

Minutes Regular Monthly Meeting of the Board of Directors Publication Date:

Approved:

Meeting Day, Date & Time: Tuesday, July 18, 2017

Attendance of Members of the Board of Directors - Quorum of 11 of 17

Present: Chris Tanner; Kari Laforge; Kelly Francois; Daniel Pirofsky; Jack Frewing; Julie Hoffinger; Deb Bridges; Linda McDowell; Michael Brown; Marty Rowe; Kathy Hansen

Excused: Michelle Johnson, Andrea Meyer, Dave Brook, Stepan Simek, Ron Boucher

Absent: Dan Lerch-Walters

Also Present: DJ Heffernan (Chair of the SGNA LUTC), Eugenia Pardue, Nik Gervais (with Turner Construction), David Peterson, Daniel Cole, Deanna Hunt, Tony Brizendine

I. Welcome, roll call of Board members, introduction of guests

II. 7:05-7:20 Open Mike: time for members of our community to raise concerns/questions

• Three neighbors affected by HPP construction attended the meeting. There followed discussion about communication, the neighbors' claims of damage to homes, day-to-day issues with construction, and the process to date. Two Board members and one homeowner indicated that damage to homes would likely need to be resolved through legal channels, and that SGNA Board had no role here. Nik and Marty invited homeowners to come to Nik's HPP office at anytime to ask questions or point out issues. Nik also will continue to try to respond to emails.

III. 7:25-7:30 Update – Turner Construction and discussion with neighbors

 Nik reported that they are almost done with the concrete, and there will be wood framing occurring the next three weeks. At the end of August, expect exterior siding and roofing, in September, exterior work and some interior rough in, and then remaining exterior and interior work until the end. They are still looking at a completion date of end of January/beginning of February.

Minutes for the Regular Monthly Meeting of the Board of Directors, July 2017, Page 1 of 10



• There was some delay with the City, and they will be starting early August on the north side of the building. The utilities control permits, street closure, will be about a three week process. Residents still have access from the other side of Clackamas. Kelly asked about sidewalk access. Nik responded that they have got the asphalt, and will work on patching tomorrow. After the utilities and building construction, new sidewalks will go in. They are putting in sewer, water, gas, communications utilities. They will build back the street curb gutter. But the sidewalk will probably be closed for the rest of the project. The other side of the street will be open.

IV. 7:20-7:25 Approval of June 13 Minutes and July 18 Agenda

- VOTE: Kelly Francois moved to approve the June 13 minutes as distributed. Kathy Hansen seconded. All approved, motion carries.
- Chris asked for any additions or other changes to the agenda. Hearing none, she announced that the agenda was approved as distributed.

V. 7:30-8:00 Old Business & announcements

Discussion of Bylaws Revision - Bylaws Committee Daniel Pirofsky

- Daniel Pirofsky discussed that as a result of the absence of a quorum at the last board meeting, the Bylaws Committee met and has made some recommendations for the board's consideration at this meeting instead. These recommendations are in the three-page handout previously circulated.
- The first question referenced in the handout is: what committees do we want to have? Some may be ad hoc, and we can consider defining these in the PPPs with approval by a majority board vote. The Committee recommends four standing committees: Communications, LUTC, Safety & Livability, and an Executive Committee. There could also be two ad hoc committees: Elections, and Events, which could be defined/described in the PPPs. Often coordination and procedures for events depend on the nature of the event itself. There is also the question of the Emergency Preparedness Committee, which is a hybrid SGNA committee where inside is the NET. This combination results in better communication. In some respects because of NET this is a permanent committee. The Bylaws Committee

Minutes for the Regular Monthly Meeting of the Board of Directors, July 2017, Page 2 of 10



recommends this Committee go in the PPPs.

The next question is the exercise of board authority by a committee. This can be needed where a decision is time-sensitive, and would be a tool in addition to the ability of the board to call special meetings or emergency meetings. The Bylaws Committee recommends that the Executive Committee be granted the ability to exercise board authority, to act in cases where a decision is needed sooner than later. The Executive Committee is not defined in our current bylaws, but in practice has been in place. The Bylaws Committee also recommends giving specific authority to committees for routine review such as the renewal of a liquor license. The grant of authority would require that at the board's next meeting, the decision is reviewed, and can be overturned or denied by the board. Linda asked what the presentation of the decision to the board would look like; would it be a yea or a nay? Daniel confirmed that there are current reporting requirements, where the item would go on the agenda, and the board would discuss. Kathy commented to thank Daniel and the Committee for the thoughtful and prudent recommendations, and expressed that she is comfortable supporting the recommendations. David asked about emergency actions, and what happens when an action is already taken? Daniel responded that with regard to the committees, the Communications Committee's work is operational and they do not make policy. They determine how to get the word out, and participate in the budget decided by the board. LUTC could have specific authority such as renewal of a liquor license, or if there is a tree targeted to be taken down and an emergency communication to the City was needed. David asked, what about an irrevocable action? Daniel responded that this would be a concern, and we need to be careful about what things we allow a committee to do. Michael asks, for example, what if the tree gets taken down? Linda asks if there could be another layer to the requirements to exercise board authority, such as circulating an email if it is something controversial. Daniel discussed that there is a seven day notice requirement for special meeting, and 24 hours notice for emergency meetings, and these are tools we already have. This grant of authority would be an additional tool for the Executive Committee and others to get things done. If our current tools are okay, then maybe we don't need this. The Bylaws Committee recommends the board allow authority to be delegated at a future time. when needed. At that time there would be opportunity for questions and debate. The executive committee has the ability to create board agendas. If something arises

Minutes for the Regular Monthly Meeting of the Board of Directors, July 2017, Page 3 of 10



that the board is not comfortable with, then maybe a step back is needed. Linda asked to clarify, it is the possibility of authority? Daniel responded yes, and we are trusting that the board will make a good decision. Chris commented about LUTC as an example, working consistent with the policy in our neighborhood plan, and able to make a decision following that plan. Daniel added that applying a prior decision to a current situation would be a good example. David asked who would be on the Executive Committee. Chris mentioned that the Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary, and Treasurer mostly review agendas or are consulted when some conditions come up. Daniel noted the Bylaws Committee is recommending one more officer—the Neighborhood Coalition Representative. This fifth committee member would mean no tie votes, and would be a convenient, direct line of communication to NECN for the board in making agendas. The Executive Committee could be allowed to make decisions if needed where the next board meeting is out beyond the time frame. Kari commented that this is not an issue when we trust the board. Daniel agreed that we would be opening this up a bit, but that the board would be able to slap a decision down. Linda asked about sending an email, saving the committee needs a comment within two days. This would not be a vote, but then some other board members can comment. It is important that actions be in the daylight. Daniel commented that it would be possible for that to be in the bylaws if the board wants it there, or recommend we put the procedures in the PPPs so it is clear. Daniel likes the idea of still reaching out to the board. Kari likes the PPP idea, and asked about having the bylaws reviewed at a general meeting. Some might feel it is too much power without the expectation of working with all the rest. PPPs would be easier to revisit. Daniel confirmed that the PPPs can be changed with a board majority. Daniel added to the discussion that the Bylaws Committee is not defining a Finance Committee, as those functions could be folded into the Executive Committee.

• Another question is how to define a committee? Do we require it go in the PPPs or can the board just create it? For important committees such as Elections, or Events, put those in the PPPs. Create others on the spur of the moment? Chris asked if this would be like calling a task force. Michael asked how often this happens. Daniel responded that it hasn't. Kelly commented when a new resident has passion for something, we want to attract energy, and do not want to limit ourselves. Chris suggested we can simply record the creation of a committee in the minutes, especially if it is a short term committee.

Minutes for the Regular Monthly Meeting of the Board of Directors, July 2017, Page 4 of 10



- A complicated question to consider is the requirement that board members serve on at least one committee. Issues include an uneven distribution of work which leads to burnout, versus those with limited time. Does this requirement discourage potential board members? We would require at least two board members on any committee that could exercise board authority. Do we force people onto committees? How do we distribute the work load? Kelly commented she does not like to force anyone to work. On her committee, each does only what they are willing to do. We would be shortchanging ourselves, because we want all people, including those who are really busy and those who want to socialize. Deb commented that on the Holladay Farmers Market board, each person is required to serve on two committees, and potential board members know this when they run. Kari commented about Gulch-o-rama, which is a big event. She helps with food always. She is hurt and disappointed when board members do not participate or do not attend. Last year was different. The board spends money on this event. She would not force anyone to come, but does not see how board members can vote for the event and then don't attend and see the event. It occurs once per year—come by for 15 minutes. This is not a criticism, just a question mark. Linda commented that she likes the idea of not forcing participation, and instead to divide tasks into very small pieces. For example, circulate a sign-up sheet for a month before. Daniel responded to a question and explained that the committee participation requirement was voted on for the PPPs last year, and that it has helped the committee structure. The question was asked again about those with limited time. Linda suggested encouraging, not requiring. Daniel responded that the Committee had considered setting "expectations" for new members, which would be soft way to encourage. Linda reiterated for tasks that sign-up sheets would be helpful. Chris asked if the board wanted to vote on going forward with these issues. Daniel added that the Committee would next work on a "Discussion Draft."
- VOTE: Kelly Francois moved to accept the Bylaws Committee recommendations, to go into a working draft of the bylaws. Kathy Hansen seconded. All approved, motion carries.

GOR and Garage Sale updates

• This year, ten signed up, and there were six sales. There were four times as many signs as sales. Participation has been declining over the years, due to Craigslist, etc.

Minutes for the Regular Monthly Meeting of the Board of Directors, July 2017, Page 5 of 10



It is something to think about next year. Kelly asked if the board's work could be electronically, in setting the date only? A low-key approach would be less work. Chris suggested that the Safety & Livability Committee could look at this. It was commented that there were disappointed buyers too, as the sale was advertised. Kari suggested we maybe give it a rest the next couple of years. People would miss the sale and ask about it, and it would increase interest when the sale started up again. Chris suggested this be a future agenda item. Linda asked if the sale could be organized in a big parking lot with tables.

VI. 8:00 – 8:50 New Business LUTC items

- DJ has items, and draft letters for discussion. There are a couple of critical dates coming up:
 - July 21, Draft TSP into City
 - July 27, Better Housing by Design comments
 - July 27, this month, the LUTC may or may not meet
 - August 31, Portland in the Streets grant application due. Also, the evening of July 27th, there is a workshop at NECN, that someone needs to go to and listen. Julie said she could attend.
- Generally, DJ would like to see more residents, not just board members, on the LUTC Committee. If you have ideas for recruitment, please talk to DJ. Kelly suggested a table at Gulchorama. Someone mentioned the use of social media. Daniel commented that there are more now on the Committee than before.
- DJ and Chris met Cassidy Bolger about the Sears Parking Lot. It was a good discussion and they were told the comments were timely because the project is going back before design review. Pedestrian access was discussed. LUTC would not like to see a duplication of running into a wall like at 17th & Wasco. DJ and Chris were told that this is a critical issue for the project as well. Plans show a new entrance to Lloyd Center between Sears and Marshalls, with a sidewalk diagonally through Lloyd Center to 9th & Multnomah.
- This discussion dovetailed with a meeting DJ had with PBOT. They like the idea of wayfinding and an enhanced pedestrian route between Lloyd Center and Fred Meyer.
- The Sidewalk Inventory is done, and LUTC is looking for a mapping tool. An intern will be bringing in information from the last two census cycles, for trend data such Minutes for the Regular Monthly Meeting of the Board of Directors, July 2017, Page 6 of 10



as the age of housing stock, ownership vs rental, etc. Kathy asked if density would be part of this data. DJ responded that it is hard to track because from the street, a census taker can't always tell how many residences there are.

Three discussion items follow:

Transportation plan update comment letter

- TSP comments can be uploaded to the website. Possible goals:
 - Get transportation system plan to include a primary pedestrian route. Staff will have to look at it and it becomes a priority.
 - Get them to include a definition for a pedestrian street. Barcelona has Las Ramblas, where no cars are allowed. Portland does not have a designation for a "pedestrian street," which means people can object because it does not accommodate all modes.
 - Put a stop sign on the streetcar, that we don't endorse it, or that we are not comfortable saying we support it.
- 3 steps for TSP process. Started with capital improvements list and ended with policy. Backwards, because usually policy should drive projects. This sequence was driven by calendar issues.
- Kathy commented that North-South transportation is not provided adequately by Tri Met. Beaumont-Wilshire or Fremont to Division. We do not need rail. DI responded that we can add a request for funds to include a project to study enhanced North-South transportation instead of a streetcar. DI commented that going further east, there is the same issue, e.g. Hawthorne to Beaumont. Montavilla, etc. Kathy commented that better north-south transportation would draw people to use resources in the eastside economic area. DJ agreed that neighborhood coalitions run from the core on out, but that the further out you go, there are different issues. Maybe rainbow arches would be more suitable than pie wedges. Kari agrees that within NECN there can be totally different issues than some other locations. Linda commented that in all these years, Tri Met has not addressed north-south transportation. David commented that there are some north-south buses. Linda responded that they are not like the spokes. DI asked if everyone was comfortable with this stance on the streetcar? In an LUTC meeting it was suggested that we might support the streetcar if it meant decoupling Broadway-Weidler. Chris mentioned that the Board has never taken a position on this.

Minutes for the Regular Monthly Meeting of the Board of Directors, July 2017, Page 7 of 10



- VOTE: Kathy Hansen moved to accept the TSP letter as written, with the addition of the North-South study. Daniel Pirofsky seconded. Kelly Francois abstains from vote. All others approve, motion carries.
- Daniel asked a question about extending the pedestrian way to 15th? DJ responded that there would be issues because of ownership changes.
- Linda asked about Halsey, and making it livable for existing automobile users, and thinking about impacts. For example, roads narrowed because the City installed bike lanes.

Better housing by design

- DJ explained that the City objective is to reduce the cost of design and development of housing, for the "missing middle." This is multifamily housing in zones R1, R2, R3, RH. The aim is to reduce the red tape by adopting a more form-based approach. The concern would be not so much what goes inside the walls, as what the walls are. The façade becomes important. DJ discussed some examples of FAR calculations which are a density-based approach. DJ thinks the number of units should be about the same, but probably the result will be to get rid of rowhouses. Apartment buildings will be encouraged because of flexibility and density. Density typically leads to affordability.
- Garages and driveways. The City does not like cars, and curb cuts reduce street parking. Might encourage alleyways but alley parking is difficult to create because we have very small blocks in this city (this is why in some areas we have very small sidewalks). Concept: limit garage openings to less than one-half of building frontage. This would eliminate row houses where parking takes up the whole frontage. Linda commented on a prior meeting, and that where there are no garages, and people park on the street it looks nice. DJ poses a Question: should we support a form based approach vs a density based approach? There would be very low parking requirements, with the minimums mostly eliminated, and with parking maximums set pretty low. The goal with this is to create affordable housing zones. Structured parking can cost \$60,000-\$75,000 per space, which makes it difficult to build an affordable unit. Jack asked about the letter position on this. DJ says it punts. There pros and cons. He is guessing this does take more out of design review into a nondiscretionary approval process. DJ comments and agrees with Daniel, if they are going to do this anyway, then let's provide some design guidelines for what

Minutes for the Regular Monthly Meeting of the Board of Directors, July 2017, Page 8 of 10



our neighborhood would like to see. It is hard to say though, when you have a developer with a nondiscretionary path to approval. In the next year, we should work on design guidelines for multi-family. Linda expressed concern that with a building, there is no neighborhood input required already. Kathy commented that near the central city there is no affordable housing, when we are looking at \$825,000 for a tear-down. Increasing density does not necessarily increase affordable housing. Michael asked if housing prices will be going down? Kari commented that there is a 30% reduction moving down from Vancouver BC, that has hit parts of Seattle already. Kathy guesses that housing will not decrease, but rentals will. Deanna commented that she is seeing more vacant buildings now, more so than two years ago. DI discussed that the Better Housing by Design phase is the Concept Report, and the next step is to draft code language. We could say generally we are okay with the idea, but are concerned about design. DJ discussed that bonuses are all eliminated, except for two: affordable housing, and heritage trees. A question was asked about affordable housing, and a response was that it is 60% of median family income. Linda is concerned that families making \$100,000 cannot afford a house. Kari wonders if the market will correct. DI commented that FAR encourages developers to build bedrooms not dwellings. In Seattle there are studios under 400 square feet. Maybe we can comment, to bring family units into the bonus structure.

Portland in the Streets Grant Application due the end of August

• Ideas? The program focuses on brick & mortar projects. A question was asked about eligibility of murals? DJ does not think so. Art fits but it must be oriented toward the street. DJ would like to hear ideas for discussion from more than this group.

VII. 8:50-9:00 Late Breaking Committee Reports & Updates

- Kelly reports that the Safety & Livability Committee has a flyer available for a Block Party as a part of National Night Out. The block party will be at Wasco, between 21st and 22nd.
- Chris commented that the Gulchorama Committee needs to catch up with each other.

VIII. 9:00 Adjournment

Minutes for the Regular Monthly Meeting of the Board of Directors, July 2017, Page 9 of 10



• Meeting adjourned at 9:11 p.m.

Reminders:

Next Board Meeting: August 8, 2017 Next Scheduled Committee Meetings:

LUTC -July 28, 2017

NET: August 9, 2017

Safety and Livability

Communications

Next Neighborhood Meeting

November 21, 2017

Gulch-O-Rama September 9, 2017