

Call to Order: 6:15pm

Board Members present: Sherry Rampy, Doug Churchill, Joan Kelchner, Pierre Kaluzny, Melanie Terpstra, George Pasquel, Cole Van Norman

Approval of Minutes: Moved- Mr. Churchill, Ms Terpstra 2 – approved unan. Patricia Zermeno asked where to find them on the Website. Mr. Kaluzny answered to look under “News”.

Treasurer’s Report: Report by Mr. Churchill, plus written report. Moved Mr. Van Norman, 2-Melanie Terpstra – approved unan.

Community Action Officer’s Report: Neither CAO was present.

New Business and Events:

711 N 7th Ave.: Grace Perry (new operating partner). One of the lots acquired requires a variance for parking (6 spaces short) for the bar. Will also need variances for outdoor dining, live music and music exceeding 50 decibels (only on weekends to 10pm) and alcohol use. Parking variance necessary now to proceed with building, others not needed until Cert of Occu., but all variances have been put on 1 application. They have provided us with a draft letter. Moved Mr. Pasquel; 2-Mr. Van Norman- both Variance request and Use Permit.

7th Ave. and Roosevelt- Will Rodriguez: Requests support for variance(s). Mr. Rodriguez owns the carwash and has been trying to get development to put up a Starbuck’s. Shows pictures (powerpoint) of proposed building. Currently leases out the carwash and adjacent lot. Has put out many offers to potential leasees, but the only legitimate respondent has been Starbuck’s. After discussions with multiple neighbors, he's fronted the building on Roosevelt, rather than 7th Ave. which is what Downtown Urban Zoning would allow. Downtown zoning limits parking spaces, but Starbuck’s wants double the number currently allowed under the Urban Zoning. City wants the drive through to be invisible (walled) on 7th, but Starbuck’s thinks that is not safe because homeless can hide. Currently needs variance from city for: (1) increased parking; (2) parking close to ROW on 7th Ave.; (3) having building front Roosevelt rather than 7th; and (4) allowing the drive thru entrance/exit on 7th. Mr. Van Norman notes that the new gas station in Garfield has a short wall and does have a problem with homeless. Dr. Kelchner – has Mr. Rodriguez tried different layouts such as a diagonal facing to corner; answer yes, does not work because of shape of lot. Leslie Doktor –?what about a 2 story building; answer city has approved the building layout just presented. Patricia Zermeno -?where does the drive thru end – answer into the alley or 7th. Rick Naimark -?shade along the sidewalks; yes. Move to support requested variances- Mr. Pasquel, 2- Mr. Churchill – approved unan.

July meeting discussion- scheduled for July 5 –Mr. Churchill moved to reschedule to July 12, 2- Mr. Kaluzny. Dr. Kelchner – do we need it; in past years we have elected to not have either the July or Aug. meeting. Ms. Rampy – Rose Law Group wants to come in July to present on the Circles building, and August will be used for 3, 5th Ave. presentation. Vote – approved unan.

Ongoing Business Updates:

FAA update by Terry Goddard; Mr. Goddard noted that the Mediation phase went back and forth, but currently the reply is scheduled to come in later this month. The Motion to Dismiss has been consolidated with the Merits of the Case, so the reply is FAA's response to the Consolidated case. There will be oral arguments then (possibly). Brief's summary: FAA said the city missed its deadline to file an objection within a 60-day review period for the new flight paths and therefore legal action is moot; BUT also, if the Court disagrees with that, then any action by the city is premature until the next motion is filed (kind of a Catch 22). Congressman Pastor convened a Special committee to hear this and the Neighborhoods did respond legally within that time-frame. Mr. Goddard feels that the Neighborhoods did everything in good faith and thought their response was timely, though the FAA never was clear about timelines. Actual substantive argument is that the FAA never investigated whether there was a true negative impact. The federal laws involved include National Historic Preservation and National Transportation Acts. Mr. Goddard feels that motion to dismiss really applies to the city and not the historic neighborhoods, and that we still have a legitimate grievance.

Mr. Naimark asked what we know about someone in the city knowing about the 60 day timeline; answer is we don't know for sure, but do have other precedents legally that we can still proceed. What we want to accomplish is that the FAA goes back to the drawing board and redoes the routes – the easiest being what we had before. Mark Davis asks about FAA's Categorical Exclusions – does this apply? Yes, the FAA can use these exclusions, but they have to have a reasonable basis for doing so. Mr. Davis is concerned about ongoing court costs. Mr. Goddard: his firm was hired about 10 days before the absolute deadline to file a brief, so had to really scramble to get it done, but managed. However, there was not enough time to go back to the neighborhoods for review and approval. But the court was then able to see what the problems were with pressing these issues too fast, which probably helped get us the mediation. He then reviewed the current billings and noted that even though mediation took much longer than anticipated, no extra charges were accrued. He also notes that Story and Roosevelt have continued to pay their fair share, but the other neighborhoods have not. Encanto is planning a fund-raiser, but has not yet held it. Willo voted to offer \$10,000, but no more, so the Law group declined. Ms. Rampy notes that she, Mr. Goddard and Steve Dreisesen have all gone to Willo to plead with them. She also detailed how much we've spent and still owe (\$2,000.00). She wants to plan a Historic Neighborhood Fundraiser and thinks we could make enough money to finish paying the entire debt. Mr. Goddard replies that the problem with Willo needs to be resolved. Steve Dreisesen is still working with both Encanto and Willo on this issue and also reassures us that this is not going to go on forever and continue building fees. ???(from the audience) Are there other precedents; yes, a few; and is there a right of appeal? No. Ms. Rampy request a motion to plan a fund-raiser, at no cost to RAA; so moved Mr. Churchill; 2 Ms. Terpstra – approved unan.

Home Tour, Ms. Terpstra: still need homes. Ms. Rampy- move to approve budget; Mr. Churchill- 2; approved unan.

Hance Park, Dr. Kelchner: next general meeting will be in July. Check website for further info.

3rd & 5th Ave. Charrette: New consultant wants to come back in August, may need special meeting.

“Circles”: have rescheduled more than once to present new plans; currently set for next week.

Development update: no new info.

Items from floor / Public comment: Dr. Kelchner brings up the question of bylaws and allowing dues paying members to vote from the floor because of concerns she has heard from several members. Has discussed this issue with Ms. Rampy and they think a new committee may be necessary. We are going to contact an attorney (resident) in the neighborhood and see if he can help. Ms. Rampy asks if Kelchner would Chair: yes

Adjournment: 8:00