

**CPIC Discussion Notes
May 10, 2018**

Composition, Bylaws, Quorum

- **Bob: suggests 7 with quorum of 4; Councilors and staff non-voting.**
- **Phil: should include members of the N**
- **Paul (Buzzy): agrees, property owners should be included**
- **Caroline: do involve business folks**
- **Councilor H: keep core CPIC members, include N people.**
- **Councilor R: Council gets recommendations and acts with orders or resolves.**
- **Tex: room limit 25±; commitment to attend; generally consensus; quorum of 7 or 9**
- **Councilor R: use motions to move business forward even if generally use a consensus approach**
- **Susan: likes consensus**
- **Buzzy: let's decide tonight**
- **Phil Crane: how get in new ideas?**
- **Phil Notis: good to have a committee to resolve issues**
- **Susanne: members should have attendance**
- **Susan: Maybe formalize next week**
- **Caroline: what happens when CPIC works on another N?**
- **Barry: similar concern**
- **Tom: maybe set percentages**
- **Susanne: if CPIC moves to another N the make-up would change—others will substitute in**
- **Mitch: core members and associate members; AMs have voting rights**
- **Eben motion: open membership mode; whoever shows up determines who can vote; open plenary vote mode. When in open membership mode; votes to be taken in open plenary fashion. Bob seconds.**
- **Susan H: prefers more committed work group; room could be stacked.**
- **Buzzy: supports that; Council is expecting recommendations from a committee**
- **Phil: agrees**
- **Councilor Rose: concerns are valid; but then—who gets to be at the table?**

- Barry: agreed that we should have a core membership. Could look at existing list.
- Melanie: whoever shows up and makes a commitment should be the ones who get to vote.
- Buzzy: open membership for three months, then finalize committee.
- Susanne: wants to step in for anyone who isn't attending.
- Luke: people who live here or own bus. here have the most skin in the game. Not in favor of open membership mode.
- Bob: official enabling ordinances require 75% attendance.
- Eva: adopt but revisit in several weeks.
- Eben: postpone his motion (and the composition question) for now; may depend on which function the Committee is in. Come back at it next meeting.
- Barry: West End plan didn't have a lot of votes
- Eben: motion—rules for voting on a topic cannot be changed on the day the vote occurs. Second: Barry Unanimous
- Tex: choices: open plenary; initial open plenary; 25-member committee; core group + associates with all voting.

Workplan

- Rick: need illustrative drawings showing existing and what would be under revised zoning
- Eben: **look at form-based zoning. For next meeting.**
- Phil: has seen in the India St N. Got rid of bisected lots. So FBZ is an option. Working in India St.
- Phil: had been seeking City grant for illustrative renderings.
- Peter: in previous master plans has drawings, had budget.
- Buzzy: sometimes FBZ results in large buildings that trump historic architecture buildings. Historic preservation regs penalize those property owners.
- Eben: FBZ is a process that can allow for different qualities than what was chosen in Portland.
- Stanton: could result in different scale of project
- Phil: owns property in India St N; they were involved.
- Rick: FBZ was used for India St, but that was a solution in Ptd; could do a Knightville appropriate FBZ; let's do drawings first to figure out the scale and features we want and then figure out how to get there—with FMZ being one option.

- **Susan:** Have to make sure that we don't only allow the profit motive.
- **Tom Ainsworth:** We create our own future here. Enhance the vitality of K for residents and businesses. Improve infra safety considering the aging of the population—sidewalks. Coordinate with neighboring Ns; walkway connections; walking connections to Mill Creek; health industries, clothing; echo's what Rick said—want solutions for K not copying Portland or elsewhere.
- **Susanne—**start with basics; street sweeping; crosswalk striping; trash and litter collection, like in Legere Park, Post Office Park.
- **Buzzy:** developed two buildings; neither conform to current zoning; his building is a model; mixed use building; 6-unit building.

Round Robin

- **Mitch:** have ability for interim recommendations for Council action
- **Melanie:** be mindful/careful of skate park; keep historic approach to ramp in TKP free of parking
- **Sue:** encourage
- **Eva:** excited
- **Susanne:** pleasure, lot of positive things coming
- **Buzzy:** K people bring their concerns forward
- **Phil:** good group; aggressive agenda, meeting once a month
- **Tom:** India Street discussion made him realize importance on being careful about effect of any economic development or other incentives
- **Bob:** happy to see large number of people
- **Rick:** agrees
- **Eben:** thinks graphically, hence FBZ and illustrations suggestions. Wants group to **get the ULI Resiliency report.**
- **Caroline:** better use for trolley maintenance building and CMP property.
- **Peter:** great N that's a tweak away from what's needed