Physical meeting location: Steeplejack Broadway

Board of Directors Attendance

Facilitator: Matt Zajack

Notetaker: Susan Bickerstaff

Name, Duty	Present	Absent	Excused
Babs Vanelli, Neighborhood Coalition Rep	☒	☐	☐
Keith Adamson, Vice Chair	☒	☐	☐
Keith Iding	☒	☐	☐
Matt Zajack, Chair	☒	☐	☐
Peter Sheehey, Treasurer	☒	☐	☐
Susan Bickerstaff, Secretary	☒	☐	☐
Ted Schenck	☐	☒	☐
Quorum (5 required)	Yes		

Neighbors Present in-person and virtual

1. Mary Kinnick, Stephanie Iding, Eugene, Tom Kilbane (URG), Matt Zmuda (MultNoMo)

Agenda and Notes

Have a question, suggestion, or idea? Email us at hello@sullivansgulch.org

Welcome

1. Public Comments: Disaster musical organized by neighbor Trip to be performed at Quake Night at Holladay Park on August 22nd
2. Calendar of events
 1. Yard Sale - July 11, 2026 (map link: <https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/edit?mid=1up1VlqGvDoN2m1GomXEHLz-XCN362aw&usp=sharing>)
 1. Deadline will be 7/3 to get on the map
 2. Gulch-oRama - Sep 12, 2026, planning meetings are underway

Speaker

1. Matt Zmuda, MultNoMo.org
 1. Presentation: MultNoMo is a citizen-led initiative to consolidate Multnomah County and the City of Portland into a single, accountable, and effective government.
 1. Matt Zmuda is the chief petitioner; MultNoMo is a grassroots organization, led by a small group of volunteers
 2. Geography: 4 out of 5 residents of MultCo live in Portland. 11,000 in unincorporated towns. Gresham is the second largest city.
 3. Org chart: Overlapping division of responsibilities; friction between city and county around homelessness, health, public safety; it's hard to get anything done
 4. History: MultCo was formed because business people got tired of traveling to Hillsboro to file paperwork
 5. Oregon Law provides a path to merge the city and county together: City-County Act of 1971
 1. 13-member charter commission designs the new government with public input; they would have 2 years to develop the plan; plan goes to a vote
 6. Successful examples: Denver, Honolulu, San Francisco,

Last Edited: 2026-08-04

Philadelphia; Denver has grown by 25% in the past 8 years; they have a unified business development

7. MultNoMo was hoping to gather signatures to put on the ballot, but will not reach the required number (21,000) by the deadline; the process can be advanced by the member of the city or county government. Matt has been in touch with several commissioners/councilors

2. Discussion:

1. What are the points of opposition? On the progressive side there's a concern re-litigation of city charter reform. Unions may have concerns
2. What about Metro? Metro would remain the same. Metro is needed to accept grants from the federal government; serves a tri-county role.
3. What would happen to Gresham? Under the law, other cities like Gresham and Troutdale get the final say on what they would do (join consolidated Portland-MultCo or potentially join another county)
4. How did you get involved in this? I'm a software engineer and father of 4. Someone was stabbed at the library and the city and county were pointing fingers; I started reading about possible solutions

Standing Items

1. Officer Updates

2. Secretary: Approval of recent minutes

1. Keith will circulate May minutes for approval by email, no vote taken

3. Treasurer

1. We're using the NECN PayPal link to collect donations for the yard sale.

Can we request information on how many donations? When will we receive the funds?

1. Pete will ask NECN for a report on donors and check after the Yard Sale

2. Committee Updates

1. Land Use and Transportation: SGNA's support of the Lloyd Center
Redevelopment Master Plan

1. On June 24th, the City Council will hear an appeal to oppose the master plan
2. Keith A has drafted a letter opposing the master plan and supporting the appeal. Matt, Keith, and Ted worked together to craft two letters. Ted's letter supports the master plan (opposes the appeal) and a closer reflection of the SGNA's vote Feb 2026
 1. Support of master plan: brought by [Ted: letter read by Matt](#)
 2. Oppose the master plan and support the appeal: brought by Keith: [Reads his letter.](#)
 1. Keith: I didn't vote in support of SGNA's testimony in February. Worked with Save Lloyd to write the letter (not affiliated with the ice rink).
3. Comments and discussion:
 1. SB: If the appeal is approved by City Council, what happens? It will go back to the design commission
 2. MZ: reads an email from Joshua Baker of the Lloyd Eco District stating that they are support of the master plan
 3. Comments Tom Kilbane of URB: The mall is not economically viable. We did intentional things to increase tenets and doubled the security budget. The mall will close this year, regardless of the city council vote. The design commission unanimously approved the plan.
 4. KA: The community engagement led by URB is less than a 10th of a size of the Save Lloyd movement. The Regal Parking lot is an example of a piece of land laying vacant because there is no demand for development in Portland.
 5. TK: The ownership of the parking lot site was taken back by the lender. They have no local partner, which is different from our approach
 6. Pete S: In both letters there's a concern about phasing of development. I would hope there would be a condition about phased development.

7. KA: The building has value to offer the city. The Post Office blocks are another example of vacant land.
 8. Mary K: I wrote a letter to city council to outline some features that were really important, including the history. I'm opposed to the current plan, but I would hope that it could go back to the Design Commission to include some other features. The ice rink and indoor spaces are important with climate change. We will also have a chance to weigh in on individual developments.
 9. KA: I don't think the master plan has captured the public sentiment. People want an effort to preserve elements of Lloyd Center.
4. Motion and vote: see results below
 1. Keith A will make edits and prepare public testimony for June 24th city council meeting
 2. Safety and Livability:
 1. Tree Team (5-min)
 1. Mary K is retiring in Nov 26, looking for a new lead
 2. Arborist Drew is going to be leading a tree walk in July 12th. Will be meeting with an arborist in SE.
 3. Renny will be heading up the Gulch-o-Rama table
 4. 62 spots will receive markings for street trees. Urban Forestry will take the lead.
 5. Could do flyering to promote trees and messaging. Get it out before the mailings go out in June and July.

Motions / Nominations / Resolutions

1. Lloyd Center Redevelopment: testimony in support of the appeal at June 24th city council meeting
 - a. Matt motions to **support the appeal** ([Keith's letter](#) in opposition of the Lloyd Center master plan)
 - b. Keith Iding seconds
 - i. Yes Vote: Babs, Keith A., Keith I., Pete
 - ii. No Vote: Matt, Sue, Ted (recorded via email)
 - iii. Motion passes

MINUTES ADDENDUM – UNAUTHORIZED DIRECTOR PARTICIPATION

Background:

During the meeting held on June 15, 2026, while Director Ted Schenck was physically absent from the proceedings, they were granted participation in voting matters without proper authorization.

Findings Regarding Validity:

1. AUTHORITY UNDER ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER:

Robert's Rules establishes that a member must be present to vote unless specific exceptions exist (e.g., properly ratified proxies under established rules, or explicit bylaw provisions).

2. ORGANIZATIONAL BYLAW COMPLIANCE:

This procedure may conflict with *Article VIII, Section 9. Quorum.* requiring directors to personally participate in Board deliberations and decision-making when present at the meeting.

3. PROCEDURAL IRREGULARITY:

While the motion outcome did not materially change (vote remained 4-3 regardless), the participation itself established a precedent inconsistent with proper governance practices and may have compromised the integrity of Board deliberation processes.

Conclusion:

The Director's vote cast while absent was conducted without established authority under organizational bylaws or Robert's Rules of Order. This creates both procedural impropriety and potential precedent-setting concerns requiring remediation through Board action.