

Neighbors of Belknap Lookout Board Meeting

Tuesday, January 8, 2018
NOBL Office, 700 Clancy Ave NE
6:30 pm

Mission: To advocate for and enhance the quality of life in the Belknap community.

Vision: To be a vibrant, diverse and desirable place to live in Grand Rapids.

Public Space Goals: Improving access down Belknap hill (design DDA budget FY2020); Hastings Connector & Linear Park (implementation City of Grand Rapids summer 2019 & 2020); Better Pedestrian Connections (MobileGR planning durable crosswalk and “stop for pedestrian” signs).

Add'l Priorities: Social Connections; Active in the Neighborhood; Voices Heard in Local Gov't.

1. Call to order and additions to agenda
2. Approval of October through December minutes and year end financials
3. Administration/Policy
 - a. Choose officers
 - b. Fill out updated bank forms
 - c. Fill out conflict of interest surveys (using updated policy)
 - d. Closed session for Executive Review
4. Strategy
 - a. Set individual and organization 2019 goals
 - b. Collect steps for reaching goals to compile into work plan
5. Budget
 - a. Approve 2019 budget
6. Miscellaneous & Public Comment
7. Adjournment

2019 Board Meeting Schedule, 6:30 pm at 700 Clancy Ave NE:

February 12

March 12

April 9

May 14

June 11

July 9 (off)

August 13

September 10

October 8

November 12 (Annual Meeting at Coit Creative Arts Academy)

December 10 (Old board/new board potluck)

Please watch the mass emails to the neighborhood for additional social event announcements.

We're adding an optional “Eat – and Drink – Local” series on board meeting nights after we adjourn.

Neighbors of Belknap Lookout Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, October 9, 2018

Board Members Present:	Brian Bremer	Rob Kennedy	Loretta Klimaszewski
	Barbara LaBeau	Todd Leinberger	Dean Rosendall
Board Members Absent:	Loren Sturrus	Jonathan Swets	
Staff Present:	Elianna Bootzin		
Guests Present:	Jackie Dawson	Jason Franklin	Dan Miller
	Chris Swank	Pat Waring	

1. The meeting was called to order.
2. Elianna provided clarification that Loretta would be moving from Gretchen's seat, which ends this year, to one of the ones vacated in August, which end 12/2020. She confirmed that the updated bylaws include the option for the board to choose whether appointments are for the term vacated or until the next election. Those present would like to include consultation with Dean as part of the decision making process on the furnace. The consent agenda was then approved:

- a. Adoption of Revised Bylaws
- b. Clarification of Bank Signatories – for MPCU's records, signatories on all NOBL bank accounts are Elianna Bootzin (executive director), Loren Sturrus (chair & secretary), Todd Leinberger (vice chair), and Rob Kennedy (treasurer).
- c. Approval of Gutter Installation & Delegation of Furnace Vendor Selection & Financing to Officers
- d. Appointment of Loretta to term ending 12/2020; Loren as Secretary
- e. Approval of September minutes and financials

3. Jason Franklin from the GVSU Johnson Center for Philanthropy then introduced himself and had everyone share their previous board experience. He outlined the board's legal and financial responsibility for the organization and its role in hiring/firing the executive director. He went over the IRS-defined duties of a board (care, loyalty, and obedience), providing examples about obtaining bids and making investments as a prudent person would. He stressed the legal definition of conflict of interest being up down and sideways (parent, child, spouse) financially. Typically it can be addressed through non-voting by the interested party, having them be one of three bids for services, and potentially even eliminating their presence or participation in the relevant discussion. Developers in particular would present, step back from the conversation, and answer questions if needed. At times, if they wish to also speak in favor of the project, physically changing seats can be sufficient. The interpersonal aspects provide an additional challenge. The important thing is that there may not be any quid pro quo. In general, we want to be sure we pass the sniff test. Obedience refers to the law; having controls in place helps with this item. Jason wrapped up this section by explaining that the board acts as a group, and should not delegate its responsibilities to one person, especially financial.

Jason went on to discuss the 10 basic activities of a board. He shared that a lukewarm perspective on an executive director is useless. Every board should be committed to either fire or coach. In relationship with its executive director, a board should outline what's needed, review what is being done, and ask how to provide support. A discussion followed on instructions and following them; the bottom line is that a board as a whole can issue directives, while requests

from individual members are more like suggestions. This issue can be addressed with policy documents identifying which areas are important enough to the board to be addressed a certain way. We will spend some time on this issue in 2019. Regarding support, Loretta pointed out that poker events have been negatively impacted by the new room at Gun Lake and that therefore we need to recruit players as well.

We spent some time discussing executive director review which is a best practice and which many of those present expressed interest in conducting. It's a good chance to clarify expectations both within the board and between the board and ED. It gives an opportunity to hear both good and bad, and avoid burn out. Methods for establishing goals vary from organization to organization. Some are staff-driven while others are board-heavy. It's important to consider organizational sustainability as part of it. A couple of items mentioned at this point were lights on the stairs and buying the community garden.

Chris relayed Pat's update that Third Coast would like to start construction on the north end of the 500 Lafayette block in the spring. Their design is going to the Development Committee.

We turned our attention to our major goals, and Jason explained that we should define actions that can be carried out whether by staff, board members or volunteers in order to move the work forward over the next 12-14 months. We will then be able to evaluate action completion. For example, regarding Belknap hill we can attend relevant meetings, monitor the DDA, ensure community input (hopefully by arranging a focus group with the neighborhood at our 2019 annual meeting), and conducting outreach. Another idea was to acknowledge donors in the design. For the Hastings Connector, we can find out if it is possible to expand the park to the south and continue communication with neighbors. Barb pointed out we need to provide an update on Trowbridge. For pedestrian crossings, the North Quarter CID is talking about Plainfield/Leonard intersection. MobileGR will have an update about crosswalks. There was a question about the cobblestone roads; they are historic landmarks.

Jason will have GVSU staff send us a template to continue gathering possible action steps via email. Elianna will arrange for a speaker from the City to explain CDBG in 2019. We may consider a potluck for a different date in December to evaluate action steps and enable Elianna to attend the Dec 11 Coit PTO meeting.

4. Jackie and Dan spoke briefly. The topic of communication was raised. Elianna provided a Housing NOW update; City staff are recommending moving most of the ADU language forward (so they would be by right) as well as the reduction from 18 to 14 feet on both 2-4 units and the non-condo zero lot line. They will seek legal information for number of occupants for an ADU and adding more teeth to the density bonus. 2-4 units and the noncondo zero lot line placement should be reserved for the master plan. We will review how the recommendations align with our ASP.

5. The meeting was adjourned.

Neighbors of Belknap Lookout Annual Meeting Notes

Tuesday, November 13, 2018

Board Members Present:	Brian Bremer	Rob Kennedy	Loretta Klimaszewski
	Barbara LaBeau	Todd Leinberger	Dean Rosendall

Board Members Absent: Loren Sturuss
Jonathan Swets
Staff Present: Elianna Bootzin
Guests Present: See sign in sheet

1. Welcome - Board members introduced themselves.
2. Brief Statements from NOBL Board Candidates/Vote for 3 Open Seats - Candidates introduced themselves and why they are running for the board after item 4 on the agenda.
3. Guest Presentation: Opportunities for Involvement at Coit School – Abby Clayton, KSSN - Abby talked about the need for help during drop off, recess, and mentoring one on one or small groups. Information will remain available at the NOBL office. Christy Dam shared that Art Night will take place Wednesday January 23 and there will be opportunities to help with set up, greeting, and activity stations.
4. Guest Presentation: Hastings Connector – Rick DeVries, City of Grand Rapids - Rick walked the group through an 11”x17” handout displaying the components of the project to be completed through four contracts; copies will remain available at the NOBL office. Early next year there will be a design meeting with property owners. The process will be similar to other projects. The completion of the Linear Park is contract 4 and will be bid through MDOT. We will know if it receives the current round of funding in February.
5. Q&A if desired to augment display: GVSU Campus – Pat Waring, GVSU - Pat and Lisa Haynes talked about the construction of the Interprofessional Health Center, parking ramp and bus loop taking place on Michigan.
6. Development Details: Coit Square – Jason Vos, RJM - Jason explained the plans for up to fifty condos on the 600 block of Coit across from Coit Creative Arts Academy. Notes are limited as recorder was counting votes. Additional details are available in Development notes.
7. Development Details: Mixed Income Housing on Trowbridge – Brad Rosely, Third Coast - Brad explained the plans for fifty apartments (70% affordable) requested by the neighborhood and further defined by GVSU’s RFP for Trowbridge across from Coit Church. They should know if they get LIHTC credits in January.
8. Announcement of Curb Appeal Contest Winner / Thanks to Outgoing Board Members - Congratulations to Michele DeWinter on Fairview for winning the curb appeal contest, made possible by GVSU. Thank you to Barbara LaBeau for her service on the board.
9. Announcement of New Board Members / General Meeting Conclusion - Robin Benton, Todd Leinberger, and Dan Miller were elected to the board.

Neighbors of Belknap Lookout Special Meeting Notes

Tuesday, November 13, 2018

Board Members Present:	Brian Bremer	Rob Kennedy	Loretta Klimaszewski
	Todd Leinberger	Dean Rosendall	Loren Sturuss
Board Members Absent:	Barbara LaBeau	Jonathan Swets	
Staff Present:	Elianna Bootzin		
Guests Present:	Robin Benton	Jim Brodi	Steve Faas
	Angel Gonzalez	Marshall Grate	Dan Miller
	Alan Otis	Don Rietema	Brad Rosely
	Jason Vos	~4 more neighbors	

Vote on Endorsement of Developments for Planning Commission: Belknap Place: The group reiterated NOBL's involvement throughout the process of RFP creation and vendor selection for the Trowbridge site. The building is reminiscent of one on Fulton. The roof is sloped like that of Coit Church. The group sought public comment. Angel Gonzalez said it was a good process, criteria were established prior to Third Coast coming on board, such as the maximum height. There was an inquiry about how students could be excluded; Brad responded that it was a LIHTC federal mandate, and that there is yearly government accountability required. They can't prioritize renting to Belknap residents but we and they can spread the word that the apartments are available. The roof will be primarily shingle but there will be standing seam on the dormers. Todd moved that we provide a letter of support to the planning commission of the project as presented. The board voted in favor of the motion.

Vote on Endorsement of Developments for Planning Commission: Coit Square. The Development Committee was ambivalent and wanted neighbor input. Several of them hoped to see 43-50 units. Brian Bremer reiterated that he would prefer lower density, the original (Artesian Group) design with no curb cuts. Angel Gonzalez talked about the lot Area per unit. The ASP shows mixed density housing. The project is 1011 sq ft per unit. 123 Newberry is 1500 sq ft per unit, there are 849 sq ft per unit at the Gateway and 863 sq ft per unit at the Trowbridge Lofts. A neighbor inquired about snow removal; they do haul snow offsite. There was also a question about safety on the pathways; they have a photo metric plan that includes keeping the walk lit at night. Alan Otis noted that the units successfully selling as condos is not guaranteed (ICON on Bond ended up being rental) and made density comparisons to other lots. Angel's home would have 6 units and 10 cars. The brownstones would be 16 units and 26 cars. He feels the project is too dense. Marshall Grate agreed, noting that this project would set a precedent for the future. The west side of Coit is LDR, and the area around the park varies. He inquired about future neighbors, since under 1600 sq ft seemed low for a family so retirees and younger people seem more likely to live there. Don Rietema lives on the 200 block of College which is very dense. He noted we are setting the stage for the next 100 years. Steve Faas also feels it is too dense. He mentioned the curb cuts, parking location, and impact at Coit Creative Arts Academy. He suggested the ASP may not have understood the implications. We noted that Todd has a conflict of interest and will not be voting. The questions are whether this is an improvement over what exists now and whether it will be good for the neighborhood. Someone asked if the Gateway was full. The 600 block of Clancy has 6 open units. Dean said he would be good at 45

units. Loretta motioned to support; the motion failed. The project was referred back to the Development Committee to review a plan with reduced density.

Authorization of Signatories for LMCU – Elianna Bootzin was authorized to sign for the minisplit loan.

Neighbors of Belknap Lookout Special Meeting Notes

Monday, December 10, 2018

Board Members Present:	Brian Bremer	Rob Kennedy	Loretta Klimaszewski
	Barbara LaBeau	Todd Leinberger	Dean Rosendall
	Loren Sturrus	Jonathan Swets	
Staff Present:	Elianna Bootzin		
Guests Present:	Jim Brodi	Deb Eerdmans	Anne & Mark Elve
	Steve Faas	Angel Gonzalez	Tara Gonzalez
	Marshall Grate	Bill Hebert	Kneeah Maldonado
	Dan Miller	Don Rietema	Brad Rosely
	John Soto	Gretchen Warnimont	~3 more

Jim Brodi from Integrated Architecture presented. Jason Vos from RJM was unable to attend due to a death in the family.

The project started with Angel in 2015. There were 28 units on Coit, with the architecture almost identical to what is being proposed now. Another 15 units were on the alley, for a total of 43. The project included the Fairbanks lot but not lot #9 (Jill's). Since then, the former has been excluded after being refurbished and sold and the latter added. All onsite parking was on the alley plus five spots were expected to be on street, for a total of 43 cars, a 1:1 ratio.

RJM's first Development Committee meeting was in September. The lot changes resulted in a loss of 2000 sq ft and a gain of 5100 sq ft, for a net gain of 3100 sq ft. There were 28 units on the alley at that point for a total of 54 units. There were 84 parking spots, with cars in driveways off Coit behind a screen. The main concerns at that meeting were the number of cars visible.

At the first October Development Committee meeting, the design kept the screen but reduced to 2 cars in driveway, adding (side-facing) garages to increase parking to 92 spaces. The concern at this point was the number of curb cuts.

At the second October Development Committee meeting, Coit units were reduced to 22 and back (alley) units increased to 28 for a total of 50. The range was 48-52. There were 79 parking spots. The lowest price point is \$165k for a studio between 500 and 600 sq ft. The top end is likely 350-400k. Someone could pay ~\$500k to combine two units.

Jim explained the challenge was to navigate the triangle of cost/affordability, density, and parking. When one goes up or down, it affects the others. He offered a comparison to Belknap Place, the apartments on Trowbridge across from Coit Church that passed easily at the annual

meeting, suggesting that with homeownership as opposed to apartments this would be an even greater benefit to the neighborhood. We also noted what the ASP calls for on Coit (mixed density).

Steve Faas noted that GVSU owns five blocks and beyond those development is supposed to step down in height and density, especially on the hill/Fairview. Someone suggested that the new design would have lower impact than what is currently approved. As at the last meeting, it was asked what would happen if the condos didn't sell. The borders and therefore transition areas are defined in the ASP. The Clancy side of the block in question has been built as apartments. Several Coit residents already don't have a place to park. The City rule of thumb is to develop 1:1 parking per unit.

Gretchen Warnimont noted the displacement that will happen when this project moves forward. She said that parking has always been problematic. Her position at the Development Committee level is that she expects the developer to "do it right" - she was a yes vote but not 100% in favor. Tara Gonzalez spoke in favor of the project. She noted that you can't tell the number of units that have been built on Fairview, and that building the larger project allows the developer to spread the cost across units. Marshall Grate is concerned about the density and transition.

Rob Kennedy asked about presales of the micro units. There is already interest from 14-15 potential buyers; one already moved into Newberry Co-housing. Another neighbor talked about helping renovate the NOBL building and complete the brownstones. He can't afford to buy one of the new condos yet but he likes them and feels they bring up the area. Elianna Bootzin followed up on Gretchen's comment about displacement by asking about assistance to be provided to current tenants. Tara helps them find new places. The Artesian Group submitted an MOU to the City that they will return deposits, provide first month's rent, and help with the move; RJM has committed to keeping that arrangement. The first priority is to keep people in the neighborhood.

A neighbor from Coit and Bradford felt that the opportunity for homeownership is a benefit to the neighborhood. Marshall asked about families - there are some bigger units and the option to combine. This project is not intended to be apartments. Tara noted that she had urged Angel not to sell. Elianna shared that she spoke with Sydney McVoy who would prefer the lower density several neighbors are advocating but does not feel it is worth a big fight. Bill Hebert shared his views on parking, routings, and density. Philosophically, the slippery slope argument is not logical but needs airing. What is our trip wire as a neighborhood? Do we need to revisit the ASP?

Don reiterated that the development is too dense. In Heritage Hill, they experience the same challenges we (will) have with parking and enforcement. Brian suggested that the design should dictate the density. He prefers no curb cuts. Angel clarified that the yellow "low density" portion of the ASP expects 1-3 units per lot.

Dean Rosendall shared that he would certainly like to see a project here. He likes a smaller number and feels that the parking works. The reduction from 5 to 3 curb cuts is good. He prefers 48' wide buildings to 60'. The project is 2.5 stories. He noted CopperRock was purposeful to

reduce density at Fairview in order to increase parking. Overall he feels this Development is still too dense. Angel was able to achieve a lower density because he was a solo developer (didn't have to answer to other people).

Angel reminded the group that this project is now a smaller scale than the original. Brian thought that block was going to be the first heading for renovation. The obstacle is the number. Dan Miller wanted to know what the middle ground might be between what is there now and what is proposed. John Soto pointed out that like it or not things are going to be happening in the neighborhood. No one else felt s need to speak and the discussion portion of the meeting concluded.

The board had a short discussion on conflict of interest. Todd Leinberger has a role in the transaction and will not be voting. However he also felt it would be prudent to exclude Dean from the vote as well. Wikipedia defines conflict of interest as a person or organization involved in multiple interests and serving one could go against the interest of another. Conflict of interest is distinct from impropriety; it is merely the presence of undue interest. There is also the possibility of the perception of a conflict whether such influence actually exists or not. Dean said that he did talk to the City and that Angel had voted on Dean's project. Dean would eventually like to see the final project approved though not in its current form. He believes he can think objectively. He also said moving forward helps improve the neighborhood; Brian agreed. Loretta Klimaszewski was also concerned about the appearance of a conflict.

Gretchen pointed out that at the last October Development Committee meeting the group agreed to approve the project [final wording was move it forward]. She said we could stall if we want, Dean shouldn't vote, and we need a new introduction to the ASP - even after the length of time it has been in use it is not set in stone. She pointed out that we look stupid when we don't agree but we shouldn't go back on our word. Angel noted that the Development Committee always gives projects a thumbs up or thumbs down so the current split is very unusual but we wanted to hear neighbors and did. Dean suggested moving the modesty walls back and would be happy with 45 units. We concluded that Dean will not vote. Loren only votes in the case of a tie.

Rob moved approval, Barbara LaBeau seconded citing the opportunity to establish a self-sufficient neighborhood. Loretta joined them to pass the project 3 to 2 (Brian and Jon Swets opposed). Elianna will write a letter of support with key points to mention including the lack of unanimity and that it will include 5 units meeting the City's definition of affordable.

A final question was raised regarding the "tipping point" for the neighborhood. Jon responded that each project is considered on its own merits. The meeting was adjourned.

Meeting Information

1. Administration/Policy
 - a. Choose officers – Our bylaws call for a chair, vice chair, secretary, and treasurer. The same individuals elected to these offices today will be authorized as signatories on our bank forms. [Fill out LMCU form; MPCU collects signatures.]

- b. Conflict of Interest - We collect statements from all board members annually. We have updated our policy to reflect that individuals affiliated with competing real estate projects should not vote on project endorsements to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest, as well as the basic exclusion from participating in selecting one's own company for a vendor transaction.
- c. Executive Review – We talked in October about the importance of executive review for setting expectations both among the board members themselves as well as between board and staff. How did Elianna do in 2018? Did she meet your expectations? Are there areas that stood out as exemplary and are there places you would prefer to see something done differently? (Not open to public.)

Our 2018 goals were:

- to hold two fundraisers (we held three poker events);
- to increase our network
 - o Email contacts from 146 to 250, actual at year end 272 (22>goal);
 - o Facebook contacts from 126 to 230, actual at year end 200 (30<goal);
 - o NextDoor contacts from 224 to 330, actual at year end 319 (11<goal);
 - o Paid members steady at 70, actually eliminated paid membership and raised \$4,450 from individuals and Gracehill (\$3,150 for the furnace).
- to complete current GVSU PILOT projects
 - o Spent down and finished activities for 5/8 projects: clear vegetation (trim trees over sidewalks), communications (3 postcards), curb appeal (ran contest), litter reduction (held pickups), trail cams (bought and distributed for crime prevention).
 - o Retain funds and will continue 3/8 projects: spay/neuter feral cats (caught 12, continue feeding, work with CSNIP for remaining), mobility (likely to work with neighbors for traffic calming on and near Fairview this year), and trash cans (waiting for City to determine where they are putting theirs so we can buy and place ours in addition to the 8 put out by the Rapid that neighbors are emptying).
- to advance major public space goals (see packet header for details)

2. Strategy

- a. Set individual and organization 2019 goals – How far should we expect to advance our goals this year? What measurable outcomes should we be looking for? What commitments are feasible for each board member?
- b. Collect steps for reaching goals to compile into work plan – What steps need to happen to make reaching our 2019 goals possible? Who will do what, when? This will at least start as a writing exercise. Elianna will compile notes into a work plan to be shared and potentially updated next month.

3. Budget

- a. Approve 2019 budget – While spending will be affected by the specific goals we set, they will primarily be within the “Neighborhood Improvement” line which we will subdivide by project next month as we determine our 2nd PILOT request.

2019 NOBL Budget

Income

Contributions, Gifts & Grants	\$	27,000.00	Fundraising plus PILOT
Gaming & Fundraising Events	\$	20,000.00	2 evening events
Interest Income	\$	40.00	
Program Service Revenue	\$	6,600.00	Rent
CDBG	\$	35,300.00	Allocation is up thru Jun '19
Total	\$	88,940.00	

Expense

Salaries & Related Expenses

Unemployment Insurance	\$	50.00
Wages	\$	30,500.00
Employer FICA	\$	2,500.00
Worker's Comp Insurance	\$	319.00
<i>Salaries & Related Expenses Subtotal</i>	<i>\$</i>	<i>33,369.00</i>

Occupancy

Building Maintenance	\$	1,000.00	AC & Fridge
Utilities	\$	2,000.00	down w new furnace
Property Taxes	\$	2,350.00	main floor 2x, back to \$1800 in 2020
Telephone Internet	\$	1,200.00	
Other	\$	3,131.89	
<i>Occupancy Subtotal</i>	<i>\$</i>	<i>9,681.89</i>	

Supplies	\$	600.00	
Postage	\$	700.00	Only 1 postcard
Printing and Pub	\$	800.00	Only 1 postcard
Accounting/Payroll	\$	400.00	Rate goes up midyear
Training	\$	1,000.00	Master Citizen Planner cont. ed.
Insurance	\$	800.00	
Service Charge	\$	699.96	Loan
Special Events Expense	\$	10,000.00	2 evening events
Other	\$	600.00	
Neighborhood Improvement	\$	28,000.00	

Grand Total **\$** **86,650.85**

Net Rev (Loss) \$ 2,289.15

Regular Report Contents:

Crime (last four weeks) from www.crimemapping.com



Fire from <https://grandrapids.maps.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=50bbc7410e5447b99edde0e32d62f4c4> (one week)



Public Safety:

- We continue to share public safety flyers and help businesses with fire inspections.

Development:

- Permit is in to build a new reservoir fill chamber in the fenced off part of Reservoir Park.
- Permit is in to build 3 Trowbridge.
- Permit is in to build the “loon” (bus turnaround) between Cook DeVos and the new GVSU building.

Updates on Old Business

- No further updates on 712 North, office signage, homeless encampment.
- HousingNOW – First set of changes have been adopted; second set will be considered in February. See mass emails to the neighborhood for more details.
- Lighting on stairs – Suzanne (Planning) has contacted additional City staff for info.

Other NOBL updates/use of staff time:

- We lost our State property tax hearing and will now pay full tax on the building.
- The new furnace and minisplit were installed!
- Created a website for the North End Welless Coalition, www.northendwellness.org and helping coordinate signage for the North End Trails.
- Helped prepare for 1/23 Community Art Night at Coit (we are their NMF fiduciary).
- Sent an introduction/solicitation to property owners living outside the neighborhood.
- We passed our CDBG audit with the City and will apply for the next round of funds.

Other area news:

- MSU is in the process of planning their next building on Michigan by Monroe. The Board of Trustees authorized MSU administration to enter into a Public Private Partnership (P3) with Health Innovation Partners, a joint venture between MB Real Estate, Walsh Construction/Walsh Investors and Rockford Construction & Development. The building will provide tenant lease space for MSU and other stakeholders that will support the MSU research and health care innovation cycle. The project may include a future building along Monroe Street on the site (referred to as Building 3) for additional, yet-to-be-determined, program space that will complement the research, education and innovation mission of Michigan State University. It is anticipated that construction could begin in the fourth quarter of 2019, with substantial completion in late 2021.
- Exciting discussion on crosswalks at the MobileGR meeting at 8 am 11/8: A proposal to go to durable materials that last three years; start up costs are fairly significant and then it settles at an annual cost \$175k higher than the current \$450k for water-based paint.
- There's also an item on gateway treatments (adding things like the "stop for pedestrians" signs); it's got a lot of specifics on where is appropriate that is kind of hard to parse. They plan to be proactive in choosing locations where they are needed so neighborhoods won't necessarily have to go through the process of requesting them.
- 1001 Monroe has requested reimbursement for eligible brownfield expenses as part of their approved Brownfield plan.
- City's Economic Development team is considering protocols around displacement similar to GVSU's tenant relocation protocol. Elianna will be providing a joint presentation on the relocation protocol and other options for neighborhood involvement in construction projects at the 2019 Neighborhood Summit (March 2).
- November 13 City of GR Committee of the Whole included a report from Police Chief Rahinsky on responses to the policy & procedure task force & the 21st Century Policing consultants; http://grandrapidscitymi.iqm2.com/Citizens/Detail_Meeting.aspx?ID=4699
- Belknap, Canal and Highland Parks are within 1000 feet of parcels suitable for medical marijuana businesses. A public hearing on park waivers is expected to take place sometime next spring.
- The Kent County Commission voted Thursday December 20 to dissolve the Kent County Land Bank Authority (which owns the lot at 762 North we have been using for a community garden). They will have until December 31, 2019 to dispose of their property and wrap up operations. We'll follow what that means for the neighborhood garden.

Neighbors of Belknap Lookout

Conflict of Interest Policy

Article I **Purpose**

The purpose of the conflict of interest policy is 1) to protect Neighbors of Belknap Lookout's (the Organization) interest when it is contemplating entering into a transaction or arrangement that might benefit the private interest of an officer or director of the organization or might result in a possible excess benefit transaction, 2) to protect the Organization from the appearance of a conflict of interest when determining positions to be shared at local government public hearings, and 3) to protect the Organization's interest and/or prevent the appearance of a conflict of interest in any other similar situations which may arise. This policy is intended to supplement but not replace any applicable state and federal laws governing conflict of interest applicable to nonprofit and charitable organizations.

Article II

1. Interested Person

Any director, officer, or member of a committee governing board-delegated powers, which has a direct or indirect financial interest, as defined below, is an interested person.

2. Financial Interest

A person has a financial interest if the person has, directly or indirectly, through business, investment or family:

a. An ownership or investment interest in any entity with which the Organization has a transaction, arrangement, or potential to support at a government public hearing;

b. A compensation arrangement with NOBL or with any entity or individual with which NOBL has a transaction, arrangement, or potential to support at a government public hearing; or

c. A potential ownership or investment interest in, or compensation arrangement with, any entity or individual with which NOBL is negotiating a transaction, arrangement, or support at a government hearing; or

d. An existing or potential ownership or investment interest, or compensation arrangement with, any entity or individual in direct competition with an entity or individual with which NOBL is negotiating a transaction, arrangement, or support at a government hearing.

Compensation includes direct and indirect remuneration as well as gifts or favors that are not insubstantial.

A financial interest is not necessarily a conflict of interest. Under Article II Section 2, a person who has a financial interest may have a conflict of interest only if the appropriate governing board or committee decides that a conflict of interest exists. These bodies should make their determinations broadly in order to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest as well.

Article III **Procedures**

1. Duty to Disclose

In connection with any actual or possible conflict of interest an interested person must disclose the existence of the financial interest and be given the opportunity to disclose all material facts to the directors and members of committees with governing board-delegated powers considering the proposed transaction, arrangement, or support.

2. Determining Whether a Conflict of Interest Exists

After disclosure of the financial interest and all material facts and after discussion with the interested person, he/she may leave the governing board or committee meeting while the determination of a conflict of interest is discussed and voted upon. The remaining board or committee members shall decide if a conflict of interest exists or would be generally perceived to exist.

3. Procedures for Addressing the Conflict of Interest

a. An interested person may make a presentation at the governing board or committee meeting, but after the presentation, he/she may be asked to leave the meeting during the discussion of, and the vote on, the transaction, arrangement, or support involving the possible conflicts of interest. This is strongly encouraged in cases of transactions or arrangements, where the following additional steps may be needed:

b. The chairperson of the governing board or committee shall, if appropriate, appoint a disinterested person or committee to investigate alternatives to the proposed transaction or arrangement.

c. After exercising due diligence, the governing board or committee shall determine whether the Organization can obtain with reasonable efforts a more advantageous transaction or arrangement from a person or entity that would not give rise to a conflict of interest.

d. If a more advantageous transaction or arrangement is not reasonably possible under circumstances not producing a conflict of interest, the governing board or committee shall determine by a majority vote of the disinterested directors whether the transaction or arrangement is in the Organization's best interest, for its own benefit, and whether it is fair and reasonable. In conformity with the above determination it shall make its decision as to whether to enter into the transaction or arrangement.

4. Violations of the Conflicts of Interest Policy

a. If the governing board or committee has reasonable cause to believe a member has failed to disclose actual, possible, or perceived conflicts of interest, it shall inform the member of the basis for such belief and afford the member an opportunity to explain the alleged failure to disclose.

b. If after hearing the member's response and after making further investigation as warranted by the circumstances, the governing board or committee determines the member has failed to disclose an actual or possible conflict of interest, it shall take appropriate disciplinary and corrective action. At a minimum, it should complete remaining conflict of interest procedures.

Article IV **Records of Proceedings**

The minutes of the governing board and all committees with board delegated powers shall contain:

a. The names of the persons who disclosed or otherwise were found to have a financial interest in connection with an actual, possible, or perceived conflict of interest, the nature of the financial interest, any action taken to determine whether a conflict of interest was present, and the governing board's or committee's decision as to whether a conflict of interest in fact existed.

b. The names of the persons who were present for discussions and votes relating to the transaction, arrangement, or support, the content of the discussion, including any alternatives to the proposed transaction or arrangement, and a record of any votes taken in connection with the proceedings.

Article V **Compensation**

a. A voting member of the governing board who receives compensation, directly or indirectly, from the Organization for services is precluded from voting on matters pertaining to that member's compensation.

b. A voting member of any committee whose jurisdiction includes compensation matters and who receives compensation, directly or indirectly, from the Organization for services is precluded from voting on matters pertaining to that member's compensation.

c. No voting member of the governing board or any committee whose jurisdiction includes compensation matters and who receives compensation, directly or indirectly, from the Organization, either individually or collectively, is prohibited from providing information to any committee regarding compensation.

1st instance of this page – your file copy.

Article VI
Annual Statements

Each director, officer and members of a committee with governing board-delegated powers shall annually sign a statement, which affirms such person:

- a. Has received a copy of the conflicts of interest policy.
- b. Has read and understands the policy.
- c. Has agreed to comply with the policy and
- d. Understands the Organization is charitable and in order to maintain its federal tax exemption it must engage primarily in activities, which accomplish one or more of its tax-exempt purposes.

Article VII
Periodic Reviews

To ensure the Organization operates in a manner consistent with charitable purposes and does not engage in activities that could jeopardize its tax-exempt status, periodic reviews shall be conducted. The periodic reviews shall, at a minimum, include the following subjects:

- a. Whether compensation arrangements and benefits are reasonable, based on competent survey information, and the result of arm’s length bargaining.
- b. Whether partnerships, joint ventures, and arrangements with management organizations conform to the Organization’s written policies, are properly recorded, reflect reasonable investment or payments for goods and services, further charitable purposes and do not result in impermissible private benefit or in an excess benefit transaction.

Article VIII
Use of Outside Experts

When conducting the periodic reviews as provided for in Article VII, NOBL may, but need not, use outside advisors. If outside experts are used, their use shall not relieve the governing board of its responsibility for ensuring periodic reviews are conducted.

Signature

Your signature below indicates you agree with annual statements a-d in Section VI above.

Signature	Title	Date
-----------	-------	------

This document became effective on January 8, 2019.

Page repeated deliberately to collect signature.

Article VI
Annual Statements

Each director, officer and members of a committee with governing board-delegated powers shall annually sign a statement, which affirms such person:

- b. Has received a copy of the conflicts of interest policy.
- b. Has read and understands the policy.
- c. Has agreed to comply with the policy and

d. Understands the Organization is charitable and in order to maintain its federal tax exemption it must engage primarily in activities, which accomplish one or more of its tax-exempt purposes.

Article VII
Periodic Reviews

To ensure the Organization operates in a manner consistent with charitable purposes and does not engage in activities that could jeopardize its tax-exempt status, periodic reviews shall be conducted. The periodic reviews shall, at a minimum, include the following subjects:

- a. Whether compensation arrangements and benefits are reasonable, based on competent survey information, and the result of arm’s length bargaining.
- b. Whether partnerships, joint ventures, and arrangements with management organizations conform to the Organization’s written policies, are properly recorded, reflect reasonable investment or payments for goods and services, further charitable purposes and do not result in impermissible private benefit or in an excess benefit transaction.

Article VIII
Use of Outside Experts

When conducting the periodic reviews as provided for in Article VII, NOBL may, but need not, use outside advisors. If outside experts are used, their use shall not relieve the governing board of its responsibility for ensuring periodic reviews are conducted.

Signature

Your signature below indicates you agree with annual statements a-d in Section VI above.

Signature	Title	Date
-----------	-------	------

This document became effective on January 8, 2019.

How far should we expect to advance our goals this year? What measurable outcomes should we be looking for? What commitments are feasible for each board member?

Collect steps for reaching goals to compile into work plan – What steps need to happen to happen to make reaching our 2019 goals possible? Who will do what, when? This will at least start as a writing exercise. Elianna will compile notes into a work plan to be shared and potentially updated next month.

Improving access down Belknap hill (design DDA budget FY2020)

Sub-goal for 2019:

Measurable Outcomes:

Personal commitments:

Steps:

Basic description	Who?	When?	Other notes

Hastings Connector & Linear Park (implementation City of Grand Rapids summer 2019 & 2020)

Sub-goal for 2019:

Measurable Outcomes:

Personal commitments:

Steps:

Basic description	Who?	When?	Other notes

How far should we expect to advance our goals this year? What measurable outcomes should we be looking for? What commitments are feasible for each board member?

Collect steps for reaching goals to compile into work plan – What steps need to happen to happen to make reaching our 2019 goals possible? Who will do what, when? This will at least start as a writing exercise. Elianna will compile notes into a work plan to be shared and potentially updated next month.

Better Pedestrian Connections (MobileGR planning durable crosswalk and “stop for pedestrian” signs)

Sub-goal for 2019:

Measurable Outcomes:

Personal commitments:

Steps:

Basic description	Who?	When?	Other notes

Social Connections

Sub-goal for 2019:

Measurable Outcomes:

Personal commitments:

Steps:

Basic description	Who?	When?	Other notes

How far should we expect to advance our goals this year? What measurable outcomes should we be looking for? What commitments are feasible for each board member?

Collect steps for reaching goals to compile into work plan – What steps need to happen to happen to make reaching our 2019 goals possible? Who will do what, when? This will at least start as a writing exercise. Elianna will compile notes into a work plan to be shared and potentially updated next month.

Active in the Neighborhood

Sub-goal for 2019:

Measurable Outcomes:

Personal commitments:

Steps:

Basic description	Who?	When?	Other notes

Voices Heard in Local Gov't

Sub-goal for 2019:

Measurable Outcomes:

Personal commitments:

Steps:

Basic description	Who?	When?	Other notes