



CITY OF LOS ANGELES

**GREATER GRIFFITH PARK
NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL**

"Your Neighborhood. Your Voice. Your Council"



PRESIDENT
Philip Gasteier

VICE PRESIDENTS
Bruce Carroll – Administration
Rosemary DeMonte – Outreach

TREASURER
Tomas O'Grady

SECRETARY (Interim)
Mark F. Mauceri

**GOVERNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES (unapproved)**

Tuesday, May 19, 2009 – 7:00 pm

Los Feliz Community Police Center
1965 North Hillhurst Avenue, 2nd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90027

CERTIFIED COUNCIL #36

PO Box 27003
Los Angeles, CA 90027-0003
(323) 908-6054

www.ggpnc.org

GGPNC@ggpnc.org

01. CALL TO ORDER:

7:04 PM –

Greater Griffith Park Neighborhood Council (GGPNC) President, Philip Gasteier, called the meeting to order.

Board Members present (18):

Gasteier, Philip District D President	Carroll, Bruce District E VP, Administration	DeMonte, Rosemary Business Interests VP, Outreach
O'Grady, Tomas District D Treasurer		Mauceri, Mark District E Secretary (interim)
Arslanian, Nyla Charitable Groups	De Ocampo, Alex District C	
Howe, Laura District A	Hyams, Tor At-Large	Kerr, Jacqueline At-Large
Louyse, Kathryn District C	Napier, Sarah Education	Ostrow, Ron District B
Owen, Kenneth At-Large	Soter, Bernadette District A	Uebersax, David District B
Vigderson, Tal Recreational Interests		Wilson, Thomas At-Large

Absent (01): Hooper, Board Member: Religious Interests

A quorum was declared.

02. PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

7:12 PM –

Gasteier reiterated the Board should remain civil to one another and keep comments directed to the Chair and the business at hand.

03. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

7:15 PM -

Changes to April 2009 Governing Board Meeting minutes were requested by Carroll, Ostrow, Owen, Louyse, Kerr and Arslanian. Kerr pointed out Stakeholder, Ann Mackeen, seated behind Nyla Arslanian at the previous meeting stated: "I'm Armenian" not Arslansian.

Howe stated she felt the Council was a community organization and not that important that the minutes needed this level of detail, noting approving the minutes would take an inordinate amount of time?

Gasteier noted lack of a motion to approve the minutes and ongoing debate would be an issue. He offered options: Approve. Approve as amended. Not approve in this form and defer until Board members have a chance to read though the minutes.

Mauceri said some previous GGPNC minutes have documented meetings extensively, some recorded little more than actions taken, and some seem to just be agenda items carried over as minutes. As Secretary, he strives to capture spirit of discussion to help understand how decisions were arrived at, adding the Board should assist and he would correct any errors and omissions. Gasteier disagreed with Mauceri's opinion.

Ostrow cited 'Roberts Rules of Order' stating the minutes shall generally include only what was done, not what was said. Gasteier stated he would show the Board, authority to the contrary. Ostrow responded he just quoted the Parliamentary Authority.

O'Grady commented it is up to the Secretary whether he wants to do a really bad job or a really good job; "this is a public meeting." If Board members didn't say something then strike it from the record.

Gasteier asked for a motion, Mauceri moved to approve the minutes, Gasteier recognized Carroll who moved to defer approval of the minutes until there is a form reflecting the actions taken exceeding no more than three pages; Vigderson seconded.

DISCUSSION:

Ostrow said he would not support the motion because it has artificial stipulations and meeting minutes should be as long as they need be. He supports the Board creating standards for what kind of information is presented, but to arbitrarily say minutes should be no more than three pages long does the public a disservice.

Vigderson opined the minutes use a lot of paper, he supports conservation, and by utilizing smaller fonts, it will allow more information to fit; he thinks the motion is reasonable.

Arslanian said if a transcript is taken, it should be a verbatim version and it would be difficult to keep the minutes to a three-page limit, but the current twenty pages is "kind of ridiculous."

O'Grady pointed out DONE needed approved minutes to release any funds allocated at a particular meeting.

Mauceri added striking anything unclear or in error is easily done, but he pointed out the last GGPNC session was over six-hours and that fills up a lot of pages. Making the font smaller won't change the substance, it just makes it harder to read.

Howe stated this is a perfect example of subjective talking and she she's no point as to where this is going.

Carroll added as a former Secretary the minutes he did were never this long, but it is a service to the community to provide some of the flavor about the meeting.

Hyams sought clarification about what the rules state about seeing the minutes only at the next Board meeting or can the minutes be seen before the next Board meeting?.. Gasteier clarified minutes being disbursed to all Board member and it conflicting with the City Attorney's interpretation of 'The Brown Act.' The minutes are distributed beforehand so comment can be made at the meeting.

Ostrow said in his efforts to peruse previous minutes, he found a lack of pertinent information; "brevity is bad." The minutes are not just for the public, but also for history, rules history, and institutional memory.

DeMonte commented about not having a problem with stating what was said, but the minutes contained unnecessary info. Mauceri asked for specificity to help him understand her concern.

Gasteier asked for consensus, Mauceri opposed, calling the motion "censorship."

VOTE: 10 for, 6 against; 2 abstentions.

Mauceri clarified future minutes were to be no more than three pages, as that was the motion, because at a six or eight point font, the minutes would be three pages.

04. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

7:30PM –

SAM KBUSHYAN from the Armenian American Chamber of Commerce, Little Armenia Chapter, introduced himself and the Armenian American Chamber of Commerce. He offered his assistance on any future questions the Board may have as they relate to the Armenian American Community. His contact email is kbushyan@littlearmeniachamber.com or telephone at (323) 399-0754.

Stakeholder, DANA CREMIN, thanked the Board for coming out to the Big Sunday event; she passed around photos. Cremin raised a point of order regarding her sitting in on the Outreach Committee Meeting and she felt the number of Committee Members was too large based on the "Quorum of a quorum" Rule. Gasteier stated as a rule, the number of Board Members is generally watched and that all conversations are closely monitored.

Ostrow pointed out City documents states Board Members can attend meetings so long as they do not take a part in the discussion. Owen made a point of order that debate such as this was not part of public comment.

KIRK PALAYAN from T.S. King Middle School, also a participant in the Big Sunday event, thanked the GGPNC Board Members and presented the Board with a framed recognition certificate [The 'Lion' Award].

Gasteier gave permission to David Uebersax to speak about on the American Cancer Society's 'Relay For Life Event.'

05. REPORTS: PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND CITY STAFF

7:40PM –

JOSEPH SALIZ, Representative for California State Senator, 21st District, Carol Liu. Mr. Saliz made announcements that Outstanding Women In Business Award were being conducted and that Senator Carol Liu would like input for her upcoming visit to Franklin Hills.

JULIAN HARRIS-CALVIN, Senior Field Deputy for Councilmember Tom LaBonge, gave updates on various Council District 4 (CD4) issues. On behalf of Councilmember Tom LaBonge, she thanked GGPNC Board Members for their support on the Big Sunday event. Harris-Calvin discussed the trail clean up event, and how a lot of work was done, albeit for a small crowd. She thanked GGPNC Board Members for the FOLAR event.

JON HISSERICH, spokesperson for Assembly Member Paul Krekorian, spoke about an upcoming event "Surviving The Housing Meltdown" offering help to renters and homeowners; Self Defense Workshop was successful

with about 30 attendees with the next event scheduled for North Hollywood.

BETTY WONG OYAMA, DONE Project Coordinator, stated the City Council approved \$45K for the Neighborhood Councils. The funding still needs to go before Mayor Villaraigosa by June 1st for approval. Ethics 1234 Training will take place online and she urged Board Members to complete this as soon as possible. The date for bylaws revisions was extended to May 26th at 5:00 PM.

07. TREASURER'S REPORT:

7:55 PM -

O'Grady clarified the GGPNC has \$93,242 to spend, however some checks have not cleared and aren't reflected in the figure. Additional monies have been encumbered in the outreach budget.

A DONE report is due for the last quarter of the fiscal year (ending 06/30). There are various credit card charges going back a few years that need to be itemized; a report has been distributed in the hopes various Boardmembers can assist in identifying them. All other reports have been submitted.

08. ANIMAL WELFARE COMMITTEE:

8:00 PM -

Committee Chair, RACHEL PAAP, updated the Board on animal rescue organizations within the district, and how they are functioning in a difficult economic climate. Animal shelters are at maximum capacity as many pets are brought in because their owners can no longer afford them. The 'Mutt Match LA' rescue organization founder lives here in Los Feliz, and the GGPNC can help with creating a cross-volunteer support base. Rachel reminded the Board she's here as a resource for animal concerns, and is available for advisement.

09. POLICY ON LIMITING BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEETING DEBATE:

8:05 PM -

Ken Owen read an agenda motion to place time limits on Council debate.

Ostrow made a point of order indicating the motion may have been improperly noticed by virtue of the Parliamentary Authority and should be treated as Special Rule of Order. He referred to the GGPNC Bylaws and Roberts Rules of Order and how they already prescribe a number of actions to accomplish limiting debate. He pointed out this

motion would actually be a Special Rule of Order superceding Roberts Rules and required a 2/3rd vote to pass.

Gasteier agreed and calculated that 2/3rds was twelve (12) votes.

Rereading, Owen moved: "At the beginning of the discussion of any item the presiding officer may (and at the request of two members shall) announce the amount of total time to be allotted to each member to speak to the item (including making procedural motions such as points of order) and such amount of time shall be allowed to each member, no member shall exceed such amount unless there is a successful motion to suspend the rule, which motion shall not be subject to discussion and shall require a majority vote of members present; and no such motion shall be allowed until each member has had the full time allotted to speak or has waived such full time. A person, who may but need not be a member shall be designated by the presiding officer to be responsible for keeping the time set. Upon request by at least 6 members any member may cede all or a portion of his or her time to another member." CARROLL seconded.

DISCUSSION:

Ostrow finds the motion redundant by virtue of the Parliamentary Authority, and it has the potential to stifle a minority opinion as Roberts Rules of Order indicates.

He moved as a procedural motion to separate the original motion into separate parts for discussion, Mauceri seconded.

Hyams commended the Chair for already allowing people a fair chance to be heard during meetings and agreed the motion to be redundant. Mauceri opined that limiting debate could have repercussions depending on the subject, and if there were options already available, they could be used on an issue-by-issue basis.

Carroll opined the Board needs to have some sort of ability to limit time spent on certain items in order to cover all agenda items within a reasonable amount of time.

Ostrow restated the procedural motion, specifying the individual separate parts, Mauceri seconds; no consensus.

VOTE: 05 In Favor, 12 Against, 01 abstention (Kerr).

Gasteier called for consensus on the main motion; no consensus.

VOTE: 08 For, 09 Against, 1 Abstention (Howe); Motion failed.

10. RULES & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE:

8:25 PM -

Gasteier commented about the history and timeline of the agendized proposals, and the DONE timeline requiring passage to be viable for upcoming elections. He asked the Board to consider all proposals on their merits and for everyone to keep comments focused on the proposals being discussed. He asked people to respect different views of fellow Board Members and of Stakeholders, and to bear in mind nothing said is intended to be personal.

Gasteier added bylaw changes require a supermajority (12 votes). Election procedures such as the City Clerk's election stipulation worksheet, require a majority vote as long as they're not in conflict with the bylaws. He proposed the Board take it issue by issue.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Stakeholder, DANA CREMIN, voiced two concerns: District Representatives must live in their respective districts, as this is true for all other geographical representatives within the United States. She also added while other Neighborhood Councils have Appointed Members, many of those appointees do not have voting rights within their council.

Stakeholder, CHARLIE MIMS, said he helped form the GGPNC and put the bylaws together. He spoke about those who made really good contributions but who would have not otherwise ran for office because of their own personal reasons. Both those Elected and Appointed have contributed a lot.

Stakeholder, BARBARA FERRIS, appreciates having motions and ancillary documents attached to the agenda available ahead of time. She stated with both Elected and Appointed members it "comes to accountability." When elected you are accountable to who elected you, and when appointed you are accountable to those who appoint you.

Stakeholder, ANN MCKEEN, is against changing the bylaws due to lack of compelling information; she likes the current system. It works wonderfully and she feels bylaw-changing motions should be tabled in order to get the community's opinion.

Stakeholder, DAVID WEINSTEIN, spoke in favor of expanding the number of elected seats. The councils were founded to engage people and get them involved. By appointment positions, you "hijack the intent" of engaging stakeholders. He thinks appointees with special skill sets can be utilized without being give voting rights.

KIRK PALAYAN, a public school teacher, supports 13-year olds voting as they can be mature and it is an amazing experience for them. He feels because he just works in the neighborhood, he would have the Board seriously consider the idea of not instituting a residency requirement.

LAUREN, EIREANN, and JUSTINE TLYLER O'GRADY read letters from other neighborhood council members who have a majority of elected seats versus appointed seats. Justine O'Grady pointed out of eighteen responses, seventeen favored a reduction in appointed positions.

Uebersax asked if they could produce the dissenting letter? O'Grady pointed out the complete package was available as a handout.

Stakeholder, RICHARD SPICER, clarified points about his thoughts on elected versus appointed Board Members; the combination of Elected and Appointed Members works effectively. As a previous Appointed Board Member, he never felt obligated to any person or group.

COMMENT:

Gasteier stated he compiled and clarified the issues being discussed by reviewing the document package and its content chronology.

O'Grady said he was withdrawing his previous motion presented at the April 2009 Board meeting regarding the creation of five (5) elected positions, reducing the number of Appointed positions to Four (4), thus the agenda info packet pages were no longer needed for discussion. He stated a revised motion was listed in meeting agenda Item 11.

Gasteier pointed out there wasn't a motion on the floor and asked to keep any motions in the agenda in order.

Carroll asked for clarification whether O'Grady's motion proposal was "effectively withdrawn?" O'Grady responded it was being "superceded" by a new motion at agenda Item 11. Carroll reported the Rules & Elections Committee resolved this matter should be further studied in depth. Soter asked the full committee resolution be repeated.

Gasteier called for a motion. Carroll responded he considered his reading of the R&E Committee resolution the motion, Carroll formally moved the Board consider the motion; Soter seconded.

Ostrow asked the Rules & Elections motion be reread:

"Resolved, we consider changing the current makeup of the GGPNC by assessing whether we want to change the number and the method by which Board Members are chosen."

Ostrow moved to table this motion and return the “simpler” question of whether Appointed Members or Elected District Representatives be allowed to vote in selecting appointees, Mauceri seconds.

Gasteier called for discussion on the motion to table. Carroll withdrew the Rules & Elections Committee resolution motion.

Ostrow moved the GGPNC Bylaws be amended so only the District Representatives be allowed to vote in the selecting of Appointed members, provided all Board Members be allowed to vote in filling vacant seats. Mauceri seconded.

DISCUSSION:

Mauceri pointed out this issue was vetted during the Rules & Elections Committee meeting. Gasteier clarified the actual bylaw language proposed in the agenda packet.

Uebersax stated he was against because it would be unfair to current Appointed Board Members who would no longer be afforded a vote in the upcoming selection process, and they had a reasonable expectation of doing so this motion would deny.

Arslanian felt the motion created a “classes” between Board Members.

Owen stated if, in theory, District Representatives had legitimacy by being elected, the Board would have instances where some District Representatives were actually appointed to fill vacancies in elected seats who had actually lost when they ran for election, and received fewer votes than other currently appointed representatives who also ran for election but lost. Ostrow added ballot results varied widely from district to district and ballot tallies wasn't a legitimate measure.

Mauceri called a point of information clarifying what conclusion the Rules & Elections committee had come to? Carroll reported by a 3-2 vote the R&E Committee resolved the current motion.

Soter commented every eventuality of this motion should be thought out to prevent unintended consequences and there were many things coming to light she hadn't previously considered, though she feels it's important Appointed Board Members recuse themselves from any selection process where a conflict exists.

O'Grady stated elections provided a direct line from the voter to the elected official, empowering them to make decisions such as appointments.

DeMonte felt this decision could be postponed until further bylaw changes were being considered, she stated there was potential for the Law of Unintended Consequences to come into play.

Napier echoed Arslanian concerns about classism becoming a problem.

Hyams said the discussion was about what system would be best for the stakeholders as opposed to the Board Members.

Ostrow reminded the Board the very first round of appointments made by the Council in 2002 had been done solely by the elected District Representatives and formed the precedent he believed stakeholders expected. He believes the timing of the discussion is appropriate and the Board should come to a decision now.

Mauceri stated getting elected was difficult because you made a compact with the voters, and in order to do so it required a lot of work. He feels the Board must evolve because the stakes were being continually raised by larger voter turnouts, and the Board had an obligation to constantly reexamine itself. He added the federal government was an organizational model and appointees such as judges could not appoint others or themselves and the expectation of such was understood by people placed those positions.

Kerr disputed whether she or any other appointee "voted for themselves." Mauceri responded if an incumbent appointee was re-selected as part of a consensus vote without recusing themselves, they, in effect, voted for themselves. Gasteier said he disputed Mauceri's assertion and asked the group remain focused on the motion on the floor.

De Ocampo called for some sort of compromise to find a good balance between appointment and elected positions.

Uebersax stated he felt both elected and appointed board members are equally accountable.

DeMonte said she felt the Appointed Board members don't feel any less obligation to the community than an District Representative feels.

Ostrow said no one should feel this discussion is personal; "we're talking about the positions and not about the people." Gasteier turned over the chair to VP, Administration, Carroll, stating he supported the motion. He felt there weren't any differences between elected and appointed members; he said he supported the motion to strengthen the public's perception.

Soter stated she wanted to make a correction "for the record" regarding the GGPNC Board having the "highest number of appointed

seats.” She referenced the Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council as having 31 appointed members and two elected members, with homeowners groups and business groups along with non-profit representation. Soter stated she wanted to make sure people understand the GGPNC did not have the highest number of appointed seats as “simply a point of information” as in truth, it wasn’t factual.

She presented a friendly amendment clarifying all board members would vote on vacancies and the motion be made effective with the 2011 selection process. Soter moved to amend the motion. Louyse seconds.

DISCUSSION:

Ostrow asked/clarified how moving the decision to 2011 would substantively change the motion?

Soter said it would keep votes in place for existing Board Members, adding the type of appointment selection by “slates” or “groups” isn’t done anymore, and perhaps she could extend the motion amendment by requiring appointees up for re-selection leave the room. Soter added the types of abuse previously commented on are just as likely to happen in an election as in an appointment process.

Ostrow inquired whether he had to accept the friendly amendment Soter proposed. Gasteier stated he was considering it a motion to amend the motion in the interest of expediency.

Hyams clarified the term for appointed positions was indeed two years regardless of if the motions were approved? Gasteier confirmed.

Mauceri addressed Soter’s point of information asking if she knew how the stakeholder groups from the Bel Air-Beverly Crest put forth their representatives?.. He added since that particular Neighborhood Council had been discussed in the previous R&E Committee meeting, upon research he learned the NC’s individual neighborhood groups actually elect the people they “appoint” to their council, and that using semantics without clarification and omission, was misleading.

O’Grady indicated he called up the NC’s website on his smart phone and read from the bylaws their Council was made up of over 35 organizations, which elect the people who represent them on their board and the idea that council was almost entirely appointed was “utter nonsense.”

Ostrow said if the only way this motion were to pass was to delay it for two years he could get behind it, but he thought that it was a mistake and it could be seen as foot-dragging and GGPNC Board Members were putting themselves above the greater good.

Uebersax supports the amendment, stating it was close to his original intent at the start of discussion.

Gasteier called for consensus on the amended motion; no consensus.

VOTE: 09 For, 05 Against, 04 Abstain (Carroll, +3 Unknown); motion to amend carries.

Gasteier called for a vote on the amended motion.

VOTE: 05 For, 10 Against, 03 Abstain; motion fails.

Mauceri asked for recount of vote tally of individual votes. Gasteier ruled if a supermajority was not reached there was no point in tallying the voting record.

11. *PROPOSALS TO AMEND ELECTION RELATED BYLAWS:

10:10 PM –

*Taken out of order unintentionally before Agenda items 10b & 10c.

Gasteier reviewed the agenda attachments. There was a discussion regarding the proper procedure to present a motion, given the written motions presented at the April 2009 meeting by O'Grady were never formally taken up by the Board.

O'Grady moved to reduce the number of Appointed Board Members:

"Resolved: The Greater Griffith Park Neighborhood Council (GGPNC) acknowledges the bylaws governing the makeup of its voting Board Members has an inordinately high percentage of Appointed Board Members not placed in office by a popular vote of the public, and hereby commits to reducing the number of Appointed Board Members from nine (9) to at least four (4) Appointed Boardmembers. Said bylaw change shall be enacted no later than December 31st 2009 after a period of thorough Board discussion and debate, including Stakeholder comment and input (potentially through a referendum), and any other means to gain insight to form a consensus regarding the particular details of how to best manifest this change in order to effectively serve the Stakeholders it represents. Adoption of this resolution shall require a 'supermajority' vote of the Board to enact and a 'supermajority' vote to amend, augment, or change." Mauceri seconds.

Ostrow clarified from O'Grady the motion's intent meant at least four (4) Board Members would remain appointed if the motion was adopted.

O'Grady referenced a 500+ signature petition, over 30 stakeholder letters, and letters from other neighborhood councilors that support the idea of a reduced number of appointed Board Members.

Kerr pointed out that the motion committed the Board to change and she couldn't support it.

Arslanian felt one person's drive on this issue was drawing the Board away from its business by taking up valuable time.

Owen concurs with Arslanian the motion will use an inordinate amount of time going forward, and ultimately it is a "waste of the community's time."

Ostrow opined the question at hand was whether the motion was "right or wrong" for the Council, and time constraints shouldn't dissuade the Board from taking action. Ostrow's main concern is the GGPNC is out of step with the majority of other neighborhood councils.

Gasteier acknowledged the issues were important, but there were also competing interests. He feels the motion calls for the Board to "agree to agree" and that is inherently flawed.

Gastier moved to amend the motion by rewording it to formulate a proposal to reduce the number of appointed members but not commit the Board to a specific decision, moving the deadline to January 2010 through the Rules & Elections committee. Hyams seconds.

DISCUSSION

There was discussion on timing issues. Uebersax suggested placing a question on a referendum ballot during the March 2010 elections.

Soter stated this motion would still use up an inordinate amount of time to accomplish, and require a large outreach effort. Gasteier added the Board is comprised of "free agents" who could pursue issues of importance to them, but on this issue the Board should move in a coordinated manner.

Howe felt the time commitment would be detrimental to other Board activity. Gasteier clarified a majority of the debate would occur at the Rules & Elections Committee level.

Mauceri said the motion was simple and being made overly complex, "Does the Board believe we need to change or not? Yea or Nay?"

Hyams asked we base the vote on the motion's merits, and not on projected ideas of the time it will take to accomplish.

O'Grady added the motion included enough time from May through December--six months-- for those interested to vet these questions through the Rules & Elections Committee, which would make a recommendation to the Board, rather than use up time here.

Owen questioned what the cost of having a referendum would be?

DeOcampo called the question, Mauceri asked for the motion to be restated. Gasteier restated the amended motion.

Mauceri said the amended motion as stated did not commit the Board to any action except study and make a recommendation back to the Board. He felt the motion as amended was basically what the Rules & Elections committee is already charged with doing, anyway.

Gastier called for a consensus on the amended motion; no consensus.

VOTE: 11 in favor, 05 opposed; motion amended.

Gasteier called for a vote on the amended motion. Ostrow clarified the vote was a simple majority and not a Supermajority.

VOTE: 04 in favor, 13 opposed, 1 Abstention (Uebersax); motion fails.

After brief discussion, Gasteier called for a vote on the original motion.

VOTE: 05 in favor, 13 opposed; motion fails.

11:00 PM -

Hyams moved the Board approve "Item 4" relating to GGPNC Bylaws IX A, regarding the timing of the selection of Appointed Boardmembers.

Resolved:

"The terms of Appointed Board Members shall commence at the regularly scheduled general Board meeting falling closest to twelve months after the last meeting at which elected District Representatives were seated, and following their selection; provided that, if the time for seating new Appointed Members falls in July or August, the time shall be automatically changed to the next regular meeting of the Board after August, so that the actual selection part of the appointment process shall not take place in the months of July and August."

*[Jacqueline Kerr left the meeting reducing the total to 17 Boardmembers].

Owen felt the motion should not take effect until the next selection process as the current Appointed Board members have had their terms already extended once. Hyams pointed out any Board Member could resign at any time.

VOTE: Gasteier called for a consensus, seeing no opposition, he declared the motion passes.

Gasteier asked if there were any more bylaw amendments to be discussed?

MAUCERI referred to agenda item 11B, referenced in the attachments and moved the bylaws, article IX B be amended as follows:

"B. Basic Qualifications. All Board Members be qualified for the position sought prior to application for election or appointment to the Board. All candidates must be at least eighteen years of age, be a Stakeholder as defined in these Bylaws and maintain their legal residence in the district from which he or she is nominated or elected for at least 90 days prior to the date of election. During their term, each Board Member must maintain the status upon which they were elected/selected for membership (i.e., a District Representative must remain a Stakeholder of that District, a representative of business must maintain an interest in or relation to a business in the Area, etc.), failing which the Board Member shall resign, or may be removed, and shall be replaced by the Board."
O'Grady seconds.

Vigderson clarified business ownership would not qualify a candidate under the proposed amendment.

O'Grady stated he thought the geographical designations of the GGPNC districts already required residency, and the nine appointed Board Members covered other interest areas such as business. He clarified a stakeholder's factual-basis affirmation was both the criteria to stand for election as well as vote? Gasteier and others confirmed.

Howe feels by virtue of Griffith Park, our stakeholders have a wider criteria to stand for election that goes beyond boundaries, way beyond the few houses that encompass District A.

Stakeholder, DORA HERRERA, spoke about business owners with special interests should not be eliminated based on lack of residency.

Vigderson asked if there was a procedure for challenging stakeholder factual-basis self-affirmation. After Gasteier clarified, Vigderson asked what the criteria would be for residency affirmation?

Uebersax said he thought some stakeholders would be excluded from running for election if the motion passed, and perhaps the idea should be revisited if the Board made changes to its makeup.

Mauceri clarified the City Clerk would be responsible for verifying legal residency status the same way they do for the other City elections. Gasteier added there were procedures the City Clerk used to validate candidates and the GGPNC bylaws also provided for Board Members retaining the required criteria, which they initially stood for election or selection under.

Hyams stated he also believed residency was already required for District Representatives, and the ability to declare a stake in practically any district could change the way candidates approach standing for election by affirming a stake in a district they felt they had a better chance of winning in.

Arslanian said she also believed residency was required as a District Representative candidate, and although a resident of District A, she had actually lost the election to a candidate who was a non-resident.

O'Grady said with almost 50% of the Board set aside for special interests, geographical representatives should have residency requirements, else he for example could declare a factual-basis for any district within the GGPNC boundaries.

Soter pointed out the city charter set the stakeholder definition, and Griffith Park is entirely within GGPNC boundaries, yet only three people actually reside there. Soter believes property ownership would turn the Districts into "homeowners associations."

Uebersax believes the stakeholders ultimately decide who is qualified regardless of whether they maintain residence or not.

Gasteier opined DONE could interpret the proposed change as "violative" if it skewed the board to have a majority of residents as "The Plan" prohibits any one group from holding a Council majority.

Howe added she, as an example, is a stakeholder spending large amounts of time in the park as both a user and as a worker at the Autry museum for over seven years.

Ostrow said this issue once again did not come down to personages, but to whether a residency requirement was a good change or not.

Mauceri said, as with others, he too believed residency was already required for District Representatives to run and was surprised it wasn't. If, as previously discussed, allowing a 13-year-old minimum voting age could be viewed as "rife for abuse," what was a system

that allowed virtually anyone to run from anywhere within GGPNC's five districts?.. He felt by leaving this "loophole" open, the Council was inviting abuse. Mauceri asked the question be called.

VOTE: 04 in favor, 10 opposed, 03 Abstentions (Howe, Arslanian, Ostrow); motion fails.

*Three (3) Board members left the meeting at this point; Kerr, ?, ?)

Ostrow moved to accept the changes as written removing the Bylaw language regarding the Vice President of Governmental Affairs position removed by previous Board action (March 2009). Hyams seconds.

Uebersax stated he was not able to participate in the previous decision to remove the position and thinks it would be a beneficial to have, so he was against the motion.

VOTE: 11 in favor, 01 opposed, 01 Abstention; motion fails with a Supermajority (12) needed to pass.

Mauceri opined failure to remove the bylaw language left the position open to be filled at the next Board meeting.

DISCUSSION:

Soter added an abstention in a vote to remove language on a previously decided issue may have made a mistake and the vote should be reconsidered.

Soter moved the vote be reconsidered. Mauceri seconded.

Owen pointed out only Uebersax could move to reconsider as the sole objecting vote defeating the motion.

Gasteier clarified the position had already been eliminated by a previous Board supermajority vote and this motion only addressed the language portions required to remove the position. He also stated he would work swiftly to get the bylaw changes revised and off to DONE for approval as soon as possible.

10. RULES & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Agenda items b & c taken out of order.

b) Carroll moved to accept the City Clerk's election stipulations as presented in the agenda packet, noting the various "options" were no longer viable as they had been previously disposed during debate. DeMonte seconded.

DISCUSSION:

Gasteier qualified the paperwork was City Clerk related and there weren't any significant changes from the 2008 elections. There brief questions from various Board Members.

VOTE: Motion approved by consensus. Approved City Clerk election worksheet attached to these minutes.

c) Rosemary DeMonte was designated to attend the City Clerk's election day-of-the-week selection process.

12. LANCC COMMITTEE AND MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS AND

11:40 PM –

Uebersax moved the agenda motion to designate himself to the LANCC DWP Committee as GGPNC Representative. Hyams seconded. Consensus reached; motion passed.

Uebersax moved the agenda motion endorsing DWP Committee resolution requesting City of Los Angeles allow NC representation at 'Resource Table.' Consensus reached; motion passed.

Uebersax moved the agenda motion endorsing DWP Committee resolution requesting that City of Los Angeles establish office of Ratepayer Advocate. Consensus reached; motion passed.

Uebersax requested Board Members and stakeholders review DWP Strategic Planning documents for future discussion and stated more information on a better solar plan should be available in July.

13. TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE:

11:55 PM –

Hyams moved an agenda motion for the GGPNC Board Members to adopt the "CARS FOR SALE RESOLUTION:"

"WHEREAS, there is a continuing proliferation of large numbers of cars for sale parked along Los Feliz Blvd. and other streets in the Greater Griffith Park neighborhood;

WHEREAS, these cars (i) are predominantly not owned by local residents, (ii) constitute coordinated commercial ventures in many instances, (iii) monopolize valuable parking spaces, (iv) discourage visitation to local businesses, (v) cause traffic and safety problems and (vi) are unsightly;

WHEREAS, the municipal ordinance allowing the Department of Transportation to remove these cars was repealed in 2001 after a court challenge on constitutional grounds; and

WHEREAS, the Public Works Committee of the City Council is currently considering the adoption of a new ordinance that places reasonable limitations on the conduct of such activities and satisfies constitutional requirements.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the GGPNC strongly supports the prompt adoption of a new municipal ordinance that places reasonable limitations and restrictions on the use of City streets to sell cars and other motor vehicles and that empowers the Department of Transportation to enforce the new ordinance by the issuance of fines and the physical removal of cars and other motor vehicles found to be in violation of the new restrictions.” SOTER seconded.

DISCUSSION:

Owen spoke about the lack of success in the past with this initiative and asked if the City Attorney is able to draft an ordinance enforcing this?

Hyams replied the public works and City Council is considering adoption of this ordinance and that our resolution will help support them in their decision. Ostrow added other cities have had success with their programs.

VOTE: Motion approved by consensus.

14. OUTREACH COMMITTEE:

Agenda item: GGPNC Newsletter, discussion and action as appropriate. DeMonte moved to table item to next meeting, seconded; approved by consensus.

15. PARKS, RIVERS & OPEN SPACE:

Various agenda items: a) Griffith Park Greek Theatre Sound Mitigation update; b) Griffith Park L.A. Conservancy and LFIA Historic Preservation Awards; c) LADWP Griffith Park Travel Town Tank/River Supply Conduit Project updates; d) City Budget Crisis Impacts on Recreation & Parks Department; e) L.A. River Clean-Up Report. Soter moved to table item to the next meeting; seconded and approved by consensus.

16. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE/ BOARD MEMBER INFORMATION REQUESTS:

Various agenda items: a) Recommendations regarding policy guidelines for council archival information availability and member requests. b) Recommendations regarding potential fiscal impact of proposed city budget cuts. Carroll moved to table item to the next meeting, seconded; approved by consensus.

17. EDUCATION COMMITTEE:

Report on BIG Sunday event at Thomas Starr/King Middle School. O’Grady stated he has received “fantastic reviews” from numerous participants in the event.

18. SECRETARY’S REPORT:

Brief comments regarding Committee rosters and aggregation of remiss committee meeting minutes. Mauceri stated the agenda item was rendered moot by circulation of committee rosters during the meeting

19. OTHER COMMITTEE REPORTS:

None.

20. OTHER COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

None.

21. ADJOURN

12:15 AM -

Hyams moved to adjourn. Howe seconded. Meeting adjourned.

MEETING SUMMARY:

Duration:	Five hours, 11 minutes
Motions/Votes:	21 / 20
Resolutions/Statements Passed:	2
Official Correspondence:	0
Funds Allocated:	\$0
