

**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, July 23, 2003

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.
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:

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.*

**Approval of Minutes**

Minutes approved for July 8, 2003 meeting.

---

**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

## **Minutes**

### Motions approved:

- No motions for final language presented.

## **Summary of Notes for July 23, 2003**

- Review of Open Meetings and Public Records Ad-Hoc committee proposal.
- Discussed differentiating between day-to-day informal administrative decision-making vs. formal policy recommendations.
- Discussion about what can take place at executive sessions.
- Discussed how much advance notice is required for emergency meetings. Three days is proposed but minority report calls for one-day notice.

## **Order of Sub-committee reports**

- Patricia reviewed the order we would like to discuss committee proposals: Open Meetings, Diversity, Business Associations, Coalitions, ONI, Grievances - needs 3-4 more meetings, Code 3.96

## **Open Meetings and Public Records: Ad-Hoc Committee proposal**

### Issues brought up:

- Leonard Gard reviewed proposal and took questions and comments.

### Overall issues:

- Concern raised the proposed language may require too much of neighborhood association subcommittees regarding notice, quorum, and minutes. This can be addressed in the next Guidelines review if problems are identified.
- Lee Perlman wrote a minority report. Three-day minimum notification for meetings is wrong. 24-hour notice is a standard now in many bylaws and is necessary for many emergency issues.
- Left issue of defining grievance up to the other ad-hoc committee on grievances.

## **Section B: Definitions:**

- "Decision".
  - Critical to differentiate between day to day operational tasks and major policy issues. That is why definition is so long.
  - Need to differentiate: neighborhood associations make lots of administrative decisions that affect their own organizational issues vs. making a decision on a recommendation that goes forward to the City and Council.
  - Suggestion to add to "Definition" can include both administrative and policy recommendations.
  - Comment that Decision should follow the law.
  - Some association leaders think their "decisions" can get them in trouble legally if someone wants to sue who doesn't agree with the decision.
  - Suggestion to change "definition" to: "Decision" includes administrative decisions and policy recommendations, but..."
  - Suggestion to take elections out of definition of decisions and create a new section.

- “Quorum”. Drop out "In addition", last sentence.

### **Section C: Decisions to be Made at Meetings:**

- Purpose of this is to differentiate between informal and formal meetings.
- Some associations provide general membership broad authority. This language may be interpreted by members to allow making decisions outside of scheduled meetings.
- This may go beyond state law by limiting ability of members of a group to deliberate an issue informally outside of a formal meeting.
- Suggestion to drop "or deliberate toward" in second sentence.
- Suggestion to drop whole 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence. Since other definitions clarify when decisions can be made.
- The idea for clarifying the purpose of informal meetings is for topics and events such as at National Night Out and other informal conversations.
- Suggestion to add in first sentence, "as empowered by the governing documents/bylaws".
- Suggestion to adjust language to clarify decisions can only be made when a meeting has been formally called for.
- Suggestion to add "Proxy voting is prohibited" to ensure members take responsibility to participate in meeting decision-making. Approved.
- Suggestion that “decisions” can only be made at meetings that meet requirements of section D: “Meetings Open to Public”.
- Suggestion: This section should be retitled "How decisions are made at meetings".
- Concern we can't limit right of people to get together and deliberate.
- Rename section: Meetings at which decisions can be made"
- Purpose of this section was to resolve confusion by leaders who didn't know whether or not they could meet informally. This helps educate people.
- Need to differentiate between internal policy recommendation that only affect the organization vs. policy recommendation forwarded to the city.

### **DRAFT Language: C: "Decisions to be made at meetings"**

- Members of a general membership, board, or committee, as established by the governing bylaws, shall make all decisions and conduct all deliberations toward a decision at a meeting open to the public at which a quorum is in attendance. (See D. Meetings Open to Public.) Members have one vote each and decisions shall be made by a vote that is at least a majority vote of those voting members in attendance. Proxy voting is prohibited. Members may gather informally but shall not make a decision.

### **Section D: Meetings Open to Public**

- Leonard explains the importance of detailing what kind of issues can be dealt with in executive sessions since there is much confusion about what authority they have.
- Difference between Executive Committee and executive session: Executive Committees are standing committees of a board of directors. Any board, executive committee, or other committees can have an executive session.

- Question raised if grievances can be dealt with in executive session.
- Neighborhood associations get to define who can participate in executive session. Need to consider requiring associations to define who can participate in executive session in their bylaws. Look for state law language on executive session.
- Suggestion that "e" should be dropped re: preparation of materials for land use review decisions. Some feel land use issues should not be discussed in executive session. General feeling is that groups need to be able to strategize without worrying if opposition will have advance knowledge.
- Mark comments that executive session is dealt with in state law in both open meeting law and corporation law. Need to research.

**Section E. Notice**

- Leonard describes how people who are participants can be notified, advance time requirements, content of agendas, etc.
- Most controversial issue is whether or not to require 3-day notice. Sometimes 24 hours notice is needed. Need to differentiate between notice to general public and members of the board.
- Some feel three days notice is necessary to ensure people with snail mail are notified and to ensure the broader population has minimal notice.
- Leonard agrees to one-day notice under section A. But it could create problems if people on one committee are receiving more advance notice than the general public.
- Question if we should require board meetings and sub-committees to have standing schedules. This needs to be addressed in the Neighborhood Association section.
- Suggestion that direct notice to members shall be one day and provide three-day notice to general membership.
- Concern that state law requires notice to include agendas. Our proposal does not require notices to include agendas.
- Need to count up which associations are incorporated.
- Straw vote approved to change subsection E. 1. a to allow one day notice for meetings. Leave subsection E. 1. b alone.

**Motions:**

- No motions for final language presented.

*The committee has approved these summary notes. 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, August 26, 2003

8:30 AM - 10:30 AM

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

Tuesday, September 9, 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