

**Grass Roots Venice Neighborhood Council
Bylaws Committee January 12, 2006 Meeting Minutes**

- 1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:10 PM.**
- 2. ATTENDANCE:** Bylaws Committee Members present – LJ Carusone (Committee Chair) presiding, Colette Bailey, David Buchanan, David Moring, Eileen Pollack Erickson, Greg Fitchitt, Ivan Spiegel, Jodi Gusek, Joe Murphy, Lisa M. Ezell, Marta Evry, Steve Freedman, Stewart Oscars, Susan Rennie, Thomas O'Meara. Absent – None. Also attending –Sylviane Dungan.
- 3. MINUTES:** The minutes from 01-03-06 meeting were not reviewed.
- 4. CONSENSUS BUILDING AND COMMITTEE GREIVANCES**

The Chair introduced the discussion as a time to air concerns about the functioning of the committee and the need to achieve a working committee process that would enable the committee to accomplish its goal. He reminded the committee of the March deadline and of the objective to achieve a consensus that would improve, without necessarily achieving a 'perfect' recommendation, the existing set of bylaws. He suggested that members, if feeling personally aggrieved by the actions of another member, communicate directly with that member (phone list distributed) or raise the issue at a meeting rather than raising such interpersonal concerns in widely distributed emails.

At the request of the scribe, permission was given to summarize the discussion rather than detail the individual comments of the members of the committee on this agenda item.

Discussion followed and a consensus was reached that acknowledged the role that was played by the several years of contentiousness experienced by many who have been, and who remain, deeply and emotionally concerned about, as well as committed to, the viability of the GRVNC. In this sense, one could say that even the recent contentiousness on the committee reflects a positive, albeit perhaps a no longer desirable or necessary, impulse – and the transition itself is clearly a very positive event.

The key elements of the unanimous consensus consisted of committing to the overriding theme of respect coupled with a few rules of thumb to guide committee member interactions as follows:

- a. Respect process of being recognized by the chair before speaking.
- b. Speak only for yourself (unless asked to do otherwise).
- c. Listen to what a member is stating without cutting in or expressing disagreement. Allow enough space for the speaker to finish his/her remarks and to be actually heard and understood by all members of the committee. If in doubt, ask the member whether s/he is finished or to clarify what s/he said rather than assuming (and perhaps subsequently mischaracterizing) what s/he said.

- d. Consider that it is acceptable, when it becomes clear that a consensus cannot be achieved on an issue, to agree to disagree.

The committee also recognized that most tensions arise when a member feels that s/he has not been heard or understood, or that s/he is being somehow misrepresented by another member, or that s/he is being negatively characterized (ie, as being manipulative or otherwise improperly motivated). Sensitivity to this principle would seem to be an organizing theme to guide the committee in dealing with future matters of this sort.

5. **MULTIPLE BYLAWS:** The chair stated that this motion, as presented by Tom O'Meara, gives the committee the option of deciding whether to present a single bylaws recommendation to the GRVNC Board or to present the Board with multiple sets of bylaws from which to choose.

(Committee Discussion Begins)

Thomas O'Meara: Suggested that his motion be deferred until after the committee deals with the next agenda item, **GRVNC BOARD COMPOSITION/DISTRICT MAKE UP/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (ARTICLES IV,XI)**, since it seemed to him that a consensus might be reached which would moot consideration of his motion.

David Buchanan: He would prefer considering the motion now.

Greg Fitchitt: Consensus is possible, so he supports delaying it.

Susan Rennie: Clarification sought – did we reach a consensus?

Joe Murphy: Suggests that there may have been some positive behind the scenes negotiations that occurred that might merit seeking a consensus before addressing the motion.

Marta Evry: The vote on the structure of the Board was 9 to 3, which is almost a consensus.

Thomas O'Meara: Makes the following motion:

Motion to include in committee report a minority bylaws proposal, and to ask the GRVNC board to resolve the issue of either sending just the committee majority bylaws proposal to stakeholders for approval, or sending both the majority and minority proposals to stakeholders for approval.

Joe Murphy: Seconds the motion.

Thomas O'Meara: He outlined the reason for the motion. The Voting Methods Committee recommendations and the bylaws that resulted from that effort were discussed and supported by a large number of stakeholders, and he believes that the support for that version of the bylaws still exists. For this reason, there remains a lack of consensus among the stakeholders, regardless of whether this committee has or has not reached a consensus. Therefore, it makes sense to present both that version and this committee's

version to the GRVNC Board and to let that be where the decision is made to recommend one or the other version or to present both to the stakeholders for their consideration.

David Moring: We currently are faced with three sets of by-laws, the original, the Feist amended and the Board amended sets. It is the duty of this Committee to present one acceptable set of by-laws to clear up all this confusion. He urged voting against the motion.

Eileen Pollack Erickson: Seeks a clarification.

Marta Evry: Reasons for voting against the motion:

- a. The current bylaws don't allow for what Tom is proposing. The Board would have to approve both sets by a 2/3 vote in order to present both to the stakeholders. And the stakeholders can't chose one over the other, they would have to vote to approve or reject each separately, which means the stakeholders could actually end up approving BOTH.
- b. She much prefers a consensus approach. She mentioned that she and David have talked about the possibility of bringing their version of the bylaws directly to voters since they already have more than enough signatures to do so, but they realize how divisive this would be. So they decided it would be much better to work this out in a committee.

Ivan Spiegel: Agrees with David Moring. He also points out that the Committee's recommendation is advisory to the Board and that the Board review is another opportunity for stakeholder comment. If the Committee's recommendation is really out of touch with the stakeholders, the recommendation will be defeated at the time of the stakeholder vote.

Joe Murphy: He believes that a consensus, although preferable, does not yet exist in the broader community and that presentation of two versions to the stakeholders so that they could choose between them would be a reasonable procedure to deal with this lack of consensus. He was assuming, apparently erroneously, that such a procedure was possible but was informed that this is not the case; therefore he will vote against the motion.

David Buchanan: 100 Venicians could submit 100 alternatives. But on a broader issue, the Bylaw adjustments (Evry/Buchanan) were born out of a crisis and that's no longer the case since we now have a vibrant working GRVNC. He then alluded to a further compromise to be presented later in the meeting that could further the consensus, and thinks it would be inadvisable to go back.

Lisa M. Ezell: She would like to somehow reconsider the stakeholder definition that was previously adopted by the Committee.

Thomas O'Meara: He heard terms like “divisive” and “divide & conquer” and he doesn't see it that way. He feels that those who favor the voting methods proposal have no reason to stay involved if there's no flexibility.

Greg Fitchitt: He is going to vote against the motion. He favors reaching a consensus. It doesn't need to be 'war'.

The question on the motion was called for and the motion was restated as follows:

Motion to include in committee report a minority bylaws proposal, and to ask the GRVNC baard to resolve the issue of either sending just the committee majority bylaws proposal to stakeholders for approval, or sending both the majority and minority proposals to stakeholders for approval.

By show of hands, the vote was:

0 For
12 Opposed
2 Abstain

Motion Failed

(Steve Freedman was absent at the time of this vote)

Joe Murphy: Being unable to refrain from seizing an opportunity to foist his mediation expertise upon the committee, he pointed out that a typical consensus process delays final agreement (ie, consensus) until the end of the process so that a participant can feel free to tentatively commit to something along the way which s/he may later wish to revisit based on personal reflection or subsequent committee discussion. He suggested that this might, for instance, help Lisa, who expressed ongoing concern with the previously adopted stakeholder definition, to feel more comfortable with the process.

David Buchanan: He thinks the drafting of the final version, with the need to make the document internally consistent, will deal with some of these concerns.

Marta Evry: We don't want to punch all the buttons on all the floors (this flew right over the head of the scribe but the rest of the committee seemed to understand it, so it has been left in verbatim).

Jodi Gusek: Don't throw the baby out with the bathwater. (The scribe did understand this).

David Moring: General Roberts deals with this (ie, Robert's Rules regarding reconsideration of motions).

The scribe missed noting remarks made here by **Thomas O'Meara** and **Sylviane Dungan**.

Jodi Gusek: We hear new ideas here and she is anxious to hear them.

(Committee Discussion Ends)

6. **GRVNC BOARD COMPOSITION/DISTRICT MAKE UP/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (ARTICLES IV, XI):** The Chair introduced the discussion by stating that the current composition is 7 district, 7 at large, and 7 officer positions. He suggested that he wants to begin by going around the table and giving everyone an opportunity to comment.

(Committee Discussion Begins)

David Moring: Wishes to hear from Marta and David.

Ivan Spiegel: Suggests that we break consideration of the matter into manageable pieces.

Marta Evry: Presents the modified proposal as set forth in **Attachment A**. Some of Marta's comments were that the original proposal was a reaction to 'slates'. This proposal reduces the number of districts from 19 to 14 and proposes 7 officers with specific roles to be elected at large, all by plurality vote. It essentially reverses the structure of the current bylaws from '7 district and 14 at large' to '14 district and 7 at large'. It also proposes that President, Vice President, Secretary & Treasurer and four district reps form the Agenda Committee. For details of the proposal, see **Attachment A**.

She raised the concern expressed to her by Steve Freedman about district 14, the Oxford Triangle which includes intense high rise residential structures adjacent to about 400 single family homes that constitute the original Oxford Triangle area. The problem he raises is that the residents of the 2000+ residential units in the high rises could easily overwhelm the interests of the 400 single family home residents.

David Buchanan: One exception to reliance on population distribution is district 13 which is primarily renters. This gives renters a voice.

Eileen Pollack Erickson: Is there an agenda committee?

Marta Evry: Yes. The Executive Committee is the agenda committee.

Marta Evry: You can't force it. The change allows a minority to use 5 board members to place an item on the agenda regardless of what the Executive Committee would otherwise do.

Joe Murphy: I like the proposal. He still prefers more at large representation.

Colette Bailey: It's a good effort. Oakwood is still large, but the compromise is good. It addresses the issue of having too many at large positions.

LJ Carusone: He likes it. He likes that the at large seats have specific responsibilities but would prefer hiring for the communications role.

Sylviane Dungan: District reps should be elected for 2 years.

Eileen Pollack Erickson: Not opposed to 2-year terms, as long as there is a method for removal. Response: there is one, addressed elsewhere in bylaws.

Stewart Oscars: District 14 is still a concern. The management of the high rises could take over the district.

Marta Evry: She has talked to others. They could do it (the management of the high rises could take over the district); but the projects are completed, and GRVNC outreach efforts are consistently rebuffed. A boundary adjustment can be done, but not in the bylaws.

Steve Freedman: (arrived at this point)

Greg Fitchitt: He likes certain aspects of it but sees a problem with the district group catering more to slate politics where 51% controls 100%.

Thomas O'Meara: He likes the reduction from 19 to 14 districts.

Jodi Gusek: 14 districts is more manageable and she likes more influence with more at large officer positions. Question regarding how Outreach and Communication differ.

Marta Evry: Outreach is more like PR and Communication is more like technical communication. The combined roles are too much for one person.

David Moring: One concern is that more districts implies mostly home owners which means less diversity. Is it intended to create more diversity?

Sylviane Dungan: She likes it because it expands the LUPC to include more community representation, and 2 year terms means more knowledge about the candidates.

Steve Freedman: Regarding diversity, a bunch of new people did run in the last election. He would like to come back to discussion of the proposed district 14, either now or later in the discussion.

Marta Evry: Regarding David Moring's comment on diversity, it is more likely that the changes will encourage more diversity.

Steve Freedman: Most of the Neighborhood Councils involve mostly residents.

Ivan Spiegel: Encourages consideration of one piece at a time. Committee discussion followed in which Greg Fitchitt mentioned having an alternative proposal regarding at large positions to consider.

(At this point, a consensus was reached to focus on that part of the presentation that urges adoption of the proposed 14 districts)

Steve Freedman: Raises his concerns about district 14. The original area had clear boundaries containing about 400 homes with a commercial area. It now includes about 2000 residences in high rises which will soon be about 3000 such residences and the 'city yard' may also become residential high rise. This density dwarfs and overwhelms the original 400 homes. It's a real problem now, not something that can be dealt with later. There is no possibility of growth beyond the 400 homes, unlike in the other districts.

Eileen Pollack Erickson: Perhaps we could isolate the high rises in a new district 15 with the understanding that we could drop it through the BONC procedure.

David Buchanan: Concern about how to draw the boundaries.

Steve Freedman: He has no solution at all.

LJ Carusone: What is the central concern?

Steve Freedman: The community has been fighting to keep a separation between the two dramatically different uses – the high rises on one side and the 400 homes on the other. There is a locked back gate that keeps getting opened which means that the 400 home area then gets inundated by the high rise traffic. This is a fight that has been going on for years without letup.

LJ Carusone: The high rise residents can organize through the city without the GRVNC.

David Moring: It's a legitimate concern; but if you break it off into a separate district 15, you no longer really have an 'Oxford Triangle'.

Steve Freedman: True. But as a district rep, how could s/he represent a district with these 2 dramatically different interest groups?

Marta Evry: Challis Macpherson likes keeping the high rises. Rita Mosier and DeDe Audet say that the high rise residents will never be involved in the GRVNC. The proposal is based on balancing these concerns with presenting a bylaws proposal that stakeholders will understand and feel comfortable adopting – ie, the vote will not be confused with the need to explain this gnarly issue and it will therefore be easier to vote for the overall proposal.

Steve Freedman: Challis Macpherson's position is not supported by her neighbors, and 'spinning it off' as suggested by Eileen is extremely unlikely to happen.

David Moring: Suggests that we vote on the 14 districts and then deal with the issue of changing the lines with a separate motion.

Marta Evry: She explains that district 1 is a distinct interest area (ie, the boardwalk) which should extend to the Santa Monica border (ie, the northern boardwalk piece currently displayed as part of district 3 should have been included as part of district 1). She explained that neighborhood integrity, not population, was the primary rationale for selection of boundaries; not that population distribution wasn't considered important, but that neighborhood integrity trumped population distribution when they were in conflict. She also recommended that the district 6 boundary be modified to include Abbot Kinney by moving the eastern boundary to the center of Electric Avenue.

Sylviane Dungan: Favors breaking district 14 into 2 districts (ie, add a district 15).

Eileen Pollack Erickson: Concurs with **Sylviane Dungan**.

(Discussion followed between **LJ Carusone**, **David Moring** and **Steve Freedman** – **Ivan Spiegel** urged the committee to move forward.

Susan Rennie: We're talking about an election to the Neighborhood Council. Would it make much difference if one of the district 14 high rise tenants were elected?

Steve Freedman: The problem is that the high rise tenants could control local opinion and overwhelm the interests of the 400 homes area – ie, force the gate to be open and allow destructive traffic to erode the character of the 400 home area.

Sylviane Dungan: The problem is not going to go away and it is likely to get more intense. The high rise portion has to be represented somehow – after all, they do exist, and both areas have the right to live – so let's divide it in 2.

Greg Fitchitt: Philosophical comment – 1 of 7 district reps has been involved in the discussion. Perhaps it would help to ask the other district reps for their opinion on the entire 14 district proposal.

Eileen Pollack Erickson: Adjust the boundaries so that the 400 home area is joined with one or more of the other districts, but keep the total number at 14 districts.

Marta Evry: If we rely on neighborhood integrity, she would prefer 15 districts.

Stewart Oscars: "Just to beat a horse to death" ... he understands the rationale for keeping the total to 14 districts but would prefer 15 districts to deal with the Oxford Triangle dilemma.

Susan Rennie: She agrees with basing districts on neighborhood integrity and also understands Steve's concerns.

Steve Freedman: Responding to both comments, he makes it clear that he supports the neighborhood integrity rationale and does not want to de-legitimize the identity of the high rise area.

Sylviane Dungan: People in towers have more in common with the Lincoln corridor. Why not combine the Lincoln corridor with the high rise area?

David Buchanan: He expresses the concern that Marina Point (the high rise area) won't participate at all. As it is, they won't even let you in to inform residents of the GRVNC, and that is a big concern. The boardwalk includes both businesses and residents. We don't have any district that is exclusively residential. He's concerned about the consequences of creating an unmixed district.

Eileen Pollack Erickson: Retracting earlier comments, suggests leaving it as is (ie, 14 districts) but put a mechanism into the bylaws to adjust the boundaries.

Marta Evry: Than could be done. It is a 'back door' way to deal with it.

The question on the motion was called for.

Marta Evry: Restates the motion as amended by consensus:

That 14 District Representatives be elected from 14 individual Districts by stakeholders in those Districts with boundaries as reflected in Attachment A.

Scribe note: Amendment A reflects the district 1 extension to the Santa Monica boundary (the boardwalk) and the shift of the district 6 eastern boundary to the center of Electric Avenue.

Eileen Pollack Erickson: Seconds the motion.

By show of hands, the vote was:

12 For
1 Opposed
1 Abstain

Motion Passes

(Jodi Gusek absent for this vote)

(Committee Discussion Ends)

7. GRVNC BOARD COMPOSITION/DISTRICT MAKE UP/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (ARTICLES IV, XI): The Chair opens the discussion on the next part of this part of the agenda – the 7 officers to be elected at large.

(Committee Discussion Begins)

Greg Fitchitt: Proposes that some at large representatives ‘without portfolio’ be elected directly by the stakeholders and appointed to perform certain roles.

LJ Carusone: Problem is how to get the necessary skills when the candidates don’t run on having those skills.

Marta Evry: Asks Greg if he is proposing more at large candidates.

Greg Fitchitt: Yes.

Marta Evry: Wants it to be 14 district and 7 at large overall, and doesn’t like at large positions without portfolio.

David Buchanan: Focus on the expertise aspect of the at large candidates. He feels that we must give specific responsibilities to the at large candidates.

Sylviane Dungan: She doesn’t understand what is being proposed.

David Buchanan: Tries to clarify it for her.

David Moring: 4 are ‘mandatory’.

Greg Fitchitt: So it would be different in this way. The proposal would not involve IRV for the district positions. There would be 11 at large candidates (including 4 officers) and 11 district candidates. The 11 district candidates would be elected by plurality vote of the voters in their district. All voters would be entitled to vote for all officers; all voters would be entitled to vote for only 1 (or 2) of the other at large candidates (to deal with the ‘51% takes 100%’ dilemma). The other 3 officers would be appointed by selected from among the remaining 7 at large members.

(The above is the scribe’s understanding of the proposal which was not clear to him at the time of the meeting)

Ivan Spiegel: All should be elected at large and all should have jobs.

Steve Freedman: 7 are well thought out and he supports that and says that we should choose 7 who run for those specific functions. It should be clear.

LJ Carusone: There’s more accountability when candidates are running for positions with specific functions.

Thomas O’Meara: It depends on the actual position. People can get burned out over 2 years. He would like more flexibility.

David Buchanan: If we give the Vice President the Outreach responsibility, then that opens up the possibility for a LUPC chair position.

Colette Bailey: She likes this LUPC Chair idea. She also feels that at large positions without specific jobs leaves it vague. She is speaking from her personal experience.

Lisa M. Ezell: Problem with leaving it (the LUPC position) open for developers to dominate. She believes developers could bankroll this.

Marta Evry: Yes, that could happen. That can be said about any position. It would be a real danger if all of LUPC were separately elected.

Steve Freedman: Strongly supports David's LUPC suggestion. He feels that the LUPC is the most important GRVNC committee and it is good to elect competence. That person is likely to have to put in more time than anyone else. It is a wise idea.

Stewart Oscars: He agrees to election of the LUPC chair.

Susan Rennie: It would get more people involved in voting.

Sylviane Dungan: What is the difference between the Outreach & Communication roles?

Marta Evry: Provides a 'right-brain / left-brain' analogy. Outreach is right-brain (PR: more creative); Communication is left-brain (Technical: more mechanical – computer and internet-web savvy)

David Buchanan: Provides analogy of external (PR) and internal (IT) communication functions in typical business.

Thomas O'Meara: Communication and Outreach are split in his early proposal.

Ivan Spiegel: Makes the motion:

That all of the Board Officers be elected at large for specific positions with specific responsibilities.

David Moring: Seconds the motion.

Discussion continues.

Greg Fitchitt: If we vote this way, we're guaranteeing that:

- a. The '51% elects 100%' problem continues; and
- b. We will lose independents from the GRVNC.

LJ Carusone: Wouldn't you want the at large ... (notes missing)

Lisa M. Ezell: Agrees with Greg. We're losing sight of the big picture.

Eileen Pollack Erickson: With jobs, the concern is mitigated.

Greg Fitchitt: We still have the 51% problem.

Steve Freedman: Plurality voting is what we're used to. He supports the proposed number of at large positions and roles.

The question on the motion was called for and the motion was restated as follows:

That all of the Board Officers be elected at large for specific positions with specific responsibilities.

By show of hands, the vote was:

9 For

4 Opposed

1 Abstain

Motion Passes

(Jodi Gusek absent for this vote)

(Committee Discussion Ends)

8. **NEXT MEETING AND AGENDA:** Committee decides to meet next on Monday Jan 23 at 7PM at a location to be announced. The agenda for the next meeting, per consensus at the 01-12-06 meeting, is continued discussion of **GRVNC BOARD COMPOSITION/DISTRICT MAKE UP/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (ARTICLES IV, XI).**
9. **ADJOURNMENT:** 10pm motion by chair to adjourn is passed by consensus.

Attachment A

To simplify the minutes, this is the proposal as amended and adopted during the 1/12/06 meeting to reflect district boundary adjustments between districts 1 & 3 (to make the boardwalk a contiguous district 1) and to include Abbot Kinney in district 6 (by shifting the eastern boundary of district 6 to the center of Electric Avenue)

GRASS ROOT VENICE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL Bylaws Committee

TO: Grass Roots Venice Neighborhood Council Board of Officers

FROM: GRVNC Bylaws Committee

SUBJECT: Proposed motion to change GRVNC Bylaws

The GRVNC Bylaws Committee met January 12, 2006 to review and discuss the “preparation of GRVNC bylaws changes for consideration of GRVNC Board approval and submission to DONE for ratification”, as the Committee mission statement requires.

By a vote of ___ in favor and ___ opposed and ___ abstention, the Committee requests that the Board utilize Article X, Section A of the GRVNC bylaws to make the following motion to change the Article XI of the bylaws:

Proposed bylaws change (strikeout sections are the areas to be amended).

ARTICLE XI — BOUNDARIES

-

~~Boundaries of the GRVNC shall follow the traditional boundaries for Venice, as set forth in the City of Los Angeles Venice Area Specific Plan and the City of Los Angeles Planning and Land Use Map for Venice, with one exception, as noted below. These traditional boundaries are approximately described as the City of Santa Monica to the North, the Pacific Ocean to the West, Marina del Rey (unincorporated County of Los Angeles) to the South, and Walgrove Avenue, the eastern edge of the Venice High School grounds, Culver City, Walnut, Del Rey and Lincoln Boulevard on the East. The exceptions to these traditional boundaries are:~~

-

~~A. ——— The area between Walgrove Ave. and Beethoven St., contains many of the schools serving the Venice Community including Venice High, Mark Twain Junior High, Walgrove Elementary and Beethoven Elementary. The grounds of these schools shall be considered an overlap area with the Neighborhood Council established by the Mar Vista Community.~~

-

~~B. ——— District Boundaries~~

-

~~**District 1: Penmar / Lincoln Place**~~

-

~~Western Boundary: Lincoln Blvd.~~

~~Southern Boundary: Palms Blvd.~~

Northern Boundary: City of Santa Monica (Navy to Dewey Ct. ROW to N. edge of Penmar)

Eastern Boundary: Walgrove Ave and eastern edge of school grounds

-

Description of Boundaries: Lincoln Blvd. at City of Santa Monica south to Palms Blvd., east on Palms, jog south on Penmar Ave. then continue east on Palms to Walgrove Ave., north Appleton, east on Appleton to Maplewood, north on Maplewood to Morningside, west on Morningside to Walgrove, north on Walgrove to the street north of Penmar Golf Course straight through along the southern border of the City of Santa Monica to Lincoln Blvd (border of Santa Monica runs between Ozone Ave. and Machado Dr. west of Penmar Park).

Census Tracts: All of #2731; Partial Tract #2714 between Walgrove and Beethoven North of Palms

District 2: Rose / North Beach

Western Boundary: Pacific Ocean

Southern Boundary: S. Venice Blvd at the Beach;

Boundary then goes North on Pacific to Westminster, then East along Westminster past Riviera to the dead end of Alhambra Ct., thence parallel to Abbot Kinney to Main St., North on Main to Brooks, East on Brooks to Hampton Dr., North on Hampton Dr. to the alley South of Rose Ave (continuation of Rose Ct.), thence East to Lincoln, thence North to the City of Santa Monica border, thence West along the border to Navy to the Pacific Ocean.

Census Tracts: Partial #2735, All of #2734 except small portion of Abbot Kinney; Partial #2733 and #2732 north of Rose Ct. or alley along that line.

-

District 3: Central Venice / Oakwood

Start at Lincoln Blvd. at Rose Ct.; South along Lincoln to California Ave.; West along California Ave. to Electric Ave; Northwest along Electric Ave. to Hampton Dr.; North along Hampton Dr. to line of Rose Ct.; East along Rose Ct. to Lincoln Blvd.

Census Tracts: Most of #2733 and #2732 except portions north of Rose Ct.

District 4: South of Palms, East of Lincoln

Start at Lincoln Blvd. at Palms; East along Palms to Penmar; South on Penmar to Palms; East on Palms to Beethoven St.; South along Beethoven to Venice Blvd; West along Venice Blvd. to Lyceum Ave; South along Lyceum to Zanja St.(Culver City border); West along Zanja to Lincoln; North on Lincoln to Palms.

Census Tracts: All of #2737; Partial #2738 east of Lincoln; Partial #2721 west of Beethoven.

-

District 5: Windward Circle / Abbot Kinney / Milwood / Walk Streets

Start at S. Venice Blvd. and Pacific; North along Pacific to Westminster; East on Westminster to Alhambra; Northwest along line of Alhambra (parallel to Abbot Kinney)

~~to intersection of Brooks and Main; North on Main to Vista; East along the line of Electric Ave. to Electric Ave; Southeast along Electric Ave to California Ave; Northeast on California to Lincoln; South on Lincoln to Venice; West on S. Venice to Pacific.~~

~~-Census Tracts: All of #2736; Partial #2735 (east of Pacific); Partial #2734 (along Abbot Kinney).~~

-
District 6: Oxford Triangle / Silver Triangle / President's Row

~~Start at Lincoln and Venice Blvd; South on Lincoln to Zanja/Van Buren; East on Zanja to Walnut; South on Walnut (turns into Del Rey) to Maxella; West on Maxella to Lincoln; South on Lincoln to LA County unincorporated line (south of 90 intersection); Northwest (parallel to Admiralty Way, following City of LA boundary and census tract border) to Washington at Mildred; Along LA County unincorporated line (Washington Blvd.) to Ocean/Via Marina; North on Ocean to S. Venice Blvd; East on S. Venice to Lincoln.~~

~~Census Tracts: All of #2741; Partial #2738 west of Lincoln; Partial #2739 east of Ocean.~~

District 7: Canals / Peninsula / South Beach / Silver Strand

~~Start at S. Venice and Ocean Ave.; West on S. Venice to the water; South along the coastline to the Marina; East on Via Marina (LA County unincorporated line) to Via Dolce; North on Via Dolce to Roma Ct; East on Roma Ct. to Via Marina (following City of LA border and LA County unincorporated line); North on Via Marina to Tahiti Way; North along LA County unincorporated line (parallel to Via Dolce) to Dell Alley; North along Dell Alley which jogs to the West to Via Dolce; North on Via Dolce to Washington; East on Washington to Ocean; North on Ocean to S. Venice.~~

~~Census Tracts: All of #2742; Partial #2739 west of Ocean Ave.~~

ARTICLE XI — BOUNDARIES

The boundaries of the GRVNC shall follow the City of Los Angeles Venice Area Specific Plan and the City of Los Angeles Planning and Land Use Map. In addition, there shall be three overlap areas with the Mar Vista Neighborhood Council to accommodate the following schools which serve both Venice and Mar Vista: Beethoven Elementary, Mark Twain Middle, and Venice High.

A. General Boundaries:

North: City of Santa Monica

East: Walgrove Ave., Culver City, Del Rey Avenue/Lincoln Boulevard

South: Marina del Rey (unincorporated County of Los Angeles)

West: Pacific Ocean

B. District Boundaries

The boundaries of each neighborhood are described by their location as points of a compass, North, East, South, and West. When necessary a more detailed description of the boundaries is provided. Unless otherwise indicated, when two of more neighborhoods share an abutting street/canal, the boundary is down the middle of the street/canal.

District 1. Ocean Front Walk

North: Santa Monica Boundary

East: Pacific Avenue

South: Washington Blvd.

West: Pacific Ocean

Census Tract No. 2734

District 2 Peninsula

North: Washington Boulevard

East: Marina del Rey

South: Marina del Rey

West: Pacific Ocean

Census Tract No. 4152

District 3. Rose Avenue

North: Santa Monica Boundary

East: Lincoln Boulevard

~~South: Rose Court to Rennie Ave. and businesses fronting on the south side of Rose Ave. from Rennie Ave to Pacific Ave., such as: Pioneer Bakery, Venice Family Clinic, Storage Area, etc.~~

West: Pacific Avenue

Census Tract No. 2732 & 2733

District 4. Oakwood West

North: Rose Court (see southern boundary of Rose Avenue)

East: Sixth Avenue

South: Electric Blvd. and Brooks Ave.

West: Pacific Avenue

Census Tract No. 2733 & 2734

District 5. Oakwood East

North: Rose Court (see southern boundary of Rose Avenue)

East: Lincoln Boulevard

South: California Boulevard

West: Sixth Avenue

Census Tract No. 2732 & 2733

District 6. Windward Circle

North: Brooks Avenue

East: Electric Avenue

South: South Venice Boulevard

West: Pacific Avenue

Census Tract No. 2735

District 7. Milwood

North: California Avenue

East: Lincoln Boulevard

South: North Venice Boulevard

West: Abbot Kinney Boulevard

Census Tract No. 2736

District 8. Canals

North: South Venice Boulevard

East: Ocean Avenue

South: Washington Boulevard

West: Pacific Avenue

Census Tract No. 2739

District 9. Silver Triangle

North: South Venice Boulevard

East: Abbot Kinney Boulevard

South: Washington Boulevard

West: Ocean Avenue

Census Tract No. 2739 & 2741

District 10. Presidents Row

North: South Venice Boulevard

East: Lincoln Boulevard

South: Washington Boulevard

West: Abbot Kinney Boulevard

Census Tract: 2738 & 2741

District 11: Penmar North

North: City of Santa Monica (Navy to Dewey Ct. ROW to N. edge of Penmar)

East: Walgrove Ave and eastern edge of school grounds

South: Palms Boulevard.

West: Lincoln Boulevard.

Census Tracts: 2731 and #2714

District 12. Penmar South

North: Palms Boulevard

East: Walgrove Avenue

South: Venice Boulevard

West: Lincoln Boulevard

Census Tract No. 2737

District 13. Zanja

North: Venice Boulevard

East: Walgrove Avenue

South: Zanja Street from Walgrove Avenue to Del Rey Avenue

West: Del Rey Avenue from Zanja Street to Washington Boulevard

South: Washington Boulevard from Del Rey Avenue to Lincoln Boulevard

West: Lincoln Boulevard

Census Tract No. 2738

District 14. Oxford Triangle

North: Washington Boulevard

East: Del Rey Avenue to Maxella Avenue to Lincoln Boulevard.

West/South: Marina del Rey from Washington Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard

Census Tract No. 2741

Overlapping School areas with Mar Vista Neighborhood Council

Venice High School

North: Venice Boulevard

East: Lyceum Avenue

South: Zanja Street

West: Walgrove Avenue

Mark Twain Middle School

North: Victoria Avenue

East: Beethoven Street

South: Lucille Avenue

West: Walgrove Avenue

Walgrove Elementary School

North: Morningside Avenue

East: Maplewood Avenue

South: Appleton Way

West: Walgrove Avenue

