

---

## **Williams & Russell Project Working Group Meeting Minutes Wednesday, April 7, 2021, 5:30-7:30 p.m.**

### **MEETING PURPOSE**

- Virtual Community Meeting Update
- Discussion & Vote on Byrd Joining the New Non-Profit Board
- Lot Line Adjustment Proposal
- RFP Evaluation Form

### **MEETING DESIRED OUTCOMES**

- Approval of Proposal & Budget for Lot Line Adjustment
- Vote on Byrd Being on the Board of The New Non- Profit Board
- Vote on RFP Evaluation Form

**Meeting Minutes:** On April 7, 2021 **Ericka Warren** opened the PWG public meeting via Zoom and the following is a brief outline of what was discussed.

#### **1. Co-Chair Report.**

**Bryson Davis** shared with the PWG that there have been a few background meetings discussing the logistics of the land transfer and funding. There was one person that expressed interest in joining the nonprofit board which will be discussed today later in the agenda. The Governance Subcommittee is working on developing a timeline of moving the PWG to the Nonprofit Board and then the eventual transfer of land from Legacy to the nonprofit. This will be discussed with the new Board as it forms in the next few weeks.

**Justice Rajee** gave an overview of the community engagement event. Time is being scheduled with the Community Engagement Subcommittee to debrief and discuss what can be improved and what was learned from the event. The questions that were asked at the event were documented and hopefully we will have the ability to share the video with the community. The next focus related to community engagement will be establishing a contract with a company to handle social media, communication plan and additional community engagement logistics. Justice hopes to meet with Joy Alise on April 21<sup>st</sup> to discuss the community benefit agreement.

#### **2. Discussion & Vote of Byrd Being Joining Nonprofit Board**

Bryson led a discussion about Byrd's interest in being on the Nonprofit Board. Byrd is a past PWG member and head of EDPA2. He indicated there would not be a specific Board

position assigned, but she is a community member and a displaced person leading EDPA2. He opened the floor for general discussion regarding this nomination.

**Michael Alexander** asked to clarify if she would represent a person or an organization. Bryson indicated that this has not yet been decided as the Board slots have not presently been assigned.

**Anthony Deloney** questioned the process going forward to electing new members to the Board and didn't think candidates should be present at the meeting during the vote. He indicated that the group needs to have an established process. Bryson said that everyone that will be considered for the Board will need to be approved at the PWG public meetings.

**Walter Robinson** asked about Byrd's candidacy. He indicated he had concerns about her being on the Board due to past participation and interactions with the PWG. He reflected on Byrd being involved with slowing down the process and work of the PWG in the past. He also indicated that there needs to be a better process for nominating potential Board members and how they communicate with the PWG. Walter also pointed out that Byrd had negative comments about the PWG in the past.

**Karis Stoudamire-Phillips** expressed two concerns: 1. If there was a call that was put out to the community for those interested in serving on the board? 2. How conversations about potential new Boards members are being handled in a public meeting. Bryson addressed the aforementioned comments and indicated that he asked the PWG to reach out to their connections for those that are interested in being a part of the Board and this was the way that the community found out about the need for Board members. Bryson stated the PWG does not have an Executive Committee to consider new Board members and uses the public PWG meetings for making decisions. Karis reiterated that many members of the PWG might not speak up because the meetings are handled in a public format.

Michael asked if the work that is discussed in the subcommittees are handled in a public facing format? Bryson responded no as the subcommittees do not have the authority to take votes and make final decisions on behalf of the PWG. Bryson suggested the PWG could form a subcommittee to discuss Board nominations. Michael agreed it would be better to handle Board nominations via subcommittee first and then once candidates are vetted, they could be asked to join the PWG meetings for vote.

**Jillian Saurage** asked when the Board members will meet to form the nonprofit. Bryson indicated they're aiming to do so in the next two weeks. Jillian pointed out that

the new nonprofit will be its own entity and not bound by the bylaws of the PWG, the challenges of executive committees and quorum.

**Charles Wilhoite** agreed with Karis's perspective that vetting a candidate publicly is challenging but noted, if they are comfortable with the PWG members that are moving on to be on the Nonprofit Board, they could be allowed to make a decision about future Board members. He pointed out that it would be better for the present PWG Board members to vote on new Board members once the Nonprofit is established. Bryson asked if they should set a deadline for nominees to submit to the Nonprofit Board and then allow the PWG members who will move to be on the new Board to make a decision. Anthony shared with the group that he is aware of other folks who are interested in being on the Nonprofit Board. Karis was adamant about having an established vetting process for new members.

**Chabre Vickers** pointed out that all the present PWG members were brought on in a very thoughtful manner and this should continue with the new board members. Justice agreed with the group that there should be an established procedure for bringing on new Board members.

**James Faison** agreed that there should be a process and deadlines associated with bringing on new board members. Bryson recommended to form the subcommittee today.

**Karis, Anthony, Chabre, Justice and Bryson** said they would be willing to be on the Nominating Subcommittee. Charles asked the group if they want to differentiate the name as "nominating subcommittee" or "governance committee." Bryson indicated that the better name would be Nominating Subcommittee. **All present members of the PWG voted yes on the Nominating Subcommittee representatives.** Justice noted that in the comments a community member asked if they could also be present in the subcommittee meetings. Bryson will notify Byrd of the new process and that she will be considered for the new Nonprofit Board.

### 3. Vote on Lot Line Adjustment Proposal

Bryson explained that the piece of land presently has two tax lots and the tax lots for the parcel of land need adjusting prior to the transfer of the land from Legacy. There is a need for the tax lots to be adjusted so that the piece of land will handed over from Legacy is the same as the nonprofit and developer will be working with. There is a proposal from Edmund Tawiah with TCC Associates (Civil Engineer) to do the lot tax adjustment work. **MinNefer Mernahkem** shared with the group that Edmund is an African American Civil Engineer that has worked in north Portland for over 30 years as

a Civil Engineer and Surveyor. He is one of 3 African American Civil Engineers in the area (1 in California and 1 in Washington state).

Bryson screenshared TCC's proposal with the group. The cost for services on the proposal are \$8,700. Bryson opened the discussion regarding how the payment for the lot adjustment work would be covered. Charles shared that Legacy was not asked to incur these costs, but they might be willing to incur the cost as part of the land transfer. Bryson clarified that this process must happen before Legacy can transfer the land. Lisa clarified that the current landowner, Legacy, or the PWG/Nonprofit would need to hold the contract and Prosper could not hold the contract because they have no ownership rights to the land. **Brian Terrett** shared that he has a meeting to discuss the survey costs and this might be something that Legacy will handle. Now that there is a proposal, he can take the document to his team to decide if Legacy will incur these costs. Chabre thanked Brian and Charles for stating that Legacy expected to incur the stated costs.

Jillian asked Bryson for clarification about why this work has to be done. A [www.portlandmaps.com](http://www.portlandmaps.com) taxlot map was screenshared showing a taxlot that needs to be split prior to the Legacy land transfer.

Bryson asked if Legacy needs the PWG approval for the civil engineer that would do the work. Brian indicated Legacy will discuss this in their meeting next week. Charles indicated they are willing to work with TCC but will need to bring his proposal to their team to discuss it first and check the pricing of the quote with other vendors. He indicated it would be ideal to use an African American civil engineer. Bryson asked to table this discussion until Legacy can meet regarding the proposal.

Jillian asked if the PWG could recommend that Legacy move forward with TCC's quote. Charles suggested that the vote to move forward with TCC could be made conditional until Legacy has a chance to meet and do their due diligence. The PWG voted on this recommendation: **Michael A, Walter R, Justice R, Jillian S, Bryson D, Karis S, Chabre V, James F and Anthony D all voted in favor of using TCC to survey the lot and for Legacy to incur the costs.**

#### 4. Evaluation Criteria approval

Bryson summarized the evaluation form that the PWG will use to evaluate RFP submittals. He shared his screen with the group and summarized the form in detail. The table outlines the three main evaluation criteria sections, assigned points and a breakdown of points: 1) Development Team Capability (50 pts.) 2) Development Approach (30 pts.) 3) Proposed Project (20pts.).

Chabre commented that the goal of the RFP Subcommittee was to incorporate DEI into the assessment and that members of this subcommittee have previous experience serving on evaluation teams. She also indicated that they are willing to take input from the rest of the PWG regarding the evaluation form. She shared that the form aligns with the submission and evaluation language in the RFP.

Michael stressed that it was important to discover “the who” that is applying and that needs to be an important factor in the RFP considerations for the PWG.

James asked how the community will get an understanding of the assessment criteria. Chabre V indicated that this form is not for the public use rather a resource for the Evaluation Subcommittee and PWG to use to evaluate the RFP submittals. Charles noted the balance of the points, and he thought there would be more points weighted for the “what” rather than the “who.” He added this might be a question that the public might ask. He commented that the group not lose focus on what the project might be and how this is weighted in the evaluation criteria.

Bryson asked the group for their approval to move forward with the presented evaluation/scoring criteria. Walter moved to approve the evaluation form. **The group voted to approve the evaluation/scoring form with the following members voting in favor: Michael A, Bryson D, Anthony D, James F, Justice R, Walter R, Jillian S, Karis S-P, Chabre V.**

5. **Public Comments:** The facilitator invited public comments and there were no public comments.

Justice asked about expectation and preparations of the PWG in response to the RFP proposals which are due tomorrow, April 8. Bryson said the Evaluations Subcommittee will review the applicants prior to bringing anything to the PWG, and he expected that initial review to take a few weeks.

**Next meeting April 21 at 12:00 noon. Meeting closed at 7:58 pm.**

## PWG - Meeting Attendance Record

x	Name	Representing	Email
x	<b>Bryson Davis, Co-Chair</b>	Soul District Business Association (SBDA)	<a href="mailto:bdavis@sussmanshank.com">bdavis@sussmanshank.com</a>
x	<b>Michael Alexander</b>	Black United Fund & Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center (POIC)	<a href="mailto:mcalexhog@aol.com">mcalexhog@aol.com</a>
	<b>Joy Alise Davis</b>	Portland African-American Leadership Forum (PAALF)	<a href="mailto:joyalise@imagineblack.org">joyalise@imagineblack.org</a>
x	<b>Anthony Deloney</b>	Self Enhancement Inc (SEI)	<a href="mailto:anthonyd@selfenhancement.org">anthonyd@selfenhancement.org</a>
	<b>James Faison</b>	Professional Business Development Group (PBDG)	<a href="mailto:info@faisonconstruction.com">info@faisonconstruction.com</a>
	<b>Stephen Green</b>	Black Investment Consortium for Economic Progress (BICEP)	<a href="mailto:greenerpasturesnw@gmail.com">greenerpasturesnw@gmail.com</a>
	<b>Tony Hopson</b>	Self Enhancement Inc (SEI)	<a href="mailto:tonyh@selfenhancement.org">tonyh@selfenhancement.org</a>
x	<b>Justice Rajee, CoChair</b>	Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center (POIC)	<a href="mailto:jrajee@portlandoic.org">jrajee@portlandoic.org</a>
x	<b>Walter Robinson</b>	Portland African-American Leadership Forum (PAALF) & Urban League	<a href="mailto:wlrii45@gmail.com">wlrii45@gmail.com</a>
x	<b>Jillian Saurage</b>	North/Northeast Housing Strategy Committee	<a href="mailto:jily99@gmail.com">jily99@gmail.com</a>
X	<b>Karis Stoudamire-Phillips</b>	North/Northeast Community Development Initiative Oversight Committee	<a href="mailto:karis.stoudamirephillips@modahealth.com">karis.stoudamirephillips@modahealth.com</a>
X	<b>Chabre Vickers</b>	Wells Fargo	<a href="mailto:Chabre.L.vickers@wellsfargo.com">Chabre.L.vickers@wellsfargo.com</a>
X	<b>Charles Wilhoite</b>	Legacy Health, Board of Directors	<a href="mailto:cawilhoite@willamette.com">cawilhoite@willamette.com</a>

### Additional Attendees:

x	<b>Vicki Guinn</b>	Legacy Health	<a href="mailto:vguinn@lhs.org">vguinn@lhs.org</a>
x	<b>Brian Terrett</b>	Legacy Health	<a href="mailto:Bterrett@lhs.org">Bterrett@lhs.org</a>
x	<b>Lisa Abuaf</b>	Prosper Portland	<a href="mailto:abuaf@prosperportland.us">abuaf@prosperportland.us</a>
x	<b>MinNefer Mernahkem</b>	Prosper Portland	<a href="mailto:mernahkem@prosperportland.us">mernahkem@prosperportland.us</a>
	<b>Nancy Wilson</b>	Prosper Portland	<a href="mailto:wilsonn@prosperportland.us">wilsonn@prosperportland.us</a>
	<b>Christine Velasquez</b>	Prosper Portland	<a href="mailto:velasquezc@prosperportland.us">velasquezc@prosperportland.us</a>
x	<b>Sharon Smith</b>	Prosper Portland	<a href="mailto:smiths@prosperportland.us">smiths@prosperportland.us</a>
x	<b>Amy Nagy</b>	Prosper Portland	<a href="mailto:nagya@prosperportland.us">nagya@prosperportland.us</a>
	<b>Leslie Goodlow</b>	City of Portland, Portland Housing Bureau	<a href="mailto:Leslie.Goodlow@portlandoregon.gov">Leslie.Goodlow@portlandoregon.gov</a>
x	<b>Khanh Tran</b>	Mayor's Office	<a href="mailto:Khanh.Tran@portlandoregon.gov">Khanh.Tran@portlandoregon.gov</a>
	<b>John Marshall</b>	City of Portland, Portland Housing Bureau	<a href="mailto:John.Marshall@portlandoregon.gov">John.Marshall@portlandoregon.gov</a>

### Action Item Log

1.	Provide a copy of the community open house video to the PWG and to share with the public. Transcribe Q&A as part of PWG meeting notes.
2.	Nominating Committee meeting to discuss potential board members and process.
3.	RFP Evaluation Subcommittee to review RFP submittals and start the evaluation process.
4.	Legacy to discuss lot line adjustment proposal and funding and communicate back to the PWG.