Minutes Regular Monthly Meeting of the Board of Directors
Publication Date: 
Approved: 
Meeting Day, Date & Time: Tuesday, May 9, 2017
Attendance of Members of the Board of Directors – Quorum met with 15 of 18
Excused absences: Deb Bridges, Stepan Simek

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

II. 7:05-7:20 Open Mike:
Jessica Rojas – NE Coalition of Neighborhoods (NECN), shared copies of the newspaper – “Hey Neighbor” and announced a meeting May 26 1:00 at NECN office of the NE Parks Committee.

Keith (last name?), representative of Lloyd district neighborhood association, reported they are working to facilitate Right to Dream 2 moving to the neighborhood. They plan to welcome and work with the Right to Dream 2 residents to get settled in the neighborhood. They will be moving near the silos near the river.

Emily Young, communications committee, announced that she had hand-delivered SGNA newsletters to all neighborhood businesses and provided a note and contact info with each. She offered to put a paragraph for each business on the SGNA website. Emily identified the four largest businesses in neighborhood: Holladay Park Plaza, Fred Meyer, Westin Property Management, and the Mariott Residence Inn. She noted that Brian Marki framing and art is moving to Palm Springs. Emily hopes to also serve as liaison to businesses for Gulchorama.

Masaki Fujimoto introduced “the Encorepreneur Café’” a new co-working space for retirees who want to take on a new business or entrepreneurial project as well as a potential meeting space for community events. The business is sponsored by Japanese company that runs retirement communities in Japan – this is first branch in US.

III. 7:20-7:25 Approval of April 11 Minutes and May 9 Agenda
Jack moved to approve April 11 minutes. Kathy seconded. Four board members abstained and the remainder approved. Andrea moved to approve the May 9 agenda. Kelly seconded. All voted in support of the motion.

IV. 7:25-7:30 Update – Turner Construction and discussion with neighbors
Nick (last name?) was unavailable to attend, but Marty read an update on his behalf – prefaced with some personal comments. Marty hoped things are going better in neighborhood, noting that Nick has been working hard to prevent deliveries before 7am and is trying to minimize street
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closures. From Nick: Turner Construction will attempt to have a representative at the next meeting. There will be a mobile crane on site from the 17th daily. Also they will be pumping concrete several days per week. They are starting utility installation on Clackamas. Some updates and project renderings are available to the public on the North fence. Trade workers are parking at Lloyd Center. Current daily average manpower on site is 30.

7:30-8: 30 Old Business & announcements

V. Discussion of Bylaws Revision – Bylaws Committee Daniel Pirofsky & Dave Brook

The strategy for the meeting was to address specific questions rather than referring to the actual text, starting with Article 4, membership. Should we establish an age, such as 16 for membership? This would be for membership in the association, not the board. Some neighborhoods have interested people sign up as members and keep list. Others accept all with addresses in neighborhood. Each resident has one vote. Each business can appoint one representative to vote. Andrea asked whether the issue would only pertain to whom might run for election? Michelle noted that if this were the case, it could be addressed through the election process itself. Julie suggested that if we are advocating for neighborhood, we may not want to exclude a segment.

Article 5, board authority. Language has been approved for PPPs to outline how we conduct business. We can amend the PPPs by majority vote. For bylaws, the membership must vote with 2/3 majority. Language prohibits board members from voting on any issue that board has not taken stance on which prohibits making public representation of policy that board hasn’t considered. Daniel originally authored this policy, but has found it difficult to implement, given the speed at which decisions are made. He now recommends that on those issues which the board has made decision, representatives must vote consistent with the board. If not, representatives must vote consistent with the goals of the association. Jack asked whether there is an obligation to report back to SGNA on the nature of a vote? Daniel responded yes, and this will be discussed in greater detail in the next section. Michael expressed unease with the board representing the larger association when individuals may not share the representatives’ opinions. There was a time on this board when members did not consistently represent the larger Association in their votes. Michael asked if issues are important enough to warrant neighborhood association in put, can’t NECN accommodate process allowing for consultation with the respective boards? Daniel responded that in ideal world, we would have more coordination and suggested that Email votes may serve for certain, simple issues. Michael asked whether issues such as these might be related to the recent article in the NW Examiner describing the desire to restructure the system of neighborhood associations as the primary tool for gathering input from the populations. Jessica from NECN noted that coordination is the largest issue and suggested that the Commissioners’ office feels neighborhood system is prone to NIMBY responses. She noted, however, that NECN has
demonstrated programming and initiatives that are positive and Commissioners seem impressed. Daniel agreed that NECN has been pioneering engagement with under-represented populations. Julie suggested that, procedurally, putting voting guidance into bylaws opens the process to grievances and also makes them harder to amend. She proposed keeping the voting guidance in the PPPs where it would be easier to adjust, as needed, over time. Chris concurred.

Regarding language requiring representative to other bodies to report back within a certain period of time, it was agreed to also keep in PPPs to allow flexibility.

Co-chairs vs. chair and vice-chair. A few other neighborhoods use a co-chair model. Do we want to allow for this possibility? Julie suggested keeping the specific reference out of the bylaws due to procedural issues. Andrea suggested that if current bylaws allow for a chair/vice-chair shouldn’t the co-chair model be included too? Daniel noted that the actual administrative processes governing the positions could be addressed in PPPs. Andrea suggested that bylaws would give co-chair same responsibility of vice-chair. Dan pointed out that “co-chair” implies equality, which is different from vice-chair. Andrea noted that we need to develop some language around this policy.

Daniel asked whether we should add “Coalition representative” as officer to executive committee. ONIs recommended language includes this. No one opposed the suggestion.

Meetings – should we allow chair/co-chair or committee chair to limit the length that people may speak? Chris suggested this should be addressed in the in PPPs.

Should we allow the board or executive committee to meet in executive session for issues as outlined by the ONI template? Minutes would need to be recorded. Any resulting voting would need to be made public. Andrea noted that she assumed would be used infrequently.

If we want to call special meeting of membership or board, the Chair currently has the power to do so. Do we want to also allow the executive committee to call a meeting? Andrea asked whether that authority already exists based on vote? Julie responded that ONI allows for a Board to call a special meeting of membership. Emergency meetings require 24 hours’ notice. Special meetings require seven days’ notice. Chris suggested that this should be a function of the executive committee.

Should we require seven days’ notice of upcoming committee meetings? Andrea suggested this language would be better in PPPs to better accommodate emergencies. Kelly noted that the “Safety and Livability” committee meets informally. Chris pointed out that the Communications Committee meets irregularly in person. Daniel noted that the board needs to know what committees are doing, so they need to submit reports.
Should we grant the Chair of any association meeting to remove a person disrupting the meeting after a single verbal warning? Daniel suggested this would empower the chair. Dave noted that this comes up so rarely, there is no need to have it in the bylaws.

Is two weeks a reasonable time period to write minutes? Andrea recommended that it would be better to use “reasonable time” in the bylaws.

Do we want to record all votes by name or “no” votes by name. Andrea pointed out that if this includes membership meetings, this would require election votes to be attributed by name. Michelle also suggested that we would need to change voting process for Board meetings, as votes are currently virtually unattributable, given the manner in which they take place.

Do we want an ad hoc election committee to organize the annual election? We have been running elections impromptu with an undefined nomination process. The ONI template election committee or nominating committee exist to cultivate nominees. Nominations may come from floor as well. Andrea clarified that anyone coming up for election would be excluded from this committee. Dave asked whether we need an election committee? Daniel responded that if it is worded as ad hoc, it is not a permanent committee, but rather convenes as needed. It would identify people whom the board thinks would do a good job, but would prevent nominations from floor. Andrea liked transparency of having regular committee structure. Daniel pointed out that it is harder to find people to serve than to hold the election. Currently this is Chair responsibility. Chris pointed out that she would like to see this as a broader board responsibility and suggested that it should be addressed in the PPPs along with the rest of the election details.

Conflict of interest, Grievances, and the amendment of bylaws remain to be discussed.

Intersection painting update and budget request – Kelly Francois
Kelly brought a design mock-up to share and also sent an electronic version to the mailing list. The intersection identified for the painting is now 26th Avenue between Halsey and Clackamas, between two alleys. It is a smaller intersection than originally identified. Kelly has ordered the paint and secured the agreement of those living at all four corners. It will be on the bike lane. She is now looking for funding for next phase of project: $250 for supplies for the installation. They will need to rent barricades to block off intersection for three days. They are planning to put the design on cards and postcards to sell and raise funds for future repainting, which they anticipate needing to do every 2-3 years. They have targeted Gulchorama for the painting activities. Miles expressed concern with slipperiness of paint in rain on the bikeway. Kelly explained that the required paint has additional texture. Miles disagreed with PBOT and suggested that even with the additional texture it will be slippery. He also had concerns with how visible it will be given the narrower width of street and parking/leaves. Kelly concurred that it would be a concern if the painting represented a safety issue for bikes. Jessica from ONI noted that of Kelly is working with City
Sullivan’s Gulch Neighborhood Association, c/o Holladay Park Plaza, 1300 NE 16th Ave., Portland, Oregon 97232
http://www.sullivansgulch.org

Repair, they will know whether the painting would represent any danger to cyclists. Chris agreed with concerns about the painting being on the bike way and wondered if there were any remaining alternatives. Kelly responded that it has been difficult to find an intersection where all neighbors agree. Michael provided a funding status update, indicating that an initial payment of $200 had been given toward this project with an additional $250 pending additional updates. Ron suggested that Miles might reach out to City Repair to see if they can address his concerns. Chris suggested that the topic be tabled until the next meeting. Have joint conversation with City Repair and report back in June? Jessica offered the use of NECN barricades for the eventual painting days. Chris suggested the board vote by email on the approval of the next tranche of funding after the concerns have been explored further with City Repair.

Neighborhood Clean-up – Dave Brook reported that the neighborhood clean-up is taking place Saturday 5/13 from 9-2 in Irvington at 21st and Tillamook. General debris, specialized recycling for electronic waste, paper shredding, paint recycling, and hard Styrofoam collection will be available. No construction debris is allowed. There will be a re-use area for useable household items. They are still looking for general volunteers to help, in particular, volunteers to oversee the Styrofoam, electronics, and paper collections. They also need mini-vans to move things around. Dan reported that the slope clean up at 16th and Multnomah will be on the same day at 9am and recommended that anyone participating wear boots and bring gloves.

VI. 8:30-9:00 New Business

LUTC update on neighborhood planning & presentation at May 16 meeting DJ has been preparing his presentation for the upcoming membership meeting, where he plans to requesting feedback on topics to engage the room in discussion. He will also make a pitch to add more voices to committee. They would like to hear from renters and broader cross section of community. He will provide updates on approved and planned development projects as well as transportation projects. He will additionally provide an update of the neighborhood plan and priorities, which they are looking at through the lenses of climate change, social justice, and livability. At the memebership meeting he will ask groups of neighbors to discuss preferred pedestrian routes through neighborhood and pedestrian amenities (lighting and benches, for example). Group recommendations will be collected in writing and posted to website. Then, Parking management will be discussed in small groups debating whether to restrict visitor parking, enhance parking, or pursue options to reduce cars and enhance alternatives. The next topic will be livability – focusing on Sullivan’s Gulch’s lack of a public park. He will suggest three options: buy a block and knock buildings down, use a blocked off street, and use Gulch – in conjunction with bike trails. An additional topic would focus on energy and the possibility of community solar. Andrea expressed concerned with the length of discussion and suggested that DJ may want to cut the final topic. Daniel noted the need to set up room in advance to allow for small
group discussion. Chris requested volunteers to help with room set-up from 6:15. Emily will help check people in. DJ will ask Board members to moderate.

A new NECN Representative to be selected in June to replace Daniel. Someone will need to step forward to fill this role. That person may also be asked to serve on an NECN committee.

Andrea recommend not having an open mike for the May membership meeting.

Deana Hunt is serving as liaison to police, attending monthly public safety mtg.

VII 9:00 Adjournment
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