

Randy Leonard, Commissioner
Jimmy Brown, Director
1221 SW 4th Avenue, Room 110
Portland, OR 97204
Phone: 503-823-4519
Fax: 503-823-3050
www.portlandonline.com/oni



*enhancing the quality
of neighborhoods
through
community participation*

Great – Guidelines Review Committee Meeting

Tuesday, March 9, 2004

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
Stanley Lewis	Downtown Community Association
Michael O'Malley	Irvington Community Association
Jerry Powell	At-Large
Mark Sieber	Neighbors West/Northwest
Ruth Spetter	City Attorney's Office
Amalia Alarcon-Gaddie	Office of Neighborhood Involvement

Absent:

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.*

Approval of Minutes

- Minutes approved for February 24, 2004 meetings with the following changes: Feb. 24, 2004 minutes approved with the following changes: Spelling error in Inclusion and Participation section, should be "adequately funded."

Minutes – approved motions

- Group agrees to add word "directly", "...ONI Standards that directly affects the outcome..."

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

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

**Neighborhood Support
Center**
503 -823 -7306 Inspections
503 -823 -7350 Noise Office

**Neighborhood Resource
Center**
503 -823 -4519

- ❑ Add word “the” in definition of Grievant. “...bylaws or the ONI Standards.”
- ❑ Change sec. C: Recommended Grievance procedure. Begin with: “Previous to any...”
- ❑ Motion approved for language: "Grievances shall be filed within one year of the date of the alleged violation." Put under B. Definitions. 1 Grievance. Put at end of definition.
- ❑ Motion approved for language: "Grievances that do not meet all the criteria in this document shall be rejected." To go in D. Required Grievance Procedure. 1. a.
- ❑ Motion approved to strike Sole source contracting language. Section IV, C, 4. d. Agree to the concept to have an action item to do further research on issue of sole source.

Summary of Notes for March 9, 2004

- ❑ Finalized Grievance section with a few changes to the definition of Grievance to clarify that a grievant needs to be directly affected.
- ❑ Addressed issue of how to limit frivolous grievances. Approved a statute of limitation that grievances need to be filed one year from date of occurrence.
- ❑ ONI reported that City is eliminating practice of allowing sole source contracts. District coalitions want sole sourcing to eliminate ability of City to punish coalitions when their associations might displease the City. Agreement to drop language and research issue.
- ❑ Nancy asks clarifying questions in preparation for business association discussion in April.

Grievances, section VIII

Definitions, subsection B

- ❑ Suggestion definition of Grievance should mirror “Appeal Procedures” which states an appeal "must describe the individual or organization that is directly harmed and why they are harmed." Suggest to add language for Grievance definition, third paragraph "and which harms the Grievant." No agreement.
- ❑ Discussion on defining "standing" and "harm." Concern someone may not be personally harmed but may find that there has been a violation of democratic process or due process. You can deal with those issue through general meeting discussion, an election, etc.
- ❑ Group agrees to add word “directly”, “...ONI Standards that directly affects the outcome...”
- ❑ Add word “the” in definition of Grievant. “...bylaws or the ONI Standards.”
- ❑ Change sec. C: Recommended Grievance procedure. Begin with: “Previous to any...”

Statute of Limitation

- ❑ Discussion on how do we limit frivolous grievances. Recognition that ONI and the neighborhood system is not a court of law and should not be put in a position of being legalistic. Group agrees to drop this idea about limiting frivolous grievances.
- ❑ One year from the occurrence of the grievance is proposed as a statute of limitation.
- ❑ Concern a grievance may be serious enough to warrant a grievance long after the occurrence. Others argue we need a timeline since guidelines are meant to deal with process. Major issues can be addressed through board elections or brought to a vote.
- ❑ Motion approved for language: "Grievances shall be filed within one year of the date of the alleged violation." Put under B. Definitions. 1 Grievance. Put at end of definition.

- ❑ Discussion on how to dismiss grievances. Concern we need to be clear grievances that do not meet all criteria in this document shall be dismissed. If an appeal is dismissed then there is no other option in this grievance language.
- ❑ Motion approved for language: "Grievances that do not meet all the criteria in this document shall be rejected." To go in D. Required Grievance Procedure. 1. a.

District Coalitions, Section IV

Sole Source, Subsection C: Unique to Non-profit District Coalitions, 4. City Contract, d:

- ❑ Mark outlines reasoning for why the coalitions want to have sole source language to show the coalitions have a unique institutional relationship with the government.
- ❑ ONI reports Purchasing Bureau says that city contracts require us to have an open competitive bidding process for all contracts. This is a separate issue from whether the city agrees to the concept of institutional support for the neighborhood coalition system.
- ❑ The issue of cracking down on sole source is not targeting coalitions but is being pursued city wide. Ruth urges group to not include language. It wasn't there before and would face legal challenges.

Discussion:

- ❑ The City can allow sole source if there are findings that show the services are sufficiently unique and could not be provided by any other providers.
- ❑ Neighborhood groups do not think of themselves as a service. Funding for coalition was considered as a unique vehicle for assisting people in neighborhood associations to participate in the democratic process.
- ❑ There are currently two models of delivery of services, City bureaus and contracted services. City bureaus do not have to go out to bid to receive funding. The coalition system should be seen as a unique institution that requires a third option.
- ❑ Governmental organizations delivering services, like most City bureaus, are different from organizations focused on accountability, like neighborhood system.
- ❑ Argument that we should maintain sole source as the status quo. Desire to change language suggests City wants to put the contracts out to bid when they expire in 2007.
- ❑ This might be a political fight. This might be an issue Council needs to consider. Others feel this might distract us from other issues we want Council to address.
- ❑ Current sole sourcing language could possibly be allowed, but it would still not guarantee coalitions would be the sole source. There would need to be fact finding with every round of contracting.

Proposals:

- ❑ Proposal for a City charter change to institutionalize the coalition system.
 - ❑ Proposal to create special service districts like street lighting districts. Jerry Powell will research.
 - ❑ Proposal to allow coalitions to have first option to bid on this contract.
 - ❑ Proposal to create a committee to research the issue of creating special districts.
 - ❑ Proposal to add as future action items that would include research on issue.
- ❑ Motion approved to strike Sole source contracting language. Section IV, C, 4. d. Agree to the concept to have an action item under ONI to research alternative options.

Business Associations, Section VI

- ❑ Nancy Chapin asks several questions of the group to help her go back to finalize APNBA's final proposal.
- ❑ Are committee members opposed to allowing business associations from collecting dues if they receive public funding?

- ❑ She suggests to take out the definition of business district associations and only list business groups in the directory. Ray brought up issue with East Portland leaders who agreed that they should be taken out.
- ❑ Business association leaders are not able to give up their right to charge dues, or be held accountable to open meetings law, etc. 501(c)6 IRS status does not require them to follow open meetings law.
- ❑ Need to consider philosophical issues what should be the relationship between business coalitions and neighborhood associations and ONI.

Public Comments

- ❑ Lee Perlman concerned business associations also need to be held accountable to open meetings rules.
- ❑ Agrees the status quo on sole sourcing is problematic. Concern that coalition staff need to know they will not be intimidated by City Hall. Having Council be able to decide if coalitions go out for bid would be detrimental to independence of neighborhood system.

Tasks to do:

The committee has approved these summary notes and they 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, March 23, 2004

8:30 AM - 10:30 AM, City Hall, Lovejoy Room, 1221 SW 4th Avenue

Tuesday, April 13, 2004

8:30 AM - 10:30 AM, City Hall, Lovejoy Room, 1221 SW 4th Avenue

Prepared by: Brian Hoop, Office of Neighborhood Involvement