

82ND AVE AREA COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Details:

Date: February 18, 2026

Time: 6pm to 8pm

Location: APANO

Online: Zoom

Attendees* (In-Person/Online):

Name	Role	Name	Role
Aaron Milano	CLC	Mesha Jones	Portland Housing Bureau (PHB)
Erika Abdelatif	CLC	Jessi Conner	Portland Housing Bureau (PHB)
Erin Maxey	CLC	Kathryn Hartinger	Prosper Portland
Jacob Loeb	CLC	Lisa Abuaf	Prosper Portland
Joshua Pangelinan	CLC	Angela Nguyen	Prosper Portland
Khanh Le	CLC	Kyoung Shin	Community Liaison
Liz Winchester	CLC		
Michael Liu	CLC		
Pam Hodge	CLC		
Theo Hathaway Saner	CLC		
Yamungu Seraya	CLC		

*Stephen Udydz absence excused

Meeting Minutes:

Meeting commenced at 6:08pm

1. Welcome!

Mesha Jones (PHB) welcomed the CLC to the first 82nd Ave Area CLC meeting.

2. Introductions and Roll Call

Mesha reviewed the agenda for the meeting this evening with the goal of having a discussion and potentially make decisions on CLC's governing process.

Before getting into the work, Mesha began with introductions for roll call and share out of the favorite thing about the neighborhood. The CLC members and staff shared out their favorite things such as restaurants, diverse communities, parks, history of the neighborhood, and natural spaces.

3. Guiding Agreements

After the introductions, Mesha shifted the conversation toward the guiding agreements.

In addition to the guiding agreements, Mesha refreshed the group on Public Meetings Law for the meetings, CLC members, and staff.

4. Administrative Items/ Housekeeping

Mesha shared reminders on emails, questions, meeting RSVPs, and 82nd Ave Area Team contact. Mesha noted that there will be a facilitator joining the CLC in March, Facilitator TBD.

Additionally, the CLC were reminded to complete their Office of Civic Life training reminders.

Lastly, Mesha shared the Honoraria for the CLC. CLC members will have to complete the form to either opt-in or opt-out.

5. Bylaws and Governance

Before diving into the decision-making and voting process, Mesha outlined the Governance Charter for 82nd Ave Area TIF (Found in CLC Binders, in the District Plan Binder). Additionally, in the Governance Charter, it outlines the Roles and Responsibilities of the CLC and City staff to the district's Action Plan.

CLC Bylaws

Mesha then reviewed the CLC's decision items for this meeting. Kathryn Hartinger (Prosper Portland) added more context about the need to add onto the current Charter. Jacob Loeb (CLC) asked if the bylaws must be changed every 5 years. Kathryn clarified that the CLC can change whenever and shared Cully TIF CLC as an example.

Length of Terms:

Mesha reviewed the length of terms for the inaugural CLC and the process that led to the creation of the current CLC.

The CLC's first decision of the evening was to determine the term length for subsequent terms. Cully TIF CLC was used as an example with a note that the City's policy states that CLC cannot serve more than 8 years.

Jacob shared that 3-year terms make a lot of sense in a timing sense. Additionally, Jacob added that Cully's example also makes sense.

Erika Abdelatif (CLC) asked what happens if there is a vacancy. Kathryn shared that it will create a vacancy and alternatives can be picked from the list of applicants from the initial round.

Joshua Pangelinan (CLC) asked what happens if someone re-runs for additional terms and places them over the 8-year max. Kathryn clarified that the CLC would need to choose between years or terms.

Erin Maxey (CLC) noted that using the current example will allow for opportunities for new voices. Jacob added that the neighborhoods change and having new opportunities and voices is good.

Erika asked if three years is too much. Kathryn shared that CLC members can step back as they need. Lisa Abuaf (Prosper Portland) shared that in Cully, they also had hesitation about three years but remained through the Action Planning process.

Pamela Hodge (CLC) asked if the inaugural CLC members would have to renew for the same length of time that they were signed up for currently. Kathryn noted that having the term limit/years are for the subsequent terms.

Jacob asked if there was a possibility to allow CLC members to serve two terms (6 years) and a third would be two years. Kathryn shared that the CLC could look into it. Jessi Conner (PHB) shared that the City's policy is up to 8 years max based on how the CLC determines their terms.

Michael Liu (CLC) asked if there was a vacancy, could the new CLC member finish out the term of the vacant seat. Jessi shared that the new member would start over with a new term.

Jacob noted that it appears that the CLC are in consensus with the term length of 3 years.

Voting and Operating Procedures

After the break, Kathryn walked the group through two questions: How many "yes" votes to move something forward and What operating

process/procedure does the group want to follow? Jessi asked how many CLC members are required to meet quorum. Kathryn noted that 7 is required.

Kathryn walked the group through the first question:

1. How many “yes” votes to move something forward?

Kathryn shared that the Cully TIF CLC chose Consensus Minus Two and the desire for collaboration.

Pamela asked if Cully has been using Consensus minus two for a while. Kathryn shared that the Cully CLC chose to have consensus with the members present. Pamela noted that if quorum is 7, there could be an opportunity for less members voting. Jessi noted that in East 205, the CLC members made a similar point and other members shared that there is an importance of being present.

Jacob asked if there was potential of the majority of seats rather than majority of those present. Kathryn noted that it could be an option but noting that there could be difficulty to plan.

Michael asked if there was a path for CLC members to say their piece to help with their decision, like a red, yellow, green light decision-making process.

The CLC members then each took a moment to share their thoughts:

- Jacob noted that majority is within his experience and is open to consensus minus two.
- Erin Maxey (CLC) noted that her initial thought is consensus minus two.
- Yamungu Seraya (CLC) noted that he is between consensus and majority.
- Liz Winchester (CLC) is leaning on consensus minus two and feels that if the current process is not working, the CLC could

change it to what works best for the group, potentially working with the facilitator.

- Theo noted that he is leaning consensus minus two.

Kathryn offered to hold the decision right now and move onto question two:

2. What operating process/procedure does the group want to follow?

Kathryn reviewed the process of Roberts Rules of Order and how Consensus operates as a decision-making process through outlining and comparing the two decision making frameworks.

Erin shared that she prefers the iterative process to work through as a group and the consensus decision making process allows for that. Joshua also agrees, adding that the CLC is unique to representing the community that they are representing.

Jacob asked if there is a need to consider efficiency or is there a time-constraint. Kathryn shared that there is a timeline but with that said, the process does not need to be rushed if the CLC needs more time. There will be a process for the CLC to learn and hear information before moving toward making recommendations. Kathryn and Lisa shared Cully as an example for their number of votes over their process and timing for their Action Plan, including lessons learned. Jessi also added that in Central City TIF districts had 8 months and was able to naturally create consensus decision making process, even though they weren't a formal body and were able to move through the process in a short amount of time.

Pamela wanted to confirm that the timeline is evolving. Kathryn clarified that it was the goal as the aim is to get the money out the door once the Action Plan is approved.

Kathryn asked where the CLC is feeling on question two. The CLC shared their thoughts:

- Michael shared that he is leaning on consensus minus one or two as complete majority can be silencing of a CLC's voice.
- Aaron would like consensus minus two
- Joshua is leaning on consensus minus two
- Pamela likes consensus but minus two allows for more flexibility
- Jacob would like to be open to it.
- Yamungu is for consensus minus two
- Erin is for consensus minus two
- Erika is for consensus minus two
- Liz is fine with consensus minus two
- Theo is for consensus minus two
- Khanh likes Robert's rules for efficiency but is open to support consensus minus two. Also, highlighting the opportunity and space to highlight any dissent.

Jacob would like it to be structured that there would be a consensus minus two with a majority of the seats. Erika notes that it would be helpful to know when the CLC will be voting. Staff will include consensus minus two and include additional language for the CLC to decide.

Removal of members

Kathryn then walked through the CLC's decision process for removal of members with unexcused absences. Jacob asked for clarification on type of notice. Kathryn shared that the language could be changed to "excused" rather than just notice. Jessi added that the staff will make efforts to connect and reach out to CLC member.

Khanh asked if the 25% or a percent would apply to regular meeting or regular meetings plus subcommittee meetings. Pamela added that language could be added to specify subcommittee. Joshua noted that participating in subcommittee meetings would affect the number of

meetings needing to attend and subsequently affect the percent required.

Jacob asked if there was a process in the past and what was the process. Kathryn shared examples from Cully where CLC members were in communication and ultimately had to step away. Jessi shared that she had been on a committee where removal was needed. This was before the City had created a process for removal. Aaron noted that we do not need to wait and the threshold and the CLC should be able to call for a vote. Jacob added that maybe call on a vote after two absences, unexcused in 12 months. The CLC is comfortable moving forward with Aaron's and Jacob's proposal.

6. Co-Chair Nominations

Due to a shortage of time, Kathryn reviews the co-chair responsibility, noting that the CLC will need to establish co-chair term limits. Kathryn also opened the nominations for a vote to the CLC.

7. Public Comment

One public commenter, Long Troung:

1. Will the CLC members be proposing projects and general confusion on the role of the CLC? Lisa outlined the Action Plan process and how the programming is working based on priorities of the Action Plan. Jessi noted similar process for the Portland Housing Bureau through the funds provided for the CLC.
2. Second question was different TIF districts having issues and problems like in Cully? Kathryn shared that the Cully has not spent any money yet as they have not had their Action Plan approved yet by City Council. Lisa added that the review of TIF should be based on the priorities, dollars, and the work done over time and focus on the question about how did the district reflect the needs of the community.

Meeting adjourned at 8:07 pm