



Southern Crossing Neighborhood Association Board Meeting Minutes

December 17, 2020

- I. Call to Order:** Karen called to order the SCNA Board meeting at 6:05 pm via Zoom.
Present: K. Bergsvik, D. DeWeese, S. Santa, L. Von Ruden, M. Zapp
Absent: B. Holman
Agenda Changes: none
- II. Approval of minutes from October 15:** Deby moved to approve with corrections, second by Lowell. All in favor with Sara abstaining.
- III. Reports:**
- A. Chair/Neighborhood Leadership Alliance (NLA)
1. Karen posted the NLA report in Slack, minutes are delayed again. She was disappointed in the NSSP update, we will have to talk about that at our retreat. Deby asked about how or if our Woodriver project would get funded. Karen said that some funds from the GO bond were planned to help reduce the NSSP backlog. Sara noted that the Chamberlain project was identified as one of the highest safety issues, so why did it rank so low? Karen described how NLA members scored projects (in some cases inconsistently), and its high cost pushed it down the list. Sara would like to see if cheaper elements of our projects could be done earlier, Karen said that would have to be discussed with Robin. Deby will try again to set up a meeting with Robin. Deby asked for some clarification on the future Columbia Street roundabout and Murphy Road closure. Deby asked about a comment from SW Bend regarding COID land. Karen confirmed that the SBNA board supported transferring the COID land to SCNA.
- B. Treasurer
1. Lowell said there's not much to report this month as we haven't been spending. He pointed out that the posted report still only contains an estimate for our general meeting mailing since BMS still hadn't sent an invoice. Deby thought she heard that budgeting info was also moved into the city's new permit system.
- C. Land Use
1. Deby highlighted a few items from her posted report. She thought it odd how the city seems to hide information about short term rentals, Lisa was also interested in this. A few people in our NA have asked Deby about potential illegal STRs, but she wasn't able to be much help because of the limited city information.



2. Developers have been pushing back on attempts to increase noticing requirements, and the planning department supported them, yielding only one small expansion. Lisa was interested in trying to coordinate land use notices between NAs.
3. Deby reminded everyone to fill out the city survey.
4. Deby found out about a recently approved STR that actually has two houses on it and both are approved for STR. She got clarification that the 250 foot distance requirement between STRs is actually between lots, not buildings. That means if code is changed to allow double/triple/quad on any lot, developers could create a pack of STRs on a single lot, which seems to go against the spirit of the STR rules. She thought this might be an area where we could work with the affordable housing groups, as they likely wouldn't want these potential affordable housing units to be made STRs. Karen suggested doing a Q&A in the newsletter, and this STR issue could be the first one.
5. Karen went back to the topic of transferring the COID land into SCNA. She said we should move on that soon, rather than waiting for the larger NLA boundary adjustments coming later, due to expected development planning starting with subdivision. Board will have to approve changes, then have a vote at a special NA meeting. Lowell mentioned seeing a lot line adjustment pre-app on e-plans. The board discussed scope and timing for a special meeting on this. Sara suggested doing a special meeting in place of our regular January board meeting, the rest of the board agreed. Deby moved to work with SBNA to transfer the COID property between Brookswood and the Deschutes River to SCNA. Second by Sara, all in favor.

IV. SCNA Boundary Change Meeting:

- A. This was discussed as part of the later virtual retreat discussion.

V. Adjusting Neighborhood Boundaries:

- A. Karen said she was nominated to be the chair of the NLA boundaries committee, and is preparing to go to council listening session with it in January, trying to get it added for the next biennium. She asked for board opinions on the NLA provided discussion prompts in order to come up with a consensus (attached below).

VI. Managed Homeless Camps:

- A. Karen moved next to the NLA provided discussion prompts on managed camps, again looking for board opinions and consensus (attached below).

VII. Virtual Goal Setting Retreat for 2021:

- A. Due to time limits, Karen did not get into specific topics for the board's annual retreat. However, she has been making a list of potential work plan topics based on notes she has taken through the year. She asked board members to think about what they personally would like to work on, and their available time. Karen also suggested



having two shorter sessions rather than a single long one. Other board members suggested having them closer together than last year, and earlier in the day. After evaluating potential dates, the consensus was 4-6 pm on January 13 and 27. The board also discussed timing for the January 21 special meeting. Consensus was that it should be quick, so 6-6:30 should be sufficient, and could be followed by time for additional questions and answers until 7 pm. Sara will send out a newsletter announcing the special meeting.

VIII.Adjournment at 8:10 pm

Minutes submitted by Lowell Von Ruden



Adjusting Neighborhood Boundaries

1. Is your NA willing to consider adjusting your current neighborhood boundaries? If not, why?
Yes, we are willing to consider adjusting our boundaries.
2. Do you think there is value in reevaluating neighborhood association boundaries?
Yes. Has been tremendous growth in the City since neighborhoods originally formed.
3. What is important to you when considering adjusting neighborhood boundaries citywide? Do you have a final outcome in mind?
 - Bigger Neighborhood Associations may want to get smaller. If we consolidate, less duplication of services and stronger boards
 - Increasing diversity of all population groups
 - People need to be able to identify with the neighborhood
 - Who defines what a neighborhood is, and where do we ask that question?
 - Correlate boundaries with data sources - fire, police, school district, census tracts
 - Look at neighborhoods that have shared interests or where there are natural boundaries - like the river, and freeway
 - Try to make neighborhoods roughly similar size, where people can feel a sense of belonging, while taking in the physical aspect of natural boundaries
4. Do you have any concerns about the idea of adjusting neighborhood boundaries citywide? What are they?
 - Look at dwelling units not tax lots to make it more equitable
 - Differentiate between tax lots and the businesses on that property. Each business should have a voice
 - Don't want to create silo's of NA's - those that do want to change boundaries and those that don't
 - Need to look at past and look at the reasons behind the current boundaries
 - If a more active NA, merges with a less active NA, may mean more work for the active NA
 - In some neighborhoods, some streets in one NA, and other streets in another NA. Make neighborhoods whole in the process
5. Do you prefer any of the boundary adjustment process options provided on the previous page? If not, do you have another suggestion for us to consider?
 - Our question is do all NA's need to agree to change boundaries, or will it be a choice that NA's can opt in or opt out?
6. Is there anything else you would like us to know related to neighborhood boundaries?
 - Be really clear about the desired outcome of this change - we are trying to foster community
 - Even without changing boundaries, SCNA will look at opportunities where we can do joint work with other NA's



Managed Camps in Bend

1. As the City pursues the managed camp concept, what actions do you think will ensure community members feel heard?
 - Public meetings, open ended questions on surveys
 - Involve neighborhood associations
 - Make sure that the criteria for the location of a managed camp is clear
 - Process transparent
 - Don't rush it
 - Be forthcoming about what property the City owns
 - Don't put the burden on one neighborhood; disperse throughout the City
2. What would make you feel comfortable with having a managed camp in your neighborhood? What would make you concerned?
 - Define "Managed"
 - Would not be comfortable with a camp during winter-time; it is a harsh and inhumane option
 - What population of the homeless does this camp serve? Is it tent camping? RV camping? Are families and single individuals all at one camp? Is it barrier free - meaning anyone can be there, regardless of mental health, addictions, criminal background?
 - Safety is a big concern. Fire Safety. Safety for neighboring properties and for neighboring families. Safety from criminals, sexual predators. Safety from illegal activities. Fire and Police have to be part of the discussion. People rummaging through garbage and recycling; Afraid to leave vehicles unlocked
3. What should the City's role be in working on the complex societal issues of affordable housing and homelessness?
 - City should have a major role - fundor, convenor, provide staffing
 - City needs to identify what resources it can contribute: funds, buildings, property
 - City needs to have an integrated approach as these issues also involve transportation (being able to get to services), economic development (having businesses nearby for essential services)
 - It needs to be a broad based, compassionate effort that can be done via the proposed Homelessness task force - but should include representatives of the homeless community, faith communities, service providers, agencies that build affordable housing
4. Which of the NLA action options provided on the previous page does your NA support? If none, do you have questions that you still need answered or another suggestion for us to consider? Please explain.
 - We support Option 2, 3, and 4
5. Is there anything else you would like to share regarding managed camps and/or homelessness?



- Board does not know enough about what homeless services are available currently in Bend, and what approach Central Oregon has taken to house people (shelters, transitional housing, and then permanent housing versus housing first)
- Board does not know enough about the homeless populations in Bend - to know if services should be prioritized and if there is a greater need in some areas
- Bend surrounded by federal property - Forest Service, BLM. People camp on those properties. The federal agencies need to partner with Bend as these properties might be appropriate for those who want to camp in recreational vehicles, as long as transportation and other issues are addressed.
- There needs to be a quick, perhaps temporary solution to house the homeless - especially during the winter months, while the community works on more permanent solutions
- Appears that some individuals go through recycling containers at private residences, in order to get cash. Some people ok with it, while others are not. Recycling containers can be placed around town where the homeless can go and get the cans. Related to this, more bottledrop locations through town, so that people looking to get cash for the cans are not concentrated in one particular area.