

# UPTOWN PLANNERS

## Uptown Community Planning Group Meeting

June 24, 2019

### DRAFT MINUTES

In attendance: Bob Daniel, Brer Marsh, Clint Daniels, Gail Friedt, Matthew Medeiros, Michael Brennan, Roy Dahl, Stephen Cline, Zach Bunshaft, William Smith, Soheil Nakshab, Stu McGraw, Tom Mullaney, Amie Hayes, Dennis Seisun (left at 7:55pm).

Absent: Tim Gahagan, Bill Ellig.

#### I) Call to Order and Introductions - Meeting called to order by Soheil at 6:02 pm

- 1) Agenda Approval: Motion to approve agenda by Soheil, Clint 2nd, unanimously approved.
- 2) Minutes Approval: Minutes were not sent out 72 hours in advance. June 4th meeting minute approval will be agendized for August 6th meeting.

#### II) General Information and Officer/Committee Reports

##### 1) Chair Report

- a. Business cards, yard signs, and banner purchase
  - i. Business cards will be given to each member, signs as well to be displayed before monthly meetings. Signs, cards, and banner will be reimbursed by the City.
- b. Future Meeting Protocol
  - i. There will be a new format for public comment. There will be comment cards placed at the sign in table and cards must be filled out prior to an agendized item to speak during public comment on that item. Public comment will be restricted to a maximum of 2 minutes. Tom voiced concerns with a two minute maximum and Soheil explained that it will be implemented and can be changed if there are issues that arise in its practice.

##### 2) Officer Reports

- a. Treasurer Report: Roy reported that there is \$150.65 in the account, minus the amount spent on banners, yard signs, and business cards which he will have the totals of at the next meeting and will be reimbursed by the City.
- b. Design Review: Brer announced the next Design Review Subcommittee meeting will be Wednesday the 26th at 6pm.
- c. Soheil will attend the CPC meeting on the 25th for his first time as our representative.

#### III) Public Communication – Non-Agenda Public Comment

##### 1) Civic & Elected Official Representatives Remarks

- a) Brittany Bailey with Chris Ward's office returned from maternity leave and announced that she will no longer be serving as a community representative for the area, but she will still be the point of contact for Normal Street Promenade and Rainbow Crosswalk projects. Ty Burch will continue to be the representative for Uptown with Tyler Renner as the representative for Hillcrest..

##### 2) Public Comment

- a) Carol Emerick voiced that the Uptown Planners website is missing the Impact Fee study and the Citizens' Guide for Capital Improvement Projects. Additionally, ongoing meeting reference items were there on the website but are now missing. Carol will email the items to Soheil.
- b) Lu Rehling voiced her disapproval of the changes to public comment because she didn't see a problem before. Soheil answered that this new format is done by the City at council meetings and used by other planning groups. Lu said she sent an email to the Chair through the website but the Chair claims he did not receive it. She was disappointed the agenda was not on the City website and that the mission of Uptown Planners on the Uptown Planners website is still not consistent with the mission the City provides. She wishes the website and planners would explain all acronyms so it is easier for newcomers to understand.

#### IV) Consent Agenda

Motion to approve the Letter of Support for America's Finest City Half Marathon, the only item on the consent agenda by Roy, 2nd by Zach, unanimously approved.

#### V) Action Items

- 1) Finalize the Vote for the Balboa Park Committee Representative (BPC)

Matt moved to nominate Brer, Zach 2nd.

Discussion: Mat Wahlstrom voiced his opposition based on Brer being a business representative and not a resident of Uptown, as well as the ties to his work. William asked the status of Don Lidell, the current representative. Soheil answered that Don understood he served at the pleasure of the board and that the board wanted a representative from the Board.

Vote to confirm Brer as the Uptown Planners recommended representative for mayoral appointment to the BPC was unanimous.

- 2) Finalize Vote on Ad Hoc Operations/Outreach Committee Motions

Matt recommended the amendments be discussed and voted on one by one and then proceeded to give a brief summary of each.

Public Comment:

- a) Oscar Tavera - Agreed with one meeting attendance requirement prior to running for a seat. Said he had attended multiple meetings before expressing a desire to run but he did not qualify because he didn't realize he had to sign in.
- b) Lu Rehling - Saw an error with Amendment 7 and emailed her correction. She disagreed with changes to the attendance minimum to run as well as term limits and neighborhood-wide appointments agreeing with Tom's comments dispersed at the last meeting.
- c) Mat Wahlstrom sent the board his issues with the amendments and recommended his own for transparency purposes.
- d) Chanda Slavon - Agreed with term limits, receiving subcommittee agendas directly instead of waiting for the chair to send them out.
- e) Patrick Santana - Generally supports all amendments. Voiced his strong support of filing vacancies with full elections and not appointments. Believes one meeting is enough to run and agrees with term limits.
- f) Sharon Gehl - Said the City will be releasing its recommendations for changes to planning group bylaws soon and that changes can be made again then. She agrees with elections being held for vacancies at the next full election and the change to a one meeting minimum requirement. She also agrees with Tom's memo of opposition to neighborhood apportionments for electing members.
- g) Kathy Keehan echoed support of all bylaw revisions.

h) Chris Olsen - strongly supports these amendments. Most strongly supports term limits and changes to meeting minimum requirements to run for a board seat.

3) By-law revision discussion (continued)

Board Comment:

- a) Amie questions where the term “best practices” came from. Asked Michael Prinz if the City has reviewed these amendments. Opposes one meeting minimum but also understands the idea of at least giving them a chance to apply. Disagrees with subcommittee chairs sending out communications for transparency purposes.
- b) Stu doesn’t understand the urgency and believes new board members should try things the way they are before seeking to change them altogether.
- c) William doesn’t see a problem with a 3 meeting requirement because we don’t have a problem filling seats. Disagrees with neighborhood-wide seats because neighborhoods are not specifically defined, but he believes that neighborhoods should be listed on ballots. Has no issue with subcommittee chairs sending out communications.
- d) Stephen looked through other planning group bylaws and there is a big range in all categories and he noted that we are in the minority for having such high meeting attendance requirements.
- e) Zach voiced support for all except neighborhood-wide seats.
- f) Michael agrees that amendment 12 is problematic. He also sees no issue with subcommittees chairs sending out communications to reduce log-jams.
- g) Dennis believes these amendments are seeking to solve problems that don’t exist.
- h) Roy believes bylaw revisions need to be concrete, referencing amendment 9 that leaves a lot up to the subcommittee. He also asked if he would be grandfathered in if term limits were applied.
- i) Tom Generally agrees with the amendments besides neighborhood-wide seats and believes the procedure for filling vacancies and whether term limits would include a grandfather clause need to be worked out further. He also disagreed with the position of time keeper being called “sergeant at arms.”
- j) Clint addressed that as an outsider the election process seemed obscure and welcomed favoritism. Believes there should be no meeting minimum requirement to run for a seat and the voters should decide. He referenced recent citywide elections calling for term limits and said the public overwhelmingly agrees with the concept.
- k) Soheil invited Michael Prinz to speak in regard to the procedural and legal intricacies of these amendments. Michael Prinz did not get to review the bylaw amendments prior to the meeting, but believes some will need the approval of the City Council because they may conflict with city-wide CPG bylaw shell. These are amendments 8-11. Michael also mentioned all bylaw amendments require a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote of membership.
- l) Gail clarified that her only aim in making these changes was to make it easier for more people to get involved in the community.
- m) Matt answered Amie’s question saying that these were “best practices” of other CPG’s. Believes “Sergeant at Arms” can easily be called “timekeeper.” Neighborhood-wide seats was added as a possible amendment to address a lack of diversity on the board. He understands the issues with the amendment but believes we should continue to look to address the lack of diversity on the board not reflecting the community.

Discussion concluded and votes on individual amendments commenced.

Amendment #6 - Motion to approve as is by Clint, Brer 2nd, unanimously approved.

Amendment #7 - Motion to approve with the term “Sergeant at Arms” replaced with “Time Keeper” by Bob, Michael 2nd, unanimously approved.

Amendment #8 - Zach moved to approve as is, Clint 2nd, Motion failed (7/7/1).

For: Clint, Michael, Zach, Brer, Matt, Stephen, Gail.

Against: Roy, Bob, Tom, Dennis, William, Stu, Amie.

Abstain: Soheil so as not to have perceived bias.

Motion to approve with "one meeting" changed to "two meetings", Bob 2nd, unanimously approved.

Amendment #9 - Clint moved to approve as is, Brer 2nd, motion approved with chair as the tiebreaker (12/2/1)

For: Clint, Tom, Bob, Michael, Brer, Matt, Gail, William, Zach, Stephen, Roy, Soheil.

Against: Dennis and Amie.

Abstain: Stu, because he disagrees with taking a vote on an item that the City might not approve.

Amendment #10 - Clint moved to approve as is, Gail 2nd. (7/7/1)

For: Clint, Michael, Zach, Brer, Matt, Stephen, Gail.

Against: Tom, Roy, Dennis, Bob, William, Stu, Amie.

Abstain: Soheil so as not to have perceived bias.

Tom moved to change Article III, Section 3 to be changed from having to take one year off after 8 years of service to four years off before being reelected to the board, Zach 2nd.

For: Clint, Tom, Bob, Michael, Brer, Matt, Gail, William, Zach, Stephen, Amie, Stu.

Against: Roy & Dennis.

Abstain: Soheil so as not to have perceived bias.

Amendment #11- Tom moves to approve as is, but process must be approved by the full board after approved by the Ad Hoc subcommittee, Zach 2nd. No vote taken. In discussion this was seen to be an unnecessary vote.

Matt motioned to table until the process has been worked out and approved by Michael Prinz and the Ad Hoc Subcommittee, Roy 2nd, unanimously approved.

Amendment #12 - Matt motioned to table this amendment, Gail 2nd, unanimously approved.

Amendment #13 - Motion to approve as is by Gail, Matt 2nd. (12/2/1)

For: Clint, Tom, Bob, Michael, Brer, Matt, Gail, William, Zach, Stephen, Roy, Stu.

Against: Dennis & Amie.

Abstain: Soheil so as not to show perceived bias.

Outreach Recommendation 1-5

Clint moved to approve as is, Matt 2nd, unanimously approved.

Matt moved to nominate community member and website creator Patrick Santana as webmaster, Stephen 2nd, motion passed (13/1/1)

For: For: Clint, Tom, Bob, Michael, Brer, Matt, Gail, William, Zach, Stephen, Roy, Dennis, Stu.

Against: Amie

Abstain: Soheil so as not to show a perceived bias.

Matt moved to have Gail added to Social Media access, Stephen 2nd, unanimously approved.

Dennis left the meeting at 7:55pm

3) Finalize Vote on Capital Improvement Project List

The City requested recommendations from planning groups for how Capital Improvement Projects should be prioritized in their communities. At the May Public Facilities meeting, the subcommittee drafted a list and brought it to the June 4th Uptown Planners Committee, where a vote was held to have a special meeting on June 24th so the list could be sent to the City on time.

Public Comment:

- a) Carol Emerick did not receive notice for the Public Facilities Subcommittee meeting. It was sent out in a timely manner.
- b) Lu Rehling thinks there should be a clarification of what scooter infrastructure entails. She believes these projects are skewed in favor of bikes instead of parks and public restrooms.

- c) Mat Wahlstrom argued that this list does not follow the template, wherein percentages of collected fees for certain categories must go toward the category they were collected from.
- d) MaryBeth Chruden believes that some items on the list are unclear, especially the Education Center. She advocated for brighter lighting on the Vermont Street Bridge.

Board Comment

- a) Amie believes Ed Center item needs clarification and wants more focus on parks, especially in Banker's Hill.
- b) Bill Smith believes there is a great deal of disagreement on the teacher's training annex and that this item should be changed with lighting on the Vermont Street Bridge or a "Dog Run" in University Heights as projects to be prioritized.
- c) Matt encouraged adding a 5th priority if we have the option.
- d) Michael agreed with prioritizing lights on Vermont St. Bridge and wondered why the Normal Street Promenade was not listed as a priority. This was because funding has already been secured for this project.
- e) Tom believes it does not prioritize parks enough. He asked if this list requests a specific dollar amount or source of money.
- f) Clint clarified that the subcommittee meeting was agendized 72 hours in advance and there was a notice on the website. He noted that CIP funds are not the same as funds from DIFs, Direct Impact Fees. He explained that CIP is not restricted by DIF sources. He is willing to put lighting on Vermont Street Bridge as a priority. He also explained that the Normal Street Promenade was not added because phase 1 is already funded.

Clint moved to adopt as is but with clarifying the Ed Center project as moving the University Heights library to that property and that this item should be moved to priority 5, with lighting on Vermont Street Bridge moved to priority 4, and a Dog Run still at priority 3 for University Heights, Gail added that there be a clarification that the Normal Street Promenade was not listed as a priority under the assumption that it is fully funded, Clint agreed and Gail then 2nd the motion which was unanimously approved.

VI) Information Items

- 1) Notice of Right to Appeal - Soheil gave notice for the right to appeal the environmental determination for St. Paul's Senior Services improvements project.
- 2) Notice of Decision - Soheil gave notice that an application was approved to demolish a single-family residence and construct three residential condominium units at 4236 4th Ave.
- 3) Normal Street Property Stakeholders- Soheil announced that the next community input workshop will be June 27th at 6pm.

Clint motioned to adjourn the meeting, Zach 2nd, meeting adjourned at 8:24pm.