

**Grass Roots Venice Neighborhood Council
Bylaws Committee February 20, 2006 Meeting Minutes**

- 1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:10 PM.**
- 2. ATTENDANCE:** Bylaws Committee Members present – LJ Carusone (Committee Chair) presiding, David Moring, Ivan Spiegel, Jodi Gusek, Joe Murphy, Lisa M. Ezell, Steve Freedman, Stewart Oscars, Thomas O’Meara. Absent – Colette Bailey, David Buchanan, Eileen Pollack Erickson, Greg Fitchitt, Susan Rennie. Also attending – Challis Macpherson, Dante Cacace.
- 3. MINUTES:** The minutes from 02-02-09 meeting were not reviewed.
- 4. PRESENTATION AND LUPC TASK FORCE REPORTS**
 - a. Presentation Task Force report**
 - i. Note: review of presentation with slides will take place at Feb. 22nd meeting**
 - b. LUPC Task Force report:**
 - i. *ACTION: Review recommendations and adopt LUPC plan**

LJ Carusone: Directs attention to Presentation Task Force report.

(Discussion begins)

Jodi Gusek: She can’t be at the presentation on February 28th.

(**LJ Carusone, Jodi Gusek, Stewart Oscars, and Challis Macpherson** provide the presentation report)

Stewart Oscars: We have made it more orderly and precise.

Jodi Gusek: We have a handout and 4 PowerPoint slides:

1. Status quo → 7 at-large & 1 district positions → 15 votes/voter
2. 14 ‘1-rep’ districts → 1 vote for 1 position → 8 votes/voter
3. 7 ‘2-rep’ districts → 1 vote for 1 of 2 positions → 8 votes/voter
4. 14 at-large → 1 vote for 1 of 14 positions → 8 votes/voter

LJ Carusone: I’ve been asked questions about why we need to make any changes.

Ivan Spiegel: If we do nothing, then we need to deal with the problems of the 2004 Stakeholder and Board amendments that have not yet been certified by DONE.

Steve Freedman: If the Board does not have some familiarity with what we’re coming up with by now, it’s almost too late.

Ivan Spiegel: Do we need to post the presentation on the web?

Steve Freedman: Should it be posted before the Board hears it?

LJ Carusone: Yes. We made an early decision to be transparent in all our deliberations.

Jodi Gusek: It's important that we feel comfortable with what we recommend.

Challis Macpherson: Wants to argue for restructuring of LUPC.

Jodi Gusek: When will that be heard by Board?

LJ Carusone: With the presentation.

Jodi Gusek: It fits with any of the alternatives.

Ivan Spiegel: We need a time frame for each part of the presentation.

(Discussion ends)

LJ Carusone: Directs attention to Presentation Task Force report.

(Discussion begins – all decisions were made by consensus and are reflected in the updated working draft of the 2001 Bylaws as amended to date)

LJ Carusone: The Task Force involved a large group and it seems to be a good plan.

David Moring: Are we proposing a name change?

LJ Carusone: No. He then reads the proposal and notes that the VSP doesn't cover all of Venice.

Challis Macpherson: Suggests adding 1 or 2 members to cover the area east of Lincoln.

LJ Carusone: It's like an unincorporated area – perhaps one additional member.

David Moring: It currently has 2 representatives.

Steve Freedman: The LUPC Task Force recommendation already includes 8 members.

Challis Macpherson: Why not have 9 or 10 plus the chair?

LJ Carusone: Is that unwieldy?

Challis Macpherson: No. Some district representatives do not want to serve on the LUPC.

Steve Freedman: This isn't about representing a district. It's just gathering and presenting information.

Ivan Spiegel: We might get by with one, but that area is going to be a bubbling hotbed in the future. Also, it's not VSP; the rules are different there, which means that there needs to be a liaison familiar with that.

Steve Freedman: The role is not major in terms of liaison. It's a hotbed, but it's not the liaison that will be doing the work.

Ivan Spiegel: What do you see as the roles? Is it completely separate from representation?

Challis Macpherson: She responds.

Ivan Spiegel: Do your district reps now do some of the work? What would be the impact on you?

Challis Macpherson: It takes a lot of time now, but it would not take as much time in the future of the LUPC revisions were adopted.

Jodi Gusek: It sounds like you're spread too thin.

Challis Macpherson: Yes.

Steve Freedman: What about Penmar (area east of Lincoln)?

Challis Macpherson: Penmar can be covered by one person and so could the Oxford Triangle.

Steve Freedman: It is my understanding that the function of a LUPC member would be to raise issues but not advocate for them – the role is not that of representing and area.

Ivan Spiegel: How do you get something on the agenda?

Challis Macpherson: Contact the person responsible for that area.

There was a discussion of the role of the LUPC member and the relationship with district reps, assuming a district rep board structure is adopted.

LJ Carusone: Summarizes: We're setting in place a protocol. The question is whether we can do it with 1 additional LUPC member.

Challis Macpherson: I can only relate anecdotal advice. It's not going to require more than 1.

Ivan Spiegel: Assume the 14 at-large option. How does a matter get before the LUPC? ExCom will ask how a matter gets to the LUPC.

Steve Freedman: LUPC members will draw from a hat as to which area they cover.

Joe Murphy: It's not advocacy.

David Moring: Who would let people know the process?

LJ Carusone: That's an outreach function.

Jodi Gusek: Random assignment lets each LUPC member know his/her area of responsibility. By not requiring 'district representation', it brings objectivity to bear on issues in that area. The LUPC member has to become familiar with the area, but it does raise the level of objectivity.

David Moring: He believes the east of Lincoln area needs two reps since there are three big sites for potential development at Lincoln Center, Lincoln Place and Smart & Final. The area is made up of single family residences and of apartments (especially in the Zanja Street area), but it is fairly homogeneous. Also a possible upcoming development issue will be the building of large multilevel homes on many of those large residential lots in the area (mansionization).

LJ Carusone: That's correct. It could happen.

David Moring: That could be too much for one person. Suggests we add 2.

Jodi Gusek: How many are on the current LUPC?

Challis Macpherson: Nine. CPAC had about 21 and only 15 would come to meetings. There was diversity on the committee → if we select members as proposed, we'll get diversity – which is good.

LJ Carusone: 10 plus 1 voting chair.

(Discussion about tie-breaker vs voting chair)

David Moring: I would hope we would move toward consensus.

Steve Freedman: Split votes are not likely to have influence → consensus is necessary for influence.

David Moring: That's why CPAC was so good.

Joe Murphy: Emphasizes need to state consensus-building role of LUPC chair.

Steve Freedman: Consider that we want Bylaws to be simple and that we want to relegate as much as possible to Standing Rules → why not let LUPC have more autonomy – don't put all the details in the Bylaws. We don't have to dictate rules about consensus building. Don't write in an attempt to create consensus.

Challis Macpherson: Right now, LUPC is reviewing LUPC Policies and Procedures and achieving consensus.

Joe Murphy: Makes a distinction between consensus on committees and getting parties in land use dispute to independently reach consensus – encourage use of neutral facilitator.

LJ Carusone: What about rules?

Jodi Gusek: Likes it as it is, leaving it up to rules, so that they can get up and running.

Ivan Spiegel: Agrees with Steve – sees problem with the way it's written. Problem is perception of community. We've been talking about making it professional – what if Joe were appointed? How would community react if he were appointed to Oakwood?

Steve Freedman: If I'm assigned **David Moring's** area and he mine, we should be able to swap.

Joe Murphy: That might not be bad.

Challis Macpherson: Currently, I refer a matter to the district rep. If the new LUPC were in place, it comes through the chair and the chair assigns it to the responsible member → caseload is shared.

Joe Murphy: I like this.

Ivan Spiegel: Likes it, but concerned about doing away with districts and now doing away with districts in LUPC.

Lisa M. Ezell: If you draw out of a hat, it could be a learning opportunity → you can learn from someone who is familiar with an issue or a neighborhood.

Ivan Spiegel: We're skipping around.

LJ Carusone: Let's start from the top.

Scribe Note: The following summary by Phil Raider, of the Bylaws Committee's LUPC Task Force recommendations resulting from its 3.5 hours of discussion on February 12, 2006, was reviewed and amended and adopted by consensus as indicated. Actual Bylaws amendments necessary to implement these changes will be dealt with in the process of final editing by the Bylaws Committee.

G. Planning and Land Use Committee:

The Chair of the Planning & Land Use Committee will be an elected 2 year position, to coincide with the general elections.

The committee will consist of 9-11 people including the chair.

All committee members must be GRVNC stakeholders.

~~Eight~~ Ten of the committee members will be selected by the board from a pool of candidates who have formally communicated their desire to serve to the Board.

The Board will within 30 days of being certified hold a public meeting solely for the selection of committee members.

Candidates will submit a statement/bio/CV of no more than 500 words to the members of the Board no less than 5 days prior to the special meeting.

At this meeting the Board will take statements of no more than 4 minutes from each of the prospective members and public comment of not more than 2 minutes per speaker from the general public.

Board members will select from a prepared ballot no more than ~~eight~~ ten people to serve on the LUPC. The ~~8~~ 10 highest vote getters will be selected.

A PLUC member may be removed from service by a 2/3 majority of ~~the board~~ the full GRVNC Board. Vacancies will be filled in the same manner that committee members were originally selected-~~i.e., notification of intent, special meeting etc.~~

~~Each confirmed committee member will, by drawing numbers from a hat, be assigned to monitor one of the eight sub-areas delineated within the Venice Specific Plan.~~

~~Each committee member will report to the PLUC concerning all projects within that designated area.~~

Scribe Note: (i) Discussion of the above focused primarily on an unsuccessful search for a less cumbersome process of selecting a replacement for removed or vacant positions. The recommended process was considered acceptable, in part, because the new LUPC structure makes it possible for it to continue to function despite vacancies.

(ii) Due to concerns regarding apparent delegation of decision-making authority by Board to LUPC, consideration of the following LUPC Task Force recommendation was tabled until the February 22 Bylaws Task Force meeting. [It was then decided to consider this at its February 27 meeting.]

Decisions of the Committee can be reconsidered by the GRVNC Board if and only if seven members of the Board call for reconsideration of a particular PLUC decision at the next Board meeting.

Projects to be reconsidered will be moved to the next Board meeting at which time the entire project, including project presentation and public comment will be taken and reviewed by the Board.

(Discussion ends)

5. **NEXT MEETING AND AGENDA:** Committee decides to meet next on Monday, February 27, 2006 at 7PM at a location to be announced. The agenda for the next meeting is to complete the review of the LUPC component.
6. **ADJOURNMENT:** 9:15pm motion by chair to adjourn is passed by consensus.