



Sam Adams Mayor

Tom Miller Director

North Williams Traffic Operations and Safety Project Stakeholder Advisory Committee

November 1, 2011, 12:00 – 2:00 pm Red Cross, 3131 N Vancouver Ave, Training Room 11

Meeting Notes

Committee Members Present:

Allan Rudwick, Neighbor
Ben Foote, Neighbor
Debora Leopold Hutchins, Sistas Weekend Cyclers (Committee Chair)
Gahlena Easterly, Neighbor
Jana McLellan, Port City Development
Jazzmin Reece, Reece Consulting LLC
Jrdn Freeauf, Eddie Murphy Cabinets
Karis Stoudamire-Phillips, Boise Neighborhood Association
Melissa Lafayette, Jesuit Volunteer Corps Northwest
Michelle DePass, Neighbor
Noni Causey, Neighbor
Pamela Weatherspoon Reed, Legacy Emanuel Hospital
Paul Anthony, Humboldt Neighborhood Association
Steve Bozzone, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition
Susan Peithman, Bicycle Transportation Alliance

Committee Members Absent:

Diana Moosman, MOSI Architecture
Dwight Terry, Terry Family Funeral Home
Irek Wielgosz, King Neighborhood Association
Jerrell Waddell, Life Change Christian Center
Jorge Guerra, Oregon Association of Minority Entrepreneurs
J.W. Matt Hennessee, Vancouver Avenue First Baptist Church
Kenneth Doswell, Betty Jean Couture
Laurie Simpson, Eliot Neighborhood Association
Mychal Tetteh, Village Market
Nathan Roll, Metropolis Cycle Repair

1120 S.W. 5th Avenue, Suite 800 • Portland, Oregon, 97204-1914 • 503-823-5185 FAX 503-823-7576 or 503-823-7371 • TTY 503-823-6868 • www.portlandoregon.gov

Tom Anctil, Anctil Heating and Cooling Shara Alexander, Neighbor

Members of the public Present:

Carla Danley, Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee & Portland Commission on Disability/ABE

Ed Abrahamson, Irvington Neighborhood Association

Evelyn Murray

Jodi Swantfager

Russ Willis

Scott Lieuallen

Virginia Johnson

City and project staff present:

Ellen Vanderslice, Portland Bureau of Transportation, Project Manager Joan Brown-Kline, Public Involvement Consultant Michelle Poyourow, Public Involvement Consultant Carol Herzberg, Portland Development Commission

Action items for Committee members:

- Review Guiding Principles (which will be emailed to Committee)
- Attend Community Forum on Monday, November 28th, 6:00-8:30 pm at Immaculate Heart Church

Key decisions made in this meeting:

- Joan Brown-Kline will write up and present a decision-making process for possible adoption by the Committee at the December meeting. This process will include these elements:
 - o This Committee will not have a "quorum," or minimum number of Committee members who must be present at a meeting for the Committee to make a decision.
 - A decision will be made if 2/3 of the Committee members in attendance vote to support it.
 - o For more detail, see the Notes below.

Next meeting: Tuesday, December 6th, 12:00 to 2:00 pm, at the Red Cross

1. Welcome, introductions (Committee Chair Debora Leopold Hutchins)

2. Check-in (Debora)

a. Review Agenda

The group approved the agenda.

b. Debrief Last Meeting

Debora summarized the October SAC meeting, at which Mia Birk (Alta Planning + Design) presented on the history of active transportation planning in Portland, and Wendy Cawley (Portland Bureau of Transportation) spoke about how, as an engineer, she observes and evaluates current conditions on Williams.

Michelle Poyourow asked people to give her feedback on lunch; to pick up a copy of Multnomah County Library's 2012 "Everybody Reads" book, which takes place on North Williams in the 1980's; and to avail themselves of the three-hole punch she will bring to all meetings, so they can put materials into their binders.

Ellen Vanderslice announced four events:

- i. A Northeast Coalition of Neighbors panel discussion on economic development in N/NE Portland, that evening;
- ii. A lecture by Dr. Karen Gibson (who wrote "Bleeding Albina," a journal article on disinvestment and redlining in North Portland that was included in Committee member binders) the morning of Wednesday, November 9th, hosted by PSU;
- iii. A "Race Talks" event the evening of Tuesday, November 8th, at the Kennedy School, which will focus on this project and North Williams; and
- iv. This project's November 28th Community Forum (6:00-8:30 pm, Immaculate Heart Church), which all Committee members should try and attend.

Pamela Weatherspoon Reed announced a diabetes and health event at the Lloyd Center.

c. Questions

Allan Rudwick asked if there was a way project staff could lug around the three-ring binders, so that he doesn't have to bring it back and forth each time. Debora offered to store it in her trunk for him.

Jana McLellan asked when the notes from the last (October) meeting would be ready for review. Ellen replied that she had emailed them out the week prior, asking for Committee member comments and changes. A few Committee members said that they had not seen them in their email inboxes. Jana asked Ellen what the deadline was for review; Ellen suggested that Friday (November 4th).

A discussion took place about what the proper procedure would be for producing, reviewing and then publicly distributing notes from each meeting. A few members suggested that one of the first actions of each meeting should be to finalize the notes from the last meeting; one member said that it would be nice, however, to get the notes from previous meetings finalized and distributed to the Committee and the public before the next meeting, so people can read them to prepare. No decision was made about the notes process.

Steve Bozzone suggested that the notes be sent in single emails, not bundled together, so that people don't overlook them.

Ellen resent the October and September meeting notes to the Committee after the meeting and asked for comments by November 4th.

3. Decision-making by this committee (Joan Brown-Kline)

Joan Brown-Kline described for the Committee what she would help them accomplish in the next hour: develop a decision-making process for the Committee to use to make future decisions.

There are some typical decision-making processes that groups use, she said, and one of them is "consensus." Consensus decision-making is a process in which an entire group comes to unanimous agreement to move forward.

There are other decision-making processes besides consensus. But because this group is very diverse, with different ages, races, perspectives and values represented – a consensus process makes sense. She was asked by the City to come and work with the Committee on a consensus decision making model, so that is what is described in a written handout passed around (attached to these meeting notes, below).

Joan read through the handout, and then asked the Committee members to make suggestions in response to her general questions. Using their answers, she would design a decision making process for them, write it up, and bring it back to them at their next

meeting for their approval.

First, if they are talking about an issue and want to come to a decision, what step would they take first? Ben Foote suggested that someone would first make a proposal.

Joan asked what that proposal would look like. Susan replied that it would include a number of options.

Allan added that, at the start, you would all get educated about what it is you are trying to decide on. Debora said that you would ask people for feedback on the proposal, and everyone would state how they feel about the proposal and options.

Joan summarized so far: you would have a proposal with a number of options, you would get educated about the issues, you would ask people for feedback. She asked what step would then come next. Michelle DePass suggested group discussion. Steve Bozzone added listening and keeping an open mind.

Mrs. Easterly suggested that people agree to disagree. Allan Rudwick asked if that was at odds with consensus, in which everyone needs to agree on something. Mrs. Easterly clarified that she meant that everyone should be allowed to express themselves and put how they are feeling on the table, even if they disagree at first, and that no one should be stopped from talking. That way she believes that a group can eventually come to consensus.

Jana McLellan said that in her experience with consensus decision-making it doesn't rely on a majority "in favor;" rather it means that everyone in the group understands the decision, and says either that they can live with it or that they actively support it. Rather than "in favor" or "opposed," people can express themselves on a scale from "support" through "I can live with it" to "I can't live with it."

Michelle DePass also has had experience with that kind of scale. She said that group consensus sounds like such a hard thing to get to for a big group. But if you allow people to express a range of feelings it is possible – agree, agree with reservations, disagree with reservations, and neutral.

Getting back to steps the group might take in making a decision, Pamela Weatherspoon Reed suggested that it would also be important to discuss who the options impact and how.

Steve Bozzone asked Joan when a group would make that decision, using the scales Michelle and Jana described. Joan pointed the group to #6 in the handout, which described the possible end of discussion. First the facilitator asks if anyone has reservations or objections to the proposal; if so, then discussion continues. If not, the facilitator says that absent objections or reservations, the group will have come to consensus. If 20 seconds of silence pass, consensus is achieved. In this case, Debora would be the facilitator.

Michelle DePass asked what happens if someone has objections or reservations. Joan

replied that the group would stop and talk again. One of the things that this group could decide, she said, is what the time frame is for discussion of reservations and objections. How many minutes do you want to spend?

Michelle DePass said that she was trying to anticipate how long decisions could take. With a diverse group of participants it doesn't happen so fast. What is Plan B, if they can't agree? Do they discuss it further for a limited amount of time? And then what? What is the worst-case scenario?

Joan said that the worst case is you can't decide to go forward with that proposal, and you change it, or you take the proposal off the table. But she said that in her experience you can make these decisions, you just have to take enough time to do it.

Jazzmin Reece echoed Michelle's concerns about decisions taking a long time given the diverse backgrounds of Committee members; also, because this project is related to construction, and construction has to happen during the non-rainy season, she doesn't know if consensus is going to be appropriate to make a decision and move it along under that time pressure.

Jazzmin also suggested that since there are so many technical aspects to this project, they look at tools to help people get up to speed on the technical elements. Joan asked her what tools she was thinking of, and Jazzmin suggested a SWOT analysis [strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats], a payoff matrix, a change management tool. It was great to have Mia Birk come and present to the group at the last meeting, and the engineer [Wendy Cawley], but there are other engineering nuances the group will need to understand.

Ben Foote said that he heard Michelle and Jazzmin's concerns that the clock is ticking on their decision. He asked Ellen, if the Committee is not able to come to a decision by June, do the dollars funding this project go away? Ellen responded that to use the budget currently allocated to this project the Committee will have to make a recommendation by March. Ben said that he was willing to go with a consensus decision-making process if the group can make a decision by March.

Pamela asked what is a consensus in terms of the number of people who need to be there. What percentage of the Committee needs to be in attendance? Joan reiterated the question to the Committee – how many people should have to be in the room for them to decide on something, to reach consensus?

Allan pointed out that this meeting had the lowest attendance so far (14 of 27 Committee members), probably because they were talking about something boring. Barely half. Joan asked the Committee if one-half attendance was too low for making decisions.

Karis Stoudamire Phillips asked if someone is not present, should they still have a vote?

Susan Peithman said that in theory she would like people to be able to vote in absentia,

since no matter someone's commitment life experiences do get in the way sometimes; but if someone isn't at the table they don't have the benefit of the discussion, which is the whole point of the consensus process. Paul Anthony said that in his opinion having votes for absent members flies in the face of the consensus approach, of people being informed by and participating in the discussion.

Jrdn Freeauf said he can understand the worry about being absent. If there's one meeting where an important decision gets made, and you miss it, but you made the other fifteen meetings, then it's all for naught?

Noni Causey agreed; she teaches until 12 so sometimes she will be late to meetings. But if you miss two meetings consecutively, you've probably missed some really good information. Jrdn pointed out that people should, of course, be reading the minutes if they miss a meeting.

Karis said that she is on the board of the Boise Neighborhood Association and if they have an important vote coming up it is explained in the minutes and agendas before that meeting, so people make a point of being there.

Michelle DePass asked if they should be using technology to get people to the meetings, like Skyping or phone conferencing. Mrs. Easterly said she thinks that sounds really good, but the person would have to really be listening. It might limit where we have meetings. Debora said that she thinks skype and teleconferencing are good alternatives, but it would concern her that people might use that option to not attend the meetings regularly, when the whole idea is to be here and present.

Allan said he would worry that not everyone has the same access to and comfort with technology.

Jana suggested that they use a simple majority, one half of the Committee plus one. There needs to be some consequence for people who have missed X number of meetings. She can look at the Committee list and know that she hasn't seen a couple of people at a meeting yet. The Committee is automatically at a handicap if we set our quorum too high, unless we manage attendance. So, for example, either Tom Anctil sends a representative to the meetings, or tells us that he can't be on the Committee after all. She said that she manages her calendar to be here, and doesn't want to be held hostage and penalized by low attendance. She would like staff to manage attendance. Here we are with good food, a good agenda, well prepared, they really can't make this a more welcoming meeting, so if people aren't attending that needs to be managed.

Joan asked the Committee if everyone could live with what Jana was proposing.

Karis responded that she couldn't, that she prefers 2/3 of the Committee as the threshold. It's a diverse group, important issues, and she wouldn't want people to leave the table frustrated.

Steve suggested that people be allowed to send an alternate who can vote on their behalf.

Jazzmin said that she is a management consultant for the state, which is famous for processes. She moved that we implement attendance measures, and increase attendance to 2/3. She would like to see adherence to an attendance policy, since she doesn't want to be held hostage by people who don't attend, either! Just like when coaching sports, if you aren't attending practice, you're not going to play.

Mrs. Easterly agreed with Jana that staff look into who's on the Committee and who isn't attending. There may be some people who have changed their minds. Once we get those names off the list we'll have a core group. But she said she likes the idea of requiring 2/3 of whatever that group is.

Pamela said that it could be important to look at the diversity of that 2/3 or ½ plus one.

Debora suggested that the group needs to know how big the Committee is, and who is really going to be on it. Once we determine that, then we can decide the quorum needed for decision-making. She added that she is not necessarily in favor of allowing people to send an alternate since that person may not have the breadth of understanding on the issues at hand.

Michelle DePass said she supported having the project team check up on Committee members and their attendance.

Ben said he wanted to call out for the group that there are two issues currently being discussed, and they are different. One is how many Committee members should have to be in attendance at a meeting in order for the group to make a valid decision, e.g. 2/3 attendance required to have "quorum." The other is what percentage of the people who are there should be required to support a proposal for it to be considered decided, e.g. a 2/3 majority is enough to decide an issue.

Paul Anthony said that the Committee has essentially four meetings left. It is winter, so there may be a snow cancellation. He asked staff, do you have the ability to reschedule us? Ellen said that staff could, though the reason we schedule this far out is so that people can manage their calendars. Paul said he greatly appreciates that, and that of course with a large committee it is hard to find a new time.

Allan asked if, were he to choose an alternate who would vote on his behalf, would it be his buddy on the Committee who agrees with him, or someone else? He said he would be comfortable with someone who is on the Committee, and therefore educated on the issues at hand, getting his extra vote.

Steve said that in his experience on other committees, acting as an alternate or sending an alternate when he couldn't attend, he found someone who shares his concerns or identifies with them, and he brought them up to speed before the meeting. But he has a lot of those people around him who are interested, and he can understand if not everyone has that

available to them.

Michelle Poyourow told the Committee that, for their information, she only saw at most three people who might drop off this Committee if pushed by staff (for lack of attendance). She wanted the Committee to know that, as they discussed that as a potential strategy. But she said she also realized that they were suggesting that attendance be managed not just so people who don't attend are no longer on the Committee, but also so people attend meetings more consistently.

Ellen mentioned that Mychal Tetteh called her to tell her he would not be able to attend this SAC meeting, and that Caitlin Wood could not make the meetings due to a new work responsibility and had resigned.

Steve asked if the group should clarify a proposal regarding quorum.

Noni said that she knows this group could go around and around for a long time; but if she knows when a decision is coming up, if that is stated in advance, and then if 2/3 of people in the room on that day agree, then that should be it. If it is important to us, and we know it's coming up, then we'll be here. But then, she added, if we're making a decision I will want to see if there are enough people of color here to be heard if we're doing 2/3 majority decision.

Allan said that he could imagine a scenario in which not everyone shows up to the meeting and then less than 1/3 of the Committee members in the room are of color. Noni said that would concern her, because the truth is, is she can just be honest, that it matters, because the people of color may not want the same thing as other people who've not been in this community as long.

(Everyone looked at their Committee rosters and started counting people of color on the Committee, and doing arithmetic.) Debora said that by her count there are 13 people of color and 14 people not of color on the Committee. Noni said that people of color would, then, as a sub group always have a voice in a 2/3 decision. She added that if we ever came to a decision and had all people of color on one side and the white people on the other, that would be a problem! Allan agreed that such an outcome should always be a red flag.

Ben said, to Noni, that he wants to to support her in that, and he respects being accounted for within your own constituency, and supported and represented in this group. For him, considering where he is coming from and wants to be heard, he looks at people who ride a bicycle and don't, and wants to be sure to be accounted for in that way.

Joan said to the Committee that she would like them to now reach consensus about how many people should be here in order to have a quorum, so that a decision made is legitimate.

Debora asked Noni to clarify a comment she made – did she mean that she would be okay with having 2/3 of the 27 people support a proposal? Or 2/3 of the people present at a

meeting support a proposal?

Ellen said that she heard the group talking about two different things. Consensus is a state in which everybody agrees. But then we started talking about how many people have to be in the room to even begin a consensus process. It is time to separate the two questions. Perhaps you should start with deciding how many people need to be in the room, to have a quorum and start the decision-making. Is it 2/3 of the membership of the committee, or is it however many people have attended that meeting?

Allan said he was a little concerned about how they can even decide, today, how many people need to be here for future decisions when they don't have 2/3in attendance today.

Jazzmin said that she appreciates staff and the chair's patience with people, but there needs to be a decree that your absence is tacit approval and we're going to keep it moving. It's unfair to keep people who do attend from doing anything.

Jana said that she is reminded of the phrase "preaching to the choir," since the people here today are the people who tend to make time. Who's in the room is who makes the decision. So far we have a pretty big group to have a pretty fruitful conversation, and she's concerned that if we stop ourselves from making a decision because others haven't come, she won't keep coming. Who's here is who's here. If we have an issue with not enough people showing up for a fruitful conversation, then that's a staff problem – staff should figure it out and direct us differently.

Joan asked, how do people feel about "who's here is who's here?" Many people voiced support.

Joan asked Michelle Poyourow to read back to the group what she'd heard them say about attendance and quorum so far. She read, "Staff will announce when decisions are coming up, in advance on the meeting agendas. Whoever shows up is empowered to make decisions, no matter the proportion of the Committee there for the meeting. If there's an attendance problem, it's staff's problem, but Committee members can show up to a meeting assuming that the group present is empowered to make decisions."

Joan asked if there were reservations or objections. No one spoke up, so the group had reached consensus.

Joan asked, what do you need to decide on next?

Ben suggested that the next decision is on the style of majority decision making. It could be 100% agreed, which is consensus; or 2/3 majority; or 50% plus one. The other decision to make today is on alternates.

Ben also suggested that they move away from using the term "consensus" if they aren't referring to having everyone agree, i.e. 100%; if it's 2/3 agreement they should call that a "2/3 supermajority."

Noni said that, on the subject of alternates, she wouldn't want anyone else speaking for her.

Steve proposed an alternate plan that is optional. You can name an alternate if you can't attend. Karis said she could more easily see people sending someone if they're representing an organization, as she is for the Boise Neighborhood Association. Jrdn said he is representing Eddie Murphy Cabinets, and he may not be able to attend the last meeting; but if he knows there's going to be a vote there's a very good chance he'll know how their business will be affected by the proposals, and he'd be pretty confident sending one of his colleagues. He likes the idea of being able to send an alternate for a vote.

Jana said that on this issue she can go with the will of the group. The question is going to be, for any alternate, are you bringing someone who is informed. Debora said that she could get with an alternate approach; however, you may send someone you know very well, who is up to speed on the issues, but you can never anticipate how the proposals could change during the meeting, and then your alternate may not know how you would wish to vote.

Ellen said that she wanted to make a plug for alternates. The first goal of the City on this project is to run a process where everyone can be heard. She wants to be sure to hear all the viewpoints at the table, and allowing people to send an alternate serves that.

Steve said he didn't want anyone to feel like they're sending an agent, a rogue, to the meeting, but that they're sending someone who is empowered to make a decision on the fly without consulting with the person for whom they are substituting.

Allan moved that they allow people to send an alternate, and make sure that they are educated.

Mrs. Easterly said she looked over the list and sees that five of us are neighbors/property owners, and this project is really important to us because this is where we live. But if we're talking alternates, is that only for the businesses and organizations? Or also for neighbors?

Ellen said in her view it would be an option for anyone.

Joan asked if anyone had reservations or objections to Allan's proposal [that people be allowed to send an alternate, and make sure that person is educated on the issues].

Ben suggested an amendment to Allan's proposal to include advanced notification of Debora and staff.

Noni brought up a concern with alternates: if we're going to vote in two weeks and all of a sudden there are alternates coming for people who themselves haven't even been here, we just said "who's in the room is who's in the room" and now we're changing that.

Susan agreed. If someone is sending an alternate a few times, she said, that is a red flag.

Noni said that if we start sending alternates, it's like the teleconference thing. It makes it easy to not attend.

Allan asked Noni if she was suggesting that alternates who aren't up to speed not get to vote. Noni said no, that's not what she was suggesting, but that the people who are in the room are in the room to make the decision. She doesn't understand why we need more people in the mix, when we really need to move the process along.

Susan said that alternates could be allowed not as a usual thing but by special request.

Jazzmin said that she thought what she was hearing from Noni is that there might be a vote by proxy. If someone can't attend a meeting, staff would work to accommodate them; in that case, they could leave it up to staff to deal with on a case by case basis.

Ben said that he wouldn't be comfortable leaving any decision making in the hands of staff.

Jana asked if they could table the alternate discussion and hold it for reflection, until the next meeting. In the meantime, see what the Committee membership turns out to be and have staff clean up the membership list.

Joan asked if people were in support of tabling this alternate question now. A few people said yes, and everyone else was silent.

Joan asked Ben to restate the other decision they needed to make at this meeting. Ben said they should try to decide what percentage vote they want to require for a decision to be made.

Steve recalled that Noni pointed out how discussions can drag on and on. If they're considering using a consensus process they should consider that, because it does take a lot of time.

Noni asked if the options on the table were 50% or 2/3. Michelle Poyourow said that, based on her notes, they were considering 100% (which could also be called consensus), 2/3 supermajory in support, or over 50%.

Jana said her preference was that each member agrees to whatever portion of the recommendation they can agree to, and then if there are parts of the recommendation they can't agree to, that is presented in the report. That way the Committee represents the whole picture and doesn't try to get everyone to nod their heads. The worst outcome would be that everyone nods their heads but then someone walks out and says they didn't really agree. She thinks the committee should leave room to sometimes not have 100% in support, but be sure to represent the dissenting opinions.

Allan proposed that they adopt a 2/3 majority with dissenting opinions. Noni seconded. Ben clarified that they are talking about 2/3 of people in the room.

Joan asked Michelle Poyourow to read out loud what had been proposed, based on her notes. She said, "The question of whether people can send alternates, and how, will be tabled until the next meeting. The proposal you are considering now is that a decision will be considered made if 2/3 of the Committee members in attendance support a proposal; but those people who don't support it will have an opportunity to write dissenting opinions."

Joan asked if anyone had reservations or objections. No one did and so there was consensus to accept that proposal.

Joan said that she would use Michelle Poyourow's notes to write up a draft decision making process, based on what the Committee had said and decided today, and would present it to them at their December meeting.

4. Guiding principles for this project's planning process

Debora introduced the sub-Committee that has been working on some Guiding Principles for this process. The Principles are based on a draft begun by Pastor J.W. Matt Hennessee; Susan Peithman, Michelle DePass and Jazzmin Reece, who are on the subcommittee, had offered to take them and wordsmith them and present a proposal to the Committee.

Susan, Michelle DePass and Jazzmin distributed the draft proposals and asked the Committee for feedback, both at this meeting and electronically in the next two weeks.

Michelle DePass told the Committee that they wanted to write a document that could guide the Committee, when it makes decisions in future months, to consider the history of the affected neighborhoods and move forward. Susan added that, with this planning process, we are in new territory for the City, so adopting Guiding Principles is one way to show the City how they can effectively and fairly engage with stakeholders in the future and in other neighborhoods.

There were some questions from Committee members about one clause (#7) in the draft, that says the Committee will not move forward until these principles are supported by the community. Would that shut the planning process down, if the community couldn't agree on these Principles? Michelle DePass responded that the wording of that clause may be too strong, as it isn't meant to stop the process, and she will revisit it.

Ellen said that these Principles could be presented at the November 28th Community Forum. Ben Foote said that he thinks it would be good to present them there, and show the

Committee's intention. Michelle DePass agreed that it would be very strategic to do so, to show the people coming to the forum that we are trying with a lot of integrity to address historical concerns and use a different model of stakeholder engagement.

Debora said that the subcommittee would finish their draft of the Guiding Principles the following week (the week of November 7th) and then would send it out to the entire Committee at the end of the week (November 11th).

Allan asked if the Committee could move on to public comment, since time was running out. Debora agreed.

5. Public comment

Carla Danley commented that, in the Committee's discussion of whether or not to allow people to stay on the Committee if they don't attend very many meetings, they are excluding the only person on the Committee who uses a wheelchair. She asked if they feel that having no one on the Committee who uses a wheelchair is okay. At best it shows a lack of competency, she said, and at worst the process could be in violation of the law.

Debora replied to Carla that Caitlin Wood had resigned from the Committee because of changed work responsibilities, but that she appreciated being reminded that the Committee still needs to think about this issue and seek representation.

Jana McLellan added in that while she does not have personal experience with disabilities, Port City serves hundreds of people with disabilities every day, many in chairs, and she is always thinking about and working on improving their access, so that is one sensitivity she brings to the Committee.

Scott Lieuallen said that, regarding a consensus decision-making model, it looks like this Committee has decided to have a 2/3 majority vote instead, and that's ok. But he wanted to urge Debora to guide the group to a higher level of agreement than 2/3 majority whenever possible. Consensus does protect minority views; with consensus as the standard, if you disagree you can shut it down. But even with the majority system, he suggested that if Debora could guide the group to consensus in the end it would be very powerful.

Russ Willis said that he was very pleased to see the group arrive at a decision making model. Consensus does allow the group to move forward with some members having reservation, and to address those reservations in later work. He suggested that when making decisions the Committee frames them around the Guiding Principles. He also pointed out that if they can't get to a decision before the money for this project goes away

then maybe there is still something they can do, or maybe doing nothing is really the will of the group.

Evelyn Murray said the guiding principles read like a eulogy, but the community is not dead. She said she wanted to speak to what Noni Causey said earlier. There are a lot of people who are not in the room at this meeting, and we need to go talk to them. We can't be excluding people, as people have been excluded in the past. But she also understands the need to move forward with the people who are here. She said that the Committee will need to work with the hand it has been dealt: that this is a bike riding community now, and there are barriers to people participating. One of the committee's responsibilities will be to deal with those barriers for those people who can't be here. But the bottom line is we need to move forward.

6. Next meetings (Debora):

- a. SAC Meeting: Tuesday, December 6th, 12:00 to 2:00 pm, at the Red Cross;
- b. North Williams Community Forum: Monday, November 28, 6:00 8:30 pm at Immaculate Heart Church (Ellen asked Committee members to attend, to help greet the community members, take notes and listen)

--Notes compiled and edited by Michelle Poyourow and Ellen Vanderslice for Committee review.---