

**Randy Leonard, Commissioner**  
David Lane, Ph.D., Director  
1221 S.W. Fourth Avenue, Room 110  
Portland, OR 97204  
Phone (503) 823-4519  
FAX (503) 823-3050  
TTY (503) 823-6868  
www.myportlandneighborhood.org



*enhancing the quality  
of neighborhoods  
through  
community participation*

---

**City of Portland, Office of Neighborhood of Involvement  
Great – Guidelines Review Committee Meeting**

Tuesday, January 14, 2002  
8:30 AM to 10:00 AM, Lovejoy Room, Portland City Hall

**MINUTES AND SUMMARY NOTES**

Members Present:

Patricia Gardner, Co-Chair	Pearl District Neighborhood Association
Moshe Lenske, Co-Chair	Woodstock Neighborhood Association
Kathy Bambeck	Bridlemile Neighborhood Association
Nancy Chapin	Alliance of PDX Neighborhood Bus. Assocs.
Cathy Crawford	University Park Neighborhood Association
Leonard Gard	Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc.
Raymond Hites	Lents Neighborhood Association
Brian Hoop	Office of Neighborhood Involvement
David Lane	Office of Neighborhood Involvement
Stanley Lewis	Downtown Community Association
Michael O'Malley	Irvington Community Association
Jerry Powell	At-Large
Mark Sieber	Neighbors West/Northwest
Charles Shi	Communities Beyond Neighborhood Boundaries
Ruth Spetter	City Attorney's Office
William Warren	Central Northeast Neighbors

Absent:

Brent Canode	Office of Commissioner Randy Leonard
Brian Hoop	Office of Neighborhood Involvement

Visitors

Lee Perlman	Media
Lynne Coward	Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood Association

*Decisions by this group are subject to change at future meetings.  
Opportunities for public input are at the end of meeting and future workshops.  
The committee approved these summary notes which are final.*

---

**Information & Referral  
Center**  
503-823-4000

**Crime Prevention  
Center**  
503-823-4519

**Neighborhood Mediation  
Center**  
503-823-3152

**Metropolitan Human  
Rights Center**  
503-823-5136

**Civic Involvement  
Center**  
503-823-4519

## **Approval of Summary Notes**

- Motion to approve Dec. 10, 02 meeting minutes approved.

## **Approved Recommended Code or Standards Revisions**

### **Summary Notes for January 14, 2003**

- DEADLINE ON GREAT WORK: Let's consider a deadline to finish our work. ONI conducts a Neighborhood Summit this fall. It would be good to be done by then. The next big issue that will go slowly will be coalitions. No objections are raised to Patricia's proposal to finish by fall.

## **Update on Public Meetings Ad-Hoc Group**

### Issues brought up:

- The ad hoc group met on January 7 and had a good discussion re accessibility and other issues. The group is waiting for a draft of open meeting standards. The draft will be distributed this week. Open meeting standards lead to open and public meetings but must be workable. We are working to make them simple with plain language. The open meeting standards should be incorporated directly into the standards, and will be section 9. We should do one full version of the standards, and it's a good idea to meet with coalitions to do education on the new standards. Standards will be flexible, for example giving options on how voting is done. Flexibility good. Idea of cheat sheet for neighborhoods to follow is a good idea. What are consequences of a neighborhood association (NA) failing to follow open meeting standards? It could depend on the kind of issue the neighborhood is addressing: for example, a land use review or something more prosaic.

### Motions:

- No action.

## **Updates Communities Beyond Neighborhood Boundaries Ad-Hoc Group**

### Issues brought up:

- The CWB ad hoc group has not met since our last GREAT meeting. We still have no definition of CWB. ONI has recently gone through three commissioners and this is part of the reason for delay. The goal is to get diverse groups involved in the neighborhood system.

### Motions:

- No action.

## **Standards for Neighborhood Associations:**

### **Membership**

### Issues brought up:

- Discussion takes place about membership of businesses and other organizations. Some NAs allow businesses to be members. Some businesses have multiple locations. Some locations constitute a separate franchise and some are part of a larger umbrella franchise. Business licenses are place-based. There's usually not a problem with a business having its office in one location but doing business elsewhere. How should

employees be treated and can a local business have an employee representative at neighborhood meetings? This issue was discussed a long time ago. It's not practicable for a business to be a neighborhood association member because there are so many kinds of businesses. It's too complicated. Some disagrees.

- Consensus of the committee: Businesses should get one vote at NA meetings.
- Concern that employees should not be included as NA members because larger employers can organize workers to turnout at neighborhood meetings and overwhelm resident turnout. We should have the most inclusive standard for membership. A NA should be open to any person who wants to be a member. There should be no age discrimination. Children should participate. There is a legal problem with that: we are governed by state corporation laws that require legal age. How does this impact churches. Second sentence in membership section covers this.

#### Motion:

- Motion is approved to adopt the following language re membership: "Maintain membership, which is open to any person who lives in and/or owns any real property or holds a business license within the recognized boundaries of the neighborhood association. Other individuals or organizations may be members as further set forth in each neighborhood association's bylaws."

### **Non-Discrimination**

#### Issues brought up:

- Should we add citizenship to the list? Patricia and Mark relate experiences regarding people who were afraid to participate in NAs because they were non-citizens. Some neighborhoods have been overwhelmed by immigrants, and that's unfair to long-term citizens. Immigrants are not the enemy. That they create problems is not a reason to discriminate. Being a citizen suggests responsibility and commitment. The reference to age in the section does not refer to old or young. The problem with children voting is that they're controlled by their parents. Stan: Basic law of the state applies. Suggestion we also add language that age is "subject to state law."

#### Motions:

- Motion is approved to adopt the following language re non-discrimination: "Not discriminate against individuals or groups on the basis of race, religion, color, sex, sexual orientation, age, disability, legal citizenship, national origin, income, or political affiliation in any of its policies, recommendations, or actions."

### **Meeting Requirements**

#### Motion:

- Committee consensus is that the current language is OK.

### **Public Meetings/Public Records Law/Minutes/Dissent:**

#### Issues brought up:

- Patricia postpones discussion on this section.

### **Bylaws:**

Issues brought up:

- Should we include language re quorum and bylaws? Why are those bylaw provisions specifically mentioned while others are not? The weakness is that bylaws are not well understood. There are choices in the organizational philosophy set out in bylaws, e.g., how authority should be divided between the board and general membership. Bylaws need to reflect how the organization really operates or wants to operate. We may need standards on bylaws. Joleen did good work on bylaws but her work did not cover philosophical issues.
- Discussion takes place re quorum.

List in current bylaws section does need to be expanded.

Motion:

- Motion is approved to adopt the following language re bylaws: "Maintain and file with ONI an up-to-date set of bylaws, which provide for meeting these standards and include provisions for adopting and amending bylaws, establishing a quorum, and setting the agenda."

**Grievances:**

Issues brought up:

- We'll have another ad hoc group for this. David Lane will lead it. The grievances section (section 7) continues the same issue in section 6 re what needs to be in bylaws. The current grievances section is good in that it focuses on grievances at the NA level. We need a larger procedure above the NA level only for the issue of NAs failing to follow the own grievance procedures. Should we address the issue of historic districts and their relationships to NAs. The new code has language re the responsibility of NAs. We'll table the issue of grievances. Nancy: The bylaws section should move up to section 4.

*The committee approved these summary notes which are final.*

*The information contained in this document is preliminary and informal in nature and does not necessarily reflect the views or adopted policies of the City of Portland or the final outcomes of this project; the reader should exercise caution in its interpretation.*

**NEXT MEETINGS**

Tuesday, February 11, 2003

8:30 AM - 10:30 AM

City Hall, Lovejoy Room, 1221 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Tuesday, February 25, 2003

8:30 AM - 10:30 AM

City Hall, Lovejoy Room, 1221 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Tuesday, March 11, 2003

8:30 AM - 10:30 AM

City Hall, Lovejoy Room, 1221 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Prepared by: Brian Hoop, Office of Neighborhood Involvement