

NORTHWEST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION OF THE CITY OF GRESHAM

Report of the Grievance Review Panel

In the matter of the complaint of Andra Fletcher and Joel Kastel dated July 2, 2026

Panel: Christian Burgess · Britt McConn · Laurie Monnes Anderson

I. Background and Procedure

On July 2, 2026 the Board received a written complaint under Article XI from Andra Fletcher and Joel Kastel, co-owners of 690 NW Angeline Ave, concerning a June 30, 2026 interaction at that property with the Association's Co-Land Use Directors, John Bildsoe and Tricia Bootzin. This panel was convened under Article XI, Section 2; all parties waived the fifteen-day deadline and accepted the panel on July 20, 2026. The panel met in a publicly noticed, recorded meeting on August 19, 2026 at the East County Library, with minutes kept; the recording and minutes are available to all parties. Panel decisions are by majority vote (Art. XI §2).

Materials reviewed: the complaint; both respondents' written statements, provided at the panel's request; the Bylaws; Association minutes from October 20, 2025 through July 9, 2026 and the recording of the October 20, 2025 Annual Meeting; City of Gresham records for the property, including Pre-Application Summary PRE-25-00049 (March 21, 2025), which describes the proper owners, and photographs taken June 30, 2026, submitted by Mr. Bildsoe in the written statement.

II. Scope and Standard of Review

Article XI, Section 1 defines a grievance as a complaint alleging a violation of these Bylaws; the Bylaws are the panel's only standard. Questions of law including trespass and the location of property boundaries are outside the Association's authority, and the panel makes no findings of law.

Under Article XI, Sections 2 and 4, the panel reviews, determines standing, attempts resolution, and reports findings and a recommendation; final resolution is reserved to the members at a hearing, should one be held.

III. Determination of Standing

The Bylaws use "standing" without defining it. The panel construes it as membership under Article IV, Section 1, which includes owners of property within the Association's boundaries. The petitioners are the owners of record of 690 NW Angeline Ave, verified in City permit records, within the Article III boundaries. The complaint was filed two days after the incident within the thirty-day window and contains every element Article XI, Section 1 requires.

The panel determines, unanimously, that the petitioners have standing. They qualify under any reasonable definition of the term. Standing concerns who may file a grievance, not whether the conduct alleged violated the Bylaws.

IV. Findings

Preliminary finding — neighborhood notification

The City determined in writing, before construction began, that this project required no land use application:

"No part of this proposal currently requires separate land use approval before building permitting." — City of Gresham Pre-Application Summary PRE-25-00049, Mar. 21, 2025

Because no land use application was required, no Early Neighborhood Notification, public notice, or comment period applied. This confirms the petitioners' statement that the project did not require neighborhood notification. That result comes from state middle-housing legislation.

Finding 1 — Art. VI §9, §9.E: the Co-Land Use Director positions. No violation (unanimous).

The complaint alleges:

“...the appointment of co-Land Use Directors does not appear to be authorized under the bylaws.” — Complaint, p. 2

The panel finds the arrangement authorized. The Board consists of the officers, the Land Use Director,

“...and any additional members determined by vote of the membership.” — Art. VI §2

The membership elected Mr. Bildsoe and Ms. Bootzin as Co-Land Use Directors at the October 20, 2025 Annual Meeting by a slate vote of 18–0, as the minutes and recording confirm; Article VI, Section 4 expressly permits slate elections. The position is an office of the Board, not a committee. Nor are the Directors' duties confined to Section 9.E's enumerated functions, Board members are also directed to:

“...work together to manage the affairs of the Association between membership meetings and assign or reassign any duties or tasks among Board members to ensure a well-functioning Board.” — Art. VI §9

Gathering information about a development in the neighborhood falls within those general duties. The panel acknowledges the Bylaws' wording is unclear on this point and addresses it in Part VII.

Finding 2 — Art. IX: conflict of interest. No violation (2–1).

Article IX requires disclosure when a conflict of interest relates to an item under discussion before a decision-making body:

“Whenever a member determines that they have a conflict of interest relating to an item under discussion, they must inform the body hearing the proposal ... and this must be recorded in the minutes. The member may elect to abstain from voting ...” — Art. IX

The June 30 visit involved no item under discussion, no hearing body, and no vote. Article IX did not apply.

Even if the complaint's account were accepted in full, including its attribution of a critical remark about the cottages at an Association meeting, no conflict of interest would follow. An opinion is not a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest requires a personal interest combined with the power to influence an outcome. The respondents had no authority over the property and nothing to gain from the visit.

The Association exists in part:

“...to represent the views of the membership before public or private bodies ... with special emphasis on planning and land use.” — Art. II

The membership elected Ms. Bootzin to this role knowing of her work on middle-housing issues, including drafting the Association’s letter to elected officials, which the membership voted to distribute. Expressing views on land use is part of the role described in Article II. It is not a conflict of interest.

When this grievance came before the Board on July 9, 2026, both respondents recused themselves. That is what Article IX requires in the settings where it applies.

Minority view (Monnes Anderson), recorded per Art. V §10: residential proximity to the property created a conflict of interest that should have been disclosed.

Finding 3 — Art. VI §9: professional and appropriate conduct. Sustained in part (2–1).

Board members must:

“...act professionally and appropriately in what they believe is the best interest of the Association.” — Art. VI §9

The panel’s finding rests on the respondent’s own written account, not on the complainants’ characterizations. Ms. Bootzin wrote:

“I let myself become defensive.”

“I didn’t stay as calm and collected as I would have liked to, which I regret.”

She acknowledges telling Ms. Fletcher that she was “being unpleasant.”

Based on that acknowledgment, a majority of the panel finds this conduct did not meet the Article VI, Section 9 standard. The panel makes no finding on the specific disputed words alleged in the complaint, which the respondent denies and which cannot be established on this record. The encounter was brief, unplanned, and heated on both sides.

Both respondents describe Mr. Bildsoe as calm throughout, and the complaint makes no specific allegation against him on this point. Ms. Bootzin’s written statement of regret was made before this panel reached any finding.

Minority view (Burgess), recorded per Art. V §10: the complaint’s characterizations are subjective descriptions of perception rather than fact, and a finding is not justified on this record.

Finding 4 — Art. II: purpose. No violation (unanimous).

The complaint characterizes the respondents’ actions as:

“...adversarial and inconsistent with cooperative citizen involvement.” — Complaint, p. 2

Article II states the Association’s purpose: an open forum on matters of common concern, education and cooperative action, representation of the membership’s views, and a communication link with the City, with special emphasis on planning and land use. The stated purpose of the June 30 visit was to gather information on refuse collection, street trees, fire access, and frontage conditions. The actions taken by the Co-Land Use Directors in response to common concerns raised at Association meetings. That purpose is consistent with Article II. The conduct of the encounter is addressed in Finding 3.

Finding 5 — Art. VIII: committees. Not applicable (unanimous).

Article VIII governs committees. No Land Use Committee exists; Section 9.E contemplates that the Director will:

“...chair the Land Use Committee if it exists.” — Art. VI §9.E

The respondents are elected officers of the Board, not a committee. Article VIII does not apply to the conduct alleged. The Bylaws’ wording on committees is a likely source of this confusion; see Part VII.

Note: the trespass allegation

Whether a trespass occurred is a question of law outside the Association’s authority. The panel makes no finding on it. The panel records the following observations derived from the photographs within the written statement: the frontage has no signage, fencing, sidewalk, or boundary marking; permitted utility work with municipal traffic cones was active there; a narrow strip of unimproved public right-of-way exists behind the curb; and when the owners identified the boundary, the respondents moved off the indicated boundary. These facts are relevant to Finding 3. They do not resolve any question of property law.

V. Attempt to Resolve (Art. XI §2)

The panel’s resolution consists of:

- The clarifications in Part IV, answering each allegation directly;
- The panel’s note that a written apology remains available at the discretion of Ms. Bootzin and the Board. Mandating one is beyond the panel’s authority.

VI. Response to the Proposed Remedies

- Convene a panel and conduct a full review: done; this report completes it.
- Corrective measures, including potential removal: The panel neither imposes nor recommends corrective measures.
- A formal written apology: left to the discretion of the respondent and the Board (Part V).
- Clarification of the Land Use Director role and Article IX review: agreed; see Part VII.
- Written confirmation of the resolution: provided by this report, delivered to the Board and all parties within fifteen days of completion (Art. XI §3).

VII. Recommendations

1. Hearing, Recommendation: that no hearing be scheduled. Four of the five allegations were resolved with no violation found. The one sustained finding is based on conduct the respondent acknowledged in writing. The panel does not believe a hearing would add anything to the resolution of this complaint.

2. Bylaws Committee. That the Board convene a Bylaws Committee (Art. VIII §6.A, chaired by the Vice President per Art. VI §9.B) to propose amendments clarifying: the positions the membership has created and how offices may be shared; the relationship between the Land Use Director's enumerated duties and Board members' general duties; expectations for conducting and documenting information gathering in the Association's name, including courtesy notice to affected property owners; and conflict-of-interest disclosure guidance. Several of the allegations in this grievance arose from unclear wording in the Bylaws. Clarifying that wording would help prevent similar grievances.

3. Communication to the membership. That the Board communicate the clarifications in Findings 1 and 5, the validity of the co-director position and the officer/committee distinction, to the membership at large.

Context, for completeness. The conditions underlying this dispute such as no neighborhood notification, no sidewalks, and no required parking, are the result of state middle-housing legislation. They are not the result of misconduct by the petitioners, the respondents, or the City. The Association's advocacy through the Coalition and its state legislators is the appropriate channel for those concerns and is outside this panel's scope.

VIII. Adoption

Prepared by panelist McConn per the panel's August 19, 2026 assignment, for review and adoption at a noticed meeting on 09/09/26. Upon adoption, delivery to the Board and all parties within fifteen days (Art. XI §3).

____ Signature on File _____ Date: _____

Christian Burgess, Panelist

____ Signature on File _____ Date: _____

Britt McConn, Panelist

____ Signature on File _____ Date: _____

Laurie Monnes Anderson, Panelist

