



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

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES (unapproved)**

Tuesday, July 21, 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:

7:10 PM –

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

Committee Members present (04)

Gasteier, Philip District D President	Carroll, Bruce District E VP, Administration	DeMonte, Rosemary Business Interests VP, Outreach
		Mauceri, Mark District E Secretary (interim)

Absent: O'Grady; a quorum was declared.

02. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JUNE 2009 COMMITTEE MEETING

7:12 PM –

Carroll moved the minutes be approved as revised, Mauceri seconded; motion passes.

03. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS; PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS

7:15 PM – None.

04. REPORTS: PUBLIC OFFICIALS & CITY STAFF

7:15 PM –

Betty Wong-Oyama from EmpowerLA advised the Board when using the City Seal in any form, permission must first be requested from DONE and a color version can only be used for the City and for business cards.

In regards to the potential adoption of Rosenberg Rules of Order, Wong-Oyama also advised choosing a Parliamentarian is helpful.

The DONE Sexual Harassment DVD is to be viewed within 90 days of receipt, after which board members can take an online survey. Regional Training is being held on July 23rd at the Aliso Village Center. All Board members are encouraged to attend. Two Budget reps must be selected to attend the Mayor's October 10th Budget Meeting.

05. CONSIDERATION OF PROCEDURE FOR RESOLVING GRIEVANCE OF ARAM SEROBIAN AND VARDUI ('ROSE') PETOYAN

7:22 PM –

Gasteier researched the case and read a the following statement:

"The Neighborhood Council lacks authority to make any determination regarding civil right violations, violations of the State's Ethics Laws or determinations regarding slander. Civil rights violations, State Ethics Laws violations or determinations regarding slander— instead, with respect to these allegations, we are informing you that the complainant, that this Board lacks jurisdiction to consider these violations and instead the complainant should redress under the City's process for administrative claims. In addition, with respect to the alleged violations of the Brown Acts since there is not a specific demand for the Board to set aside the action and rehear this issue in regards to the grievance; therefore, there is not an obligation on the Board to reconsider the issue. And in that regard, at least with respect to the item that's mentioned in the grievance or the Board hearing in June there was no action taken. So, even if we were to consider setting aside any action, there would be no action to set aside. I'm further advised that if the complainant continues to raise concerns with the Brown Act, these issues will be raised in alternative venues outside the Neighborhood Council grievance process."

Gasteier continued, to the extent the complainant alleges violations of Article I or II of the Plan for Neighborhood Councils. The Board is advised it does have authority to determine how to address those claims.

The issue up for discussion at this meeting is not a hearing on the subject matter of the grievance, but a discussion on how to resolve it. The Executive Committee can attempt to resolve the case on its own or refer it to a panel of stakeholder volunteers. As of now there is not a stakeholder panel of volunteers.

Stakeholder, DANA CREMIN, commented the grievance was not posted on the website and inquired what the policy was on posting grievances for public viewing on the website?

GASTEIER explained that CREMIN'S grievance was posted, but due to the concerns raised within and about this grievance, public posting was deterred.

Darren Margules, Legal counsel for the Grievant addressed the Board and stated he has no objections with the grievance being posted publicly. He asked whether or not they could expect to receive a formal written response on the official position the Board has taken on the matter? He would also like to gain an understanding of the procedures that will be followed to resolve the grievance.

Gasteier advised the Executive Committee one of the members is named as a principal element of the grievance and two others have made public comments about matters surrounding it. With this in mind, it seems difficult for the Executive Board to be wholly impartial in considering the case. Other options could be explored to involve the Committee, but outside assistance seems necessary.

Gasteier sought the advice from the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment (DONE) regarding their procedures and assistance in addressing this grievance. A clear response from them has not been received yet.

O'Grady agreed that the Executive Committee is compromised and it would be beneficial to have a third party involved in this matter.

Mauceri addressed Gasteier's statement and suggested the Committee examine just the issues that fall under their purview without the need of third party. He also suggested the grievance could be broken up into parts, which could be resolved by the Committee itself and the remaining parts could be set aside for third party mediation.

Gasteier clarified the discussion for the evening would only explore the procedures for resolving the matter and not directly address the issues contained within the grievance. He also pointed out many of the issues contained within the grievance do not fall under the Committee's jurisdiction and would have to be addressed by a third party. Mediation appears to be the best course of action.

Wong-Oyama confirmed a meeting date has been requested with the HRC (Human Relations Committee) and the Board will be notified as soon as they become available. The HRC along with the City of the Los Angeles facilitates in mediating grievances between stakeholders, city departments, and neighborhood councils. Their main role is to act as a mediator.

Mauceri suggested the HRC would likely be the best option given the circumstances surrounding this particular case.

Cremin asked Gasteier why there appears to be a "double standard" in play when dealing with this grievance and hers. Gasteier pointed out they are entirely different cases and thus, need to be addressed as such.

Darin Margules noted the complaint includes a violation of the GGPNC's own by-laws. He urged the Committee to examine the violation of the bylaws as part of their investigation and it should be up for discussion. He also expressed concern about the mediation process, and claimed it is completely unclear what the process would be if there is not resolution after mediation. Gasteier let him know if the mediation brought about no resolution than the case would be recorded as such. Margules expressed overall distrust of the mediation process and of the process at large and cited the Cremin case as an example of how the process has proven to be ineffective.

Mauceri moved the Executive Committee initiate mediation process through the LA City Human Resources Commission as soon as reasonably possible, and acting in good faith, in an attempt to resolve this grievance between the Greater Griffith Park Neighborhood Council and the filers of the grievance at hand, on the issues that fall within our purview. Gasteier seconded.

VOTE: 05 In Favor, 0 Against. Motion passed unanimously.

06. NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL RELATED RECORDS & INFORMATION POLICY

7:58 PM –

Item also contained on the Board Meeting Agenda. Gasteier suggested deferring the item to that meeting. Agreed.

07. SECRETARY'S REPORT:

7:58 PM –

Mauceri informed the Board that in the boxes he received from Kurt Rademaekers, one contained a Sony Vaio laptop and power pack. He suggested it be disposed or donated on behalf of the Board to a charitable organization.

Gasteier referred the question to Betty Wong-Oyama who advised if it is an item previously purchased by the Board it could not be disposed of, but must be turned in to the City salvage program and there is a process to follow.

Carroll suggested the GGPNC should retain the laptop, which could be put into use sometime down the line.

Mauceri moved one of the laptops be submitted to the City salvage due to the fact it is relatively unusable.

Gasteier suggested that item be presented to the Board at a future meeting and allow them some time to consider the potential use of the equipment.

08. UPDATE ON CITY CLERK’S RECENT PROCEDURE AND CURRENT STATUS OF 2008 ELECTION BALLOT MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

8:04 PM –

CARROLL updated the Board on the emails he sent to Darren Martinez and the City Attorney’s office on the rules and procedures the City would like the Neighborhood Councils should abide by. He is waiting to hear from them and will address the Board once that information becomes available.

09. AD HOC COMMITTEE: WEB SITE:

8:05 PM –

Carroll reported the new web site is operational and being loaded with content.

10. TREASURER’S REPORT:

8:07 PM –

Treasurer absent. Wong-Oyama confirmed the inventory had been submitted and received a few days ago.

11. ADJOURN

8:08 PM –

CARROLL moved to adjourn. MAUCERI seconded; meeting adjourned.

MEETING SUMMARY:

Duration:	01 hour
Motions/Votes:	04 / 04
Resolutions/Statements Passed:	0
Official Correspondence:	0
Funds Allocated:	\$0.00
