

# FAN Executive Board Meeting

## Monthly Minutes – adopted

January 11, 2016

7:00 PM

Washington Park Community Building

**Facilitator:** Josh Newman, Co-Chair; Morgan Greenwood, Co-Chair      **Recorder:** Todd Miller, Secretary

**Board Attendees:** Lisa Arkin, Carlos Barrera, Tim Blood, Nancy Classen, Bernie Corrigan, Greg Giesy, Morgan Greenwood, Deb Jones, Kristina Lang, Nancy Ellen Locke, Matt Lutter, Todd Miller, Josh Newman (13)

**Board Absentees:** Larry Robbins (1)

**Guests:** Josh Skov, Hope Crandall, Lena Davidson

### Minutes

**Agenda item:** INTRODUCTIONS/NEWS      **Presenter:** Board members

**Discussion:**

Board members sat with their name tents, announced themselves, and attendees signed in.

**Conclusions:**

Carlos’s name tent is misspelled (should be “Barrera”, misspelled “Berrara”)

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Make new name tent for Carlos	Todd	Feb. mtg

**Agenda item:** PUBLIC COMMENT      **Presenter:** Crandall, Davidson

**Discussion:**

**Hope Crandall**, steward of little library Friendly, reporting that Greg’s and Carlos’s work has held up, except for kids/parents forgetting to shut down, wind catches and snatches off. Hope understands no funds for maintenance; grant paid to build. This winter, library completely got smashed. Jeem Peterson built a new door with simple latch for time being. Hope asks: is there money in FAN funds, or does she instead need to solicit folks for funds. Hope notes that at the Sunday Streets event, people asked if donations were possible; Hope suggested perhaps people could donate via FAN board.

Kristina suggests we could put notice out. Bernie as treasurer agreed that FAN can take funds and earmark them for that purpose. Greg noted ENI could serve to accept funds via agreement, with caveat that ENI wants to avoid paperwork on <\$25 for tax deduction purposes, but can take any amount; additionally Bernie contends that donations to FAN are tax deductible; FAN has IRS letter documentation as non-profit.

Hope confirmed there is no money now? Board noted at very least would require motion from board to allocate funds. Bernie, Carlos, and Greg could go take a look and assess costs to rebuild robust door. Hope noticed South University (SUN) has new little library.

**Lena Davidson** – lives in FAN for 23 years, but never has been to a meeting. Associates “FAN” with the Friendly Street area; being on other side of hill [College Hill towards Willamette], she does not feel like part of this neighborhood. Really had to search for information about FAN and just learned today of meeting. Wants to know more about how her interests are represented feeling so geographically isolated. Lee expressed disconnect, newsletter usually gets recycled promptly, and often have date conflicts.



**Q&A:**

Deb – who will do work?

Dana: volunteer pledge hours (have 3 sheets pledged), there is a treasurer – lots of work, yes, have people poised to do it, including urban planners, poster people, etc. Will be talking with Paul Conte and Ebon Fodor at Wednesday evening Conte meeting and to help pledge more participation.

Morgan – great idea – important to get people involved. Who is lined up as speakers?

Dana: not specific yet: city planning staff, regional planners (Ebon, Paul), and neighborhood leaders, but not settled.

Morgan – 5 meetings over what time span?

Dana: exact dates are in grant.

Lisa – really impressed with pulling this together; great. Outreach goals and surveys – will everyone fill survey?

Dana: will outreach for online participation as well as meeting attendees. Still need to find out email contacts – distribute via emails. Don't want to pre-suppose outcomes [of what neighbors thoughts/intentions are]; feels city didn't do effective outreach and get full participation that should have [so project is to ensure larger net is cast].

Todd – dittoed great idea; important to pick up slack of outreach that should have happened. Since it represents the four neighborhoods, will we have opportunity to preview outreach flyers and surveys before they go out?

Dana: thinks that's a good idea and will bring up at their next meeting.

Tim – have SWN coordinated with CSEN on this?

Dana: Yes. Greg stated that CSEN board and SWN committee share personnel, so communicating that way, not necessarily sending a rep.

Deb – all hoods struggle with representing residents; cautions that being so ambitious as stating 'will get support of majority of people in area' is a lofty goal.

Dana: yes, focus mainly on agreement that Plan Jam is supported, in coordination with Cindy Clark at city.

**MOTION** **Moved by:** Greenwood **Seconded by:** Arkin

**Endorse SWN proposal for NMG to fund the Plan Jam proposal**

Discussion: Deb loves idea, but is very concerned don't have the personnel to pull it off. Todd asked if there is screening at the city level in reviewing grants for competition of funds that would look for that to flag critical flaws? Deb indicated that review does happen.

**Outcome** (For/Against/Abstain): 8/0/5 (Lang, Corrigan, Jones, Blood, Newman abstain)

**Conclusions:**

Dana passed around petition to support the Plan Jam (additional individual voluntary endorsement).

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Endorse SWN "Plan Jam" NMG proposal	Morgan	

**Agenda item:** CSEN CHARTER ADOPTION **Presenter:** Greenwood

**Discussion:**

Morgan asked for board consensus on adding an agenda item before discussing the CSEN charter, which would be to do a roundtable on board members' individual thoughts on the CSEN and SW-SAZ as currently faced by FAN. Morgan senses the "debate" is being dominated by a very vocal group that she wonders how representative is of the FAN board at large. Board members wondered if we should just discuss in terms of the CSEN charter agenda item, but agreed that a roundtable would be beneficial to the ensuing charter consideration.

**Rounds:**

Todd – agrees with planning principles, SWSAZ is community based planning, understandable frustration from those involved all along and those in SWN – and SWN have legitimate voice and stakeholder; CSEN is good idea (in principle) for bringing together the 4 neighborhoods, however sense that this otherwise well-meaning group is dominated by Paul

Conte's camp, getting more divisive rather than bringing folks together proactively. Concerned that CSEN is a pendulum swing the other way and not conducive to facilitating consensus.

Kristina – ditto Todd

Carlos – had previously felt good neighborhood involvement started to unravel, now need to step back. Existing plan is one he no longer agrees with, goes too far, will degrade the neighborhood, and minor fixes won't work. Need more in depth study/participation. Carlos has been very involved in preserving the UGB, and personally funded efforts to manage the UGB. Political things drive the process – 20 year growth potential and home builders lobbying for subdivisions, etc, cause the need to take a jaundiced look at whole process – competing interests, many self-serving, see who's doing what. Feel like we need to have faith that those who live right there should have the most voice in what should happen, what's wanted.

Kristina (asking for time previously ceded to add a point) – Kristina DOES live there, and her house will be rezoned (under the SW-SAZ), but believes plan CAN be saved.

Josh – feeling that CSEN does not serve FAN well, that we don't need to be in lock step with the 4 neighborhoods to get full involvement of neighbors. CSEN started with a few members getting together and churning out a very specific non-constructive motion on R1 zoning (Mike Clark motion). Started to really hear from folks in the hood at that point – letter sent by Anya D. today (circulated to the board via email) is illustrative of that. CSEN requires approval of 4 hoods, not set up for fast decision-making, but then get letter fully formed that needs to be approved now. Now we have a FAN SWSAZ committee open to all FAN members to get better input from FAN residents specifically.

Deb – Back talk about what's going on, not a good feeling – everyone here is a good person who believes in respectfully process and balanced approaches. Fears that CSEN is not true to that.

Lisa – clarifies that her feelings here are about CSEN, not necessarily SWSAZ. Feels that this roundtable is disingenuous to start discussion before the CSEN charter item is introduced before the board. Emphasizes that CSEN is to coordinate, not to usurp. Lisa voted for FAN's SWSAZ committee because she believes in participation as a good thing – but the committee should not be a substitute for CSEN. Getting curmudgeonly as sees city drop ball over and over again. Need to be our own watchdog and look very closely at the details.

Tim – agree, get planners telling him how to manage his subdivision, but not plan for retail, benefits, etc. Then city moved out and changed plan. Agrees with importance of walk/bike/condensed development, South Willamette is a good focal place. Really need to listen to those neighbors directly impacted.

Morgan – feels like she is coming from a slightly different demographic – maybe she is the only renter on the board? Got involved in FAN specifically for this type of issue. SWSAZ does a lot to move those concepts forward. CSEN seems to be representing our board, not the neighborhood at large – FAN loses some of its stake.

Nancy – not too much to add; many amazing opinions – good conversation to have, need to step back and think. Today is not the day to make the decision.

Nancy Ellen – agree with Lisa; example: one thing CSEN would do to empower the four neighborhoods would be to have one forum for elected office candidates to all gather one evening for all four neighborhoods – would draw more candidates to participate, generate more interest overall. The idea behind CSEN is to find what we can do better together, but not take away from FAN. CSEN is definitely a plus.

Greg – have already stated his opinion for CSEN – notes he is hearing two different things: CSEN as an organization in of itself, and then there is the SWSAZ issue. CSEN had a rough start, Greg is trying darnedest to correct that path. Recently talked with hours to Josh and Morgan over charters, letters, trying to sort it out. Essentially: the CSEN Charter is really a mundane organization about how 4 neighborhoods would coordinate together. If not all 4 hoods agree on what CSEN is doing, drops out of a 4-way coordination, reverts to other hoods.

Matt – listening to years of presentations on how it [south Willamette area] would be rezoned; more recently finding that it has effects that have not been fully understood. Do agree that increased density in that area is a good idea, but is neutral on CSEN, seems like could be good.

Bernie – personally for increased density on Willamette, rezoning idea is excellent. This stuff is so far in the future, everyone who lives there will have moved or died. If development now actually penciled out, we would have 10 story buildings there now. Have time, no emergency, to step back and do it better.

Greg (adding) – the letter on SWSAZ is only part of what CSEN is about; the letter is to help SWSAZ get off that topic and focus on other things. Josh discussed education needs – there is a lot of misinformation on both sides. CSEN not involved with code change – more on outreach/involvement. Planning team would look at both old code and new code and pass that info on and suggestions on how to get out of mistakes of old code.

**Conclusions:**

Overall, the board sees the importance and value of the planning focus on the south Willamette area and the needs and benefits that a good planning effort would bring to increase multi-modal transportation use, dense living/shopping opportunities, and overall livability. The board has a wide spectrum of thoughts on CSEN’s role for FAN, ranging from faith to skepticism.

**CSEN charter adoption**

GG passed around charter. KL asked if same charter that was previously sent out. Had made comment on participation – quorum more than half and member of every neighborhood and including at least one chair.

DJ move, MG second – move to accept the CSEN charter. Discussion: JN (as GG clarified) not a problem with charter, but more how do we do that with FAN’s charter. How are we Section 4 Art 5: council will be asked to advocate on behalf on the neighborhoods. JN feels there should be deliberation – FAN needs to be on our game in terms of who are reps are in taking position of advocacy.

BC VIII2D – boards must approve amendments to charter.

JN – just cautioning that we need to be deliberate in how we approve and move forward with CSEN.

<b>MOTION</b>	<b>Moved by: Jones</b>	<b>Seconded by: Greenwood</b>
<b>Accept the CSEN charter as drafted</b>		
Discussion: Josh expressed not a problem with charter, but more how do we do that with FAN’s charter. How are we true to that? The CSEN charter Section 4 Article 5 states CSEN will be asked to advocate on behalf of the neighborhoods. Josh feels there should be deliberation – FAN needs to be on our game in terms of who reps are in taking position of advocacy. Bernie notes that Section 7 Article 2D states boards must approve amendments to charter. Josh notes he is just cautioning that we need to be deliberate in how we approve and move forward with CSEN.		
<b>Outcome (For/Against/Abstain): 11/0/2 (Greenwood, Newman abstain)</b>		
<b>MOTION CARRIES</b>		

**CSEN letter on SW-SAZ to city leadership for FAN endorsement**

CSEN letter on SWSAZ passed around by Greg. All board members received a copy to look at during discussion. Greg asked if everyone had chance to see Greg’s responses to Morgan and Josh’s comments (made online via Google docs). Deb – confused following thread of comments, one example is unclear whether letter suggests setting up a planning team.

Greg explained the outline of the letter – CSEN involvement in coordinating involvement, not in developing a different process. Suggest hold off on facilitation until residents have more facts. Think starting with facilitation will not go over well. Unclear what/who CSEN is recommending the South Willamette Planning Team – who convenes that, who is appointed? Is the idea that CSEN will recommend members for SW Planning Team?

Kristina – sounds like such a lot of work, so who will be on that team? Won't that duplicate what the city is doing anyway?

Greg – problem is nobody trusts anybody currently– neighbors vs neighbors, neighborhoods vs city, etc. Need to get to point where we see what the code actually says. Yes lots of work, thankless, but important. At same time, seem to generate committee after committee on the topic.

Josh – the topic has created polarization all around. Challenges to different value systems (supporters of new urbanism/multimodal vs neighborhood protectionists) – hard to get that together in a neighborhood run format.

Kristina – who/where are reps drawn from? Who's on it?

Josh – if we (as a community) go the refinement plan route, the geometry gets odd – far corners, Amazon doesn't directly have overlay with SWSAZ. State facilitator would work to bring that together – not sure why CSEN would oppose facilitation.

Carlos – not in favor of facilitation: city is state-mandated to get public input. Sees having a facilitated process as legal gambit to check that off the box (had outreach) and move forward.

All stakeholders need to have input, review – without refinement plan.

Morgan – best case scenario – city goes forth with refinement plan, what happens if CSEN (4 hoods) don't like the content; what level of civic engagement is acceptable? Senses from SHINA that their hood failed to provide good outreach whereas others (FAN) did.

Carlos – participated in virtually all the meetings, yet plan came out with some things that was unexpected, particularly rezoning – unpalatable.

Greg – refinement plan will address all those gaps

Deb – what is difference of refinement plan and special area plan?

Greg – refinement plan involves much more in depth look at transportation, etc. FAN asked many times for transportation study and SAZ as one study, not two. Does not follow a neighborhood boundary.

Lisa – also a RP addresses open space, schools.

Josh – also hears refinement plan has teeth, city can't change that much.

Greg – Since 1998... folks had been trying for refinement plan for 20 years – so now we are at 40. SAZ came up as outcome.

Lisa – been involved in many difficult issues, opposing sides, but people want to move toward consensus, get more information, feels refinement plan gets us there. Suggest we don't dwell on the fear of what might be the outcome of the RP. Just spent a yearlong effort bringing parties together roadside vegetation management project, 18 months; started out contentious, pulled together in end.

Josh – sense is RP is a big bureaucratic way to get at mitigating spot issues with SWSAZ.

Greg – thinks that a newly formed planning committee will have more credibility than FAN – some neighbors don't trust FAN. (Kristina expressed was not welcomed when other group got together).

Tim – asked why there would be distrust of FAN.

Greg – FAN was heavily involved in getting the ball rolling on the planning effort, but the city started adding things that were not initially discussed and expanded boundary from 29<sup>th</sup> to 32<sup>nd</sup> (and therefore lack of initial involvement with south neighborhoods). City placed all the big buildings in the Cascade Manor area.

## **MOTION**

**Moved by:** [Greenwood](#)

**Seconded by:** [Barrera](#)

### **Approve the CSEN letter to the city leadership as drafted**

Discussion: Kristina suggests we don't demand a refinement plan and do not oppose facilitation. Also suggest that Pillar 5 item is subjective, can remove to streamline letter.

Greg stated we can't change the letter but we can add addendum to how FAN voted to address comments, even though not making changes to letter directly.

**Outcome** (For/Against/Abstain): 7 / 6 / 0 (Greenwood, Lang, Newman, Corrigan, Jones, Miller vote Nay)

**MOTION CARRIES**

---

**Agenda item:** OLD BUSINESS / WORKS IN PROGRESS **Presenter:** Greenwood

**Discussion:**

FAN general meeting preparations: full agenda set at 2 hours. Kristina reminded board that Friendly Market donates refreshments to be picked up.

**Conclusions:**

General meeting agenda is good to go.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Review board priorities at February meeting	All	Feb. mtg.

---

**Agenda item:** COMMITTEE REPORTS **Presenter:** none

**Discussion:**

Meeting was adjourned due to time; no committee reports were given. Todd distributed printed notes from the December Transportation Committee meeting for board member information.

***Time Adjourned: 9:00***

---