

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, August 26, 2003
8:30 AM to 10:00 AM, Lovejoy Room, Portland City Hall

MINUTES AND SUMMARY NOTES

Members Present:

Moshe Lenske, Co-Chair	Woodstock Neighborhood Association
Kathy Bambeck	Bridlemile Neighborhood Association
Nancy Chapin	Alliance of PDX Neighborhood Bus. Assocs.
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

Absent:

Patricia Gardner, Co-Chair	Pearl District Neighborhood Association
Charles Shi	Communities Beyond Neighborhood Boundaries
Ruth Spetter	City Attorney's Office
William Warren	Central Northeast Neighbors

Visitors

Lee Perlman	Media
-------------	-------

*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 has approved these summary notes and they 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 Minutes

- Change definition of "definition" to say: Includes "administrative decisions and policy recommendations, but"
- Minutes approved for August 12, 2003 meeting.

Minutes

Motions approved:

- Motion approved to rewrite definition of "Decision" to say "includes administrative decisions and policy recommendations,"
- Motion approved to change the order of 1. a. and 1. b. so that 3 day notice is listed before 1-day notice.
- Motion passed to add in after 3rd sentence: "Parties who are known to have a special interest in the topic of a meeting should receive direct notice, even if they have not specifically requested it in writing."

Summary of Notes for August 26, 2003

- Discussion on "Notice" section focused on whether to require minimum of one day or three days notice for meetings. Seven days advance notice was also suggested to meet non-profit law. Arguments made one day notice needed to respond quickly to City land use notices. Arguments made more time needed to meet spirit of public notice for meetings.
- Discussion about "Emergency Meeting" focused on whether to use word "shall" or "should" require direct notice to interested parties and board members. Also noted that we are missing section on Special Meetings.

Section B: Definitions

Motions:

- Motion approved to rewrite definition of "Decision" to say "includes administrative decisions and policy recommendations,"

Section C: Decisions Shall be Made at Meetings

Issues brought up:

- Discussed changing but decided to keep current language re: "Proxy voting is prohibited."

Section D: Meetings Open to Public

Issues brought up:

- After quick review group agreed current language was fine.

Section E: Notice

Issues brought up:

- Discussion about whether or not notice needs to be one or three days notice.
- Concern raised there is no differentiation between "published" and "direct notice."

- Need to clarify how you would get notice with one-day meeting notice such as by phone or email or word-of-mouth.
- We should provide clarifying definition for "interested parties".
- Another part of open meetings law mentions how groups should have ongoing recurring meeting schedules. This might be a way to eliminate getting into trouble by always providing notice that you meet on a specific day of the month.
- Leonard and Mark will attempt to rewrite Section E. Notice for next meeting.

- Arguments for only one days notice:
 - We need to allow quick notice to allow Neighborhood Associations to quickly respond to land use notices with very short response times.
 - Case made current language does clearly outline different notification requirements between core membership and general public:
 - 3 days published notice to general public stating the meeting will take place.
 - 1 day direct notice to key members and interested parties about what will be on the agenda.

- Argument for more notice:
 - Concern raised that we need to adopt the most conservative procedures to protect the public's right to have adequate notice and ensure "the best intentions" of the leadership.
 - Incorporated neighborhood associations already need to follow state non-profit law that requires seven days notice. Some neighborhoods are confused about which rules to follow on notification, do they follow state non-profit law, state open meetings law, or ONI guidelines.
 - Existing notification mechanisms available to Neighborhood Associations make it difficult to publish info about their meetings in advance.

Suggested language changes:

- Add reminder that Neighborhood Associations which are 501-c-3's need to follow State non-profit law requiring seven days notice.
- Encourage neighborhood associations to approve their agendas right after approval of the previous meetings minutes.
- Suggestion to change advance notice from three days to seven.
- E. 1 . b. first sentence is unclear. Needs rewrite.
- E. 2 should say "receive general and direct notice"
- Suggestion to harmonize state non-profit law and ONI guidelines regarding seven days notice. State law states notice of 7 days allowed using first class mail. Notice of no less than 30 days or no more than 60 days if mailed other than first class.

Motions:

- Motion approved to change the order of 1. a. and 1. b. so that 3 day notice is listed before 1-day notice.

Section F: Notice for Emergency Meetings

Issues brought up:

- Discussion about how often and why emergency meetings are held. Typically because neighborhood associations have been forced by the City into tight deadlines to respond to land use issues or major policy issues without advance notice.
- Note made this does not include special meetings which are meetings which have more than 24 hours of notice but are not regularly scheduled meetings. This allows middle ground between advance notice and emergency meetings.

Suggested language:

- Suggestion that emergency meetings should have 24 hours notice.
- Suggestion to use the word "shall" but most don't want to have an absolute requirement. But "should" would allow a group to never have to communicate with the developer. Using "shall" would avoid messing up their opportunity to appeal a land use decision. Developers have the right to request direct notice if they so choose. "Should" seems to meet the need of a volunteer organization that is trying to do their best and can't possibly always know.

Motions:

- Motion passed to add in after 3rd sentence: "Parties who are known to have a special interest in the topic of a meeting should receive direct notice, even if they have not specifically requested it in writing."

The committee has approved these summary notes and 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, September 23, 2003

8:30 AM - 10:30 AM

City Hall, Lovejoy Room, 1221 SW 4th Avenue

Tuesday, October 14, 2003

8:30 AM - 10:30 AM

City Hall, Lovejoy Room, 1221 SW 4th Avenue

Prepared by: Brian Hoop, Office of Neighborhood Involvement