

This includes all **LUPC Chair** and **LUPC Committee** extracts from the Bylaws Committee Minutes, the LUPC Task Force, and the 02-28-06 Board Minutes (where the Bylaws Committee presented the options considered and received a sense of the board). It is intended to assist the Board in its task of soliciting, considering, and selecting the applicants who will serve on LUPC during the coming year Prepared October 23, 2006 by Joseph D. Murphy.

Bylaws Committee Minutes 01-03-06

GRVNC BOARD COMPOSITION/DISTRICT MAKE UP/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (ARTICLES IV, XI)

- a. **Each committee member will take up to five minutes to state his or her preferences and why.**
- b. **Open discussion of different structures.**

Committee member statements of preference:

Joe Murphy: ... He also expressed interest in increasing the professionalism of the LUPC.

Committee Discussion

Joe Murphy: Urges time be allocated for brainstorming options for making the LUPC more professional. He aired the idea of creating an at large 'urban design' position which met with immediate resistance.

Bylaws Committee Minutes 01-12-06

GRVNC BOARD COMPOSITION/DISTRICT MAKE UP/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (ARTICLES IV, XI)

Committee Discussion

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.

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.

Bylaws Committee Minutes 01-23-06

David Moring: Moves:

That seven (7) board officer positions be established consisting of President, Secretary, Treasurer, Communications, Government Relations, Outreach, and LUPC Chair – each board officer to be elected by vote of all voting stakeholders.

David Buchanan: Seconds the motion.

Lisa M. Ezell: ... She also expresses concern about the LUPC position, fearing that moneyed interests could negatively influence that person.

Steve Freedman: ... Regarding Lisa's concerns about the LUPC Chair, he indicated that that person can be removed if there is a problem of the sort that she fears.

...

Linda Lucks: ... The LUPC Chair is a pretty important position that could also be a Vice President.

...

David Buchanan: ... Responding to **Lisa M. Ezell's** concern about undo influence of the LUPC Chair position by moneyed interests, he points out that the RAD/MTA project is over a \$200m project whereas it would take only \$20k to \$30k to control the GRVNC and not just LUPC; he wants someone in that position that is accountable to stakeholders.

...

LJ Carusone: He likes the LUPC Chair; it has the potential of getting people engaged and that is great.

...

Ivan Spiegel: ... He likes the idea of the LUPC Chair; the board could remove that person, but he's not worried about a developer taking over the LUPC.

...

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

That seven (7) board officer positions be established consisting of President, Vice President/Government Relations, Secretary, Treasurer, Communications, Outreach, and LUPC Chair – each board officer to be elected by vote of all voting stakeholders.

By show of hands, the vote was:

9 For

1 Opposed

1 Abstain
Motion Passes

Bylaws Committee Minutes 01-23-06

David Moring: ... Except for chairing the LUPC, the role of the new LUPC Chair position is not fully resolved and it is anticipated that another Task Force will consider this further; ideas that were considered, however, include orientation of new LUPC members, liaison about land use matters with the GRVNC board and the community, and preparing and distributing Community Impact Reports.

...

David Buchanan: Moves:

That we accept the descriptions as amended by consensus subject to further amendment of section G [LUPC Chair]

Susan Rennie: Seconds the motion.

The question on the motion was called for and by show of hands the vote was:

11 For
0 Opposed
1 Abstain

Motion Passes

Steve Freedman: The only place districting really affects this nc is by restricting participation on the LUPC which is arguably the most important committee in the nc at this time. Districting approach does more harm than good to LUPC.

...

David Moring: ... Reminds us that, before we adjourn, we need to create a task force to look at the LUPC.

...

The scribe was instructed by unanimous consent to record the creation of a LUPC Task Force to include **LJ Carusone, Ivan Spiegel, Joe Murphy, Steve Freedman, Dante Cacace** and **Jodi Gusek** with other members to be appointed by the chair.

Bylaws Committee Minutes 02-09-06

LJ Carusone: The LUPC Task Force is meeting Sunday at 8AM.

LUPC Task Force Notes 02-12-06

NOTE: The LUPC Task Force had the following 3 communications before it at its 2/12/2006 meeting when considering revisions to the structure of the LUPC Committee.

LJ Carusone Email (2/9/2006) - includes Michel King's discussion points

Hi Everyone,

Here is a list of some discussion points started by Michael King to help get us focused at our LUPC Task Force meeting this Sunday @ 8 AM, 738 Howard Street (Oxford Triangle, SW of Lincoln and Washington intersection)

Please keep in mind this meeting needs to address LUPC as it pertains to our bylaws and revisions we intend to make. The Bylaws Committee is leaning toward an all At Large board make up, without district reps. However, we have an alternate model that constructs 14 districts. We may need to address both until the committee and board have agreed to support a single model.

Also, the Bylaws Committee has proposed making the LUPC chair an elected officer to the board. We need to define that role and responsibilities.

Michael King's discussion points:

1. What should be the role/responsibilities of the elected LUPC chair?
2. Who takes over when elected Chair is not Available?
3. How many members on the LUPC committee?
4. How do we keep one area from having multiple members under an all At-Large plan?
5. How would a 14 district plan address regional representation?
5. Should the members be appointed or placed through an election process?
6. Who appoints members if it is an appointment process?
7. May stakeholders sit on the LUPC committee? What are the requirements? How would they be approved/appointed?
8. How do we handle existing two year LUPC members who are already appointed to the LUPC. When the new Board is in place in October they will still have a year left on their seat. Will they need to be reappointed or will empty seats need to be filled?

*Not all of these questions necessarily need to be taken up in the bylaws.

I think we really need to focus on the Chair position and the duties, the number of people who will sit on the LUPC committee, and the process for selection from within the board and outside the board.

See you all in a few days,

L.J. Carusone
GRVNC Government Relations Officer
www.grvnc.org 310-625-1481 c

Joe Murphy Emails (2/11/2006 & 1/19/2006)

Hi,

A short outline of some recent thoughts I've had about LUPC and its chair:

I believe the LUPC Chair should be tasked with providing 2 basic services:

1. Investigative - a service provided by LUPC to the Board, which seems to fit with the idea of a Community Impact Report.
2. Facilitative - a service to the community which I envision as making available a pool of unpaid neutral 3rd-party facilitators trained to help clarify and resolve conflicts between owners wishing to build something and impacted neighbors. This role cannot be performed by LUPC (quasi-judicial) or the Board (appellate) since hearings before them generate the adversarial impulses that neutral facilitators wouldn't. This would probably be most useful in situations involving small proposals by residents of Venice, and rarely useful in situations involving the AIMCO or RAD types of proposals of large non-Venice corporate developers.

Thanks. Joe

Hi.

Sometime soon, the issue of LUPC will be upon us. Issues I see are:

1. Matters that come before LUPC are required to come before the full board and essentially heard a second time. This is because a vote by LUPC can be modified and/or reversed by the full board. This is cumbersome because it basically requires duplicate presentations (or more) by proposal proponents and duplicate hearings of pro and con public comments. Politically, I can't see how the board level review and hearing can be avoided.
2. Some Bylaws Committee member comments have expressed a desire to raise the level of professional expertise of LUPC.

Whatever the form of the solution, I would personally want LUPC to remain essentially advisory to the full board with the full board having the sole authority to make the final decisions; but beyond that, I would want LUPC to be comprised of the high level of expertise and sophistication which I believe to be absolutely necessary to effectively meet the challenges of large outside development interests that threaten to erode the unique character of Venice.

I think this means that LUPC, much like LA approving authorities but capable of doing even better, needs to be:

1. Sufficiently knowledgeable about Venice to distinguish its character from that of Santa Monica and Marina Del Rey so that Venice doesn't gradually become indistinguishable from them;
2. Sufficiently savvy, about the urban design and economic and legal and political environments, to make solid and credible recommendations that will effectively counter the considerable spectrum and depth of expertise that outside interests can and will muster; and
3. Sufficiently confident to risk approval of projects while imposing rationale and enforceable conditions that will further the interests of Venice.

I'd like the committee to allocate the time to brainstorm alternatives that might do this. It doesn't need to be at our next meeting. Them're my thoughts! (^_^) Joe

PLUC NOTES [Summary Report prepared by Phil Raider]

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 people including the chair.

All committee members must be GRVNC stakeholders

Eight 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 that 4 minutes from each of the prospective members and public comment of not more that 2 minutes per speaker from the general public.

Board members will select from a prepared ballot no more that eight people to serve on the PLUC. The 8 highest vote getters will be selected.

A PLUC member may be removed from service by a 2/3 majority of the 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.

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 take and reviewed by the Board.

Bylaws Committee Minutes 02-20-06

- a. **LUPC Task Force report:**
 - i. ***ACTION: Review recommendations and adopt LUPC plan**

...

Challis Macpherson: Wants to argue for restructuring of LUPC.

...

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 if 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 an 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.

Bylaws Committee Minutes 02-22-06

NEXT MEETING AND AGENDA: Committee decides to meet next on Monday, February 27, 2006 at 7PM at Extra Space Storage. The agenda for the next meeting is to complete the review of the LUPC component.

Bylaws Committee Minutes 02-27-06

LJ Carusone: Directs Committee attention to LUPC Task Force report.

(Discussion begins)

David Buchanan: Committees are internal and must report to the Board. You can use Standing Rules to create a consent calendar.

LJ Carusone: The consent calendar is not recommended by DONE.

Ivan Spiegel: LUPC matters dominate Board meetings.

David Buchanan: After being elected, Rosendahl learned that land use matters constitute over 85% of his work load.

Ivan Spiegel: Recommends that we do away with LUPC as a Committee and replace it with an advisory panel that provides analysis but does not necessarily hold hearings.

Joe Murphy: Supports the concept.

Ivan Spiegel: Indicates that this would avoid duplication and would enable the Board to make informed decisions.

LJ Carusone: He has received comments that stakeholders like the LUPC process because it gives them information earlier.

Ivan Spiegel: At the last Board meeting, there was a lot of comment questioning why matters were being heard 'a second time'.

Steve Freedman: The LUPC has always been a standing committee. Many community members believe it is the most important GRVNC committee. Remarks that the suggestion that an LUPC advisory board could do staff work comparable to the paid, professional, full-time Staff of the CCC is absurd. Also, many Board members who initially want to be on the LUPC often later regret it because few have enough time to handle the responsibilities of being on the Board and the LUPC.

David Buchanan: Controversial issues in LA go to PLUM where it gets heard all over again. GRVNC is purely advisory → it does not have paid staff. Where we've missed the boat, however, is in not providing an opportunity for collaboration. LUPC could perform this role. If so, developers could use the LUPC as a forum in which to present proposals and get feedback.

LJ Carusone: Mentions talking with **Ivan Spiegel** regarding the Board conducting 2 meetings per month – one the regular meeting chaired by the GRVNC President, the other the LUPC meeting chaired by the LUPC Chair.

Steve Freedman: Having two hearings is OK. It's a benefit to stakeholders to present a project twice because it gives two opportunities to hear a matter discussed and to comment.

David Buchanan: **Ivan Spiegel** is raising a 'bubble problem'. The LUPC, besides performing the role of a judge, can provide an forum where developers can have an ongoing sounding board, which is good. And the Board is going to have to develop trust in the LUPC → the LUPC needs to provide balanced information and recommendations.

CJ Cole: Likes what we're coming up with and states candidly that she does not trust the current LUPC because she believes they all have agendas.

Joe Murphy: Echoes CJ Cole's comment regarding lack of trust in the current LUPC, indicating that the perception is that your real objective is to get past an unfavorable LUPC decision so that you can get before the full Board where you believe you are more likely to get a more favorable decision – but regardless, the entire process is laden with these unfortunate political overtones that the proposed LUPC could mitigate considerably, which would give the Board better and more impartial information – and this would enhance its credibility and influence.

Richard Myers: District Reps are not doing LUPC work.

David Buchanan: It comes down to what the report is. The problem is not structural, it's a question of delivery of information → standing rules could provide a template format for LUPC reports that would provide the information.

Richard Myers: The Board could insist on a report which, if not provided, would preclude the issue from being placed on the agenda.

Joe Murphy: It's the report, certainly. But it's not just that. It's also a matter of trusting the LUPC, and that is structural.

Keith Harrison: Do you want to consider having LUPC votes tallied by name?

David Moring: Likes the theme of achieving consensus.

Steve Freedman: Maybe knowing who voted how would be helpful.

David Buchanan: The proposed LUPC makeup is going to be appointments → perhaps selection process should shield them from public comment?

LJ Carusone: Indicates preference to hear about them.

Ivan Spiegel: Moves:

That public comment be submitted in writing.

Motion fails for lack of a second.

CJ Cole: Who votes for whom has to be public.

Joe Murphy: Should board members be excluded from being appointed?

(David Buchanan departs)

At this point, the Committee considered each paragraph of the proposed LUPC Committee as presented by the LUPC Task Force and amended at the prior Bylaws Committee meeting and made further amendments as follows (**changes are in bold blue print**):

The Chair of the Land Use and Planning 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 and cannot be members of the current Board with the exception of the Land Use and Planning Committee Chair.

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 Land Use and Planning 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 list no more than eight ten people to serve on the LUPC. The 8 10 highest vote getters will be selected.

A Land Use and Planning Committee 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 LUPC concerning all projects within that designated area.~~

~~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.~~

The Land Use and Planning Committee recommendations to the Board shall be in the form of a written report including the project description, pros & cons, summary of community input, and findings, if any, by the committee.

Ivan Spiegel: Moves to add the following provision:

That projects that comply with the VSP development standards shall not qualify for consideration by the LUPC.

Keith Harrison: The Board reviews all matters that are pertinent to the community.

Joe Murphy: Although attracted to the thought, he indicates that the issue is a bit more subtle than this and that there is value in the constructive exchange of ideas and the input that can come from hearing LUPC and neighbor concerns and comments is valuable and does affect project design – often improving it. Therefore he would oppose the motion.

Motion fails for lack of a second.

LJ Carusone: Moves adoption of the amendments to the functions of the proposed LUPC Committee.

Steve Freedman: Seconds the motion.

The question being called and determined by voice vote as follows:

For	9
Opposed	0
Abstain	0

Motion passes

(Discussion ends)

LJ Carusone: Directs Committee attention to the function of the LUPC Chair.

David Moring: Reviews the functions as previously adopted by the Committee:

7. Land Use and Planning Committee Chair

- **Chair of the Land Use and Planning Committee**

(Remaining LUPC Chair duties to be developed as the LUPC language is finalized. May include:

- *Chief liaison for LUPC with GRVNC Board of Officers and Venice community*
- *Provide reports to LUPC and GRVNC Board of Officers that tracks land use project in Venice*
- *Works with President and VP to present Community Impact Reports to LA City planning officials*
- *Inform stakeholders of the impact of land use projects in Venice*
- *Orient all new LUPC members on the land use planning and approval process in LA City)*

(Discussion begins)

David Moring: Moves that the following amendments be adopted:

7. Land Use and Planning Committee Chair

- **Chair of the Land Use and Planning Committee**
- **Responsible for all required reports to the Board**

~~*(Remaining LUPC Chair duties to be developed as the LUPC language is finalized. May include:*~~

- ~~*—Chief liaison for LUPC with GRVNC Board of Officers and Venice community*~~
- ~~*—Provide reports to LUPC and GRVNC Board of Officers that tracks land use project in Venice*~~
- ~~*—Works with President and VP to present Community Impact Reports to LA City planning officials*~~
- ~~*—Inform stakeholders of the impact of land use projects in Venice*~~
- ~~*—Orient all new LUPC members on the land use planning and approval process in LA City)*~~

Joe Murphy: Seconds the motion.

The question was called and, by unanimous (8) voice vote:

Motion passes

(Discussion ends)

Board Minutes 02-28-06 [Meeting to present options & obtain sense of board]

LJ Carusone: Introduces **David Moring**.

David Moring: Creation of new LUPC structure
Roles and Responsibilities of Officers

David Moring's remarks included the following:

- Most positions are pretty familiar except for the last one, the LUPC Chair. LUPC deals with issues that are viewed by many stakeholders to be the most important that the GRVNC considers, and certainly the most demanding and time-consuming. For this reason, and to attract candidates with suitable expertise, the Committee is recommending the creation of this new position.
- He then reviewed each position & the Committee's allocation of the roles and responsibilities of each as follows (**blue print on following page**), indicating that the final draft could result in minor word changes.

7. Land Use and Planning Committee Chair

- **Chair of the Land Use and Planning Committee**
- **Responsible for all required reports to the Board**

Scribe note: To provide continuity regarding the proposed new LUPC structure, the scribe has placed the following section here in the minutes even though it was actually presented after the Election Cycle section.

LJ Carusone: Introduces **David Moring**.

Creation of New LUPC Structure

David Moring's remarks included the following:

- The recommended provisions establishing the proposed new LUPC structure are as follows (**blue print**):

Land Use and Planning Committee:

- **The Chair of the Land Use and Planning Committee will be an elected 2 year position, to coincide with the general elections.**
- **The committee will consist of 11 people including the chair.**
- **All committee members must be GRVNC stakeholders and cannot be members of the current Board with the exception of the Land Use and Planning Committee Chair.**
- **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 Land Use and Planning Committee members.**
- **Board members will select from a prepared list no more than ten people to serve on the LUPC. The 10 highest vote getters will be selected.**
- **A Land Use and Planning Committee member may be removed from service by a 2/3 majority of the full GRVNC Board. Vacancies will be filled in the same manner that committee members were originally selected.**
- **The Land Use and Planning Committee recommendations to the Board shall be in the form of a written report including the project description, pros & cons, summary of community input, and findings, if any, by the committee.**

Challis Macpherson: I want to say that I strongly endorse the new LUPC concept – both the LUPC Chair and the restructured Land Use and Planning Committee. The LUPC Chair is a big job and it interferes with my district duties. One concern is how we remove and replace a non-performing LUPC Chair; is there something in the Bylaws that provides for this?

L.J. Carusone: Yes. It requires a 2/3 majority for removal.

Linda Lucks: ... She also expressed appreciation for the thought given to the new LUPC system.

Michael King: ... if LUPC comprises only non-board members, you lose something. It would be better to have a mix of, say, 5 stakeholders and 5 board members. And there is the issue of handling the transition from the current to the new LUPC system.

David Moring: LUPC is a full-time job, as far as a GRVNC commitment is concerned. Also, the concept of the new LUPC is to attract a commitment from applicants who would bring impartial expertise to the table.

L.J. Carusone: Points out that even the current LUPC members, whether or not appointed by their district rep, would serve out their terms.

Challis Macpherson: A couple of thoughts.

Regarding **Linda Lucks'** concern about a committee inheriting abilities from predecessors (ie, transition and institutional memory) – in LUPC, she was fortunate that Darryl Dufay initiated formal 'policies and procedures' that have helped her a great deal. She believes that every standing committee should create similar sets of policies and procedures to guide successors.

Regarding **Michael King's** concern about including a mix of board and non-board members on the new LUPC – the way it is structured, the LUPC Chair could assign a LUPC member or even several LUPC members to an issue such as Lincoln Place. The structure provides flexibility and enables more efficient allocation of resources, which benefits Venice since the members can be assigned where needed.

Phil Raider: Fourth: LUPC subcommittee meeting ...

Naomi Nightingale: She likes the proposed new LUPC system and supports it.

C.J. Cole: She senses consensus on the proposed LUPC ...

2. **SENSE OF THE BOARD:** Out of 15 Board members present at the time that a show of hands was requested (**Linda Lucks** left earlier in the meeting), the following tally was recorded by the scribe:

<u>Election System</u>	<u>Preferred by</u>
Current (15 votes/voter)	0 Board Members
7 Districts, 2 Reps/District (8 votes/voter)	1 Board Member
14 Districts, 1 Rep/District (8 votes/voter)	0 Board Members
14 At-Large (8 votes/voter)	12 Board Members
No Preference Stated	<u>2 Board Members</u>
	15 Board Members

Bylaws Committee Minutes 03-08-06

(Discussion begins on LUPC membership issue)

Lisa M. Ezell: The problem is that it takes too much time.

David Buchanan: No Executive Officer should serve, but we could allow at large members to serve.

Ivan Spiegel: (i) If they can run, they have to recuse themselves. (ii) If 10 members run, it's a problem. (iii) If members appoint themselves to LUPC, it's a problem.

Marta Evry: We will have enough candidates, but it should not be all Board members. **Phil Raider** suggests that no more than 5 members, including the chair, should be board members.

Lisa M. Ezell: Why should they recuse themselves?

David Buchanan: They can vote for themselves. Recusing is only when financial benefit is involved. The biggest concern is from the election perspective – problem is if 7 board members are nominated and 8 community members are nominated.

Lisa M. Ezell: Why limit it to 5?

David Buchanan: Original intent was that district reps would nominate others to LUPC.

Lisa M. Ezell: Nightmare scenario – what if the others are clearly not qualified?

David Buchanan: **Challis Macpherson** basically stated that the job is too much for a district representative with district obligations.

Ivan Spiegel: The intent was to get committee of experts so they could report to board.

Marta Evry: Reality check – it's negotiation – board wants some members to be able to serve on LUPC if they choose. 12 members of board favored 14-at-large option. She likes **Phil Raider's** suggestion.

David Buchanan: He also likes it.

Stewart Oscars: It should be no more than 4 board members.

Ivan Spiegel: Problem with stakeholders.

David Buchanan: He's upset by the manner in which board members appointed themselves. He moves the amendment of the LUPC provision to state:

All committee members must be GRVNC stakeholders ~~and cannot be members of the current Board with the exception of the Land Use and Planning Committee Chair. No executive officers may be appointed to the Land Use and Planning Committee with the exception of the Land Use and Planning Committee chair. Other than the chair, no more than four (4) board members may be appointed to the Land Use and Planning Committee provided that they are among the top ten (10) votegetters.~~

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 Land Use and Planning Committee members.

Board members will select from a prepared [list](#) no more than ten people to serve on the LUPC. ~~The 10 highest vote-getters will be selected.~~

Stewart Oscars: Seconds the motion.

The question was called & determined by voice vote as follows:

For	4
Opposed	2
Abstain	1

Motion passes

(Discussion ends on LUPC membership issue)

Bylaws Committee Minutes 03-08-06

ADOPT DRAFTING TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS (DRAFT WILL BE DISTRIBUTED PRIOR TO MEETING)*

a. Resolution of LUPC language

*The Committee began final consideration of the Bylaws by focusing on the recommendations distributed to the Committee by the Drafting Task Force which is appended hereto as Exhibit A. The Committee then reviewed each Article in turn and either adopted the recommendations of the Drafting Task Force or made final edits and changes. At this meeting, the Committee covered Articles I through VI in this manner, leaving the rest for the March 15, 2006 continuation meeting. All of the edits will be provided in the final version when the committee completes its review of the Drafting Task Force recommendations.

ARTICLE IV — BOARD OF OFFICERS

7. Land Use and Planning Committee Chair

- **Chairs the Land Use and Planning Committee**
- **Responsible for preparation and submission of all required reports to the Board**

Bylaws Committee Minutes 03-15-06

ADOPT DRAFTING TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS (DRAFT WILL BE DISTRIBUTED PRIOR TO MEETING)*

a. Resolution of LUPC language

*This meeting is a continuation of the March 14, 2006 Bylaws Committee meeting in which the Committee began final consideration of the Bylaws by focusing on the recommendations distributed to the Committee by the Drafting Task Force which is appended Exhibit A to the March 14, 2006 meeting minutes. After reviewing additional edits to clarify Articles I through VI, the Committee continued its work and focused on **Article VII – Committees** and either adopted the recommendations of the Drafting Task Force or made final edits and changes. At this meeting, the Committee completed its review of **Article VII**, leaving the rest for the next continuation meeting which was scheduled for March 20, 2006, at which time the Committee expects to complete its work. All of the edits will be provided in the final version when the committee completes its review of the Drafting Task Force recommendations.

In the course of its work at this meeting, one Committee decision was reconsidered and one suggestion not included as part of the Drafting Task Force work was considered and added to the Bylaws by consensus.

Joe Murphy moved to reconsider allowing Community Officers to serve on the LUPC. **L.J. Carusone** seconded the motion. The vote was 6 for excluding Officers from serving on the LUPC, 0 against, and 1 abstention.

ARTICLE VII — COMMITTEES

G. Land Use and Planning Committee: *The Land Use and Planning Committee (LUPC) will consist of eleven (11) GRVNC Stakeholders including the elected Chair. No Board Officer may serve as a LUPC member, with the exception of the Land Use and Planning Committee Chair. Ten LUPC members will be appointed by the Board of Officers from a list of candidates who have formally communicated to the Board their desire to serve on LUPC. The Board will, within 30 days after beginning their term, hold a public meeting solely for the selection of LUPC members.*

Board members will select ten Stakeholders to serve on the LUPC.

A LUPC member may be removed from service by a 2/3 majority of the full GRVNC Board of Officers. Vacancies will be filled in the same manner that committee members were originally selected.

The Land Use and Planning Committee recommendations to the Board of Officers shall be in the form of a written report, which will include a project description, pros & cons, a summary of community input and any LUPC findings.

Bylaws Committee Minutes 03-20-06 [last Bylaws Committee meeting]

ADOPT DRAFTING TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS (DRAFT WILL BE DISTRIBUTED PRIOR TO MEETING)*

b. Resolution of LUPC language

* This meeting is a continuation of the March 15, 2006 Bylaws Committee meeting in which the Committee began final consideration of the Bylaws by focusing on the recommendations distributed to the Committee by the Drafting Task Force which is appended Exhibit A to the March 14, 2006 meeting minutes. After reviewing additional edits to clarify **Articles I through VII**, the Committee continued its work and focused on the remaining articles beginning with **Article VIII – Meetings** and either adopted the recommendations of the Drafting Task Force or made final edits and changes. At this meeting, the Committee completed its review of the remainder of the Bylaws and completed its work. The final strikethrough version is appended hereto as Exhibit A.

Scribe note: Exhibit A includes subsequent corrections of errata.

(Discussion begins)

Phil Raider: He thanked the Committee for its work, urged that it not disband, and stated his support for it. He then suggested, as one who will be running for the position of the LUPC Chair, that it was too big, that it would be difficult to find 10 qualified people, and that it could

work well with 7 people (6 plus the Chair) – referring to the WLAAPC as examples.

L.J. Carusone: No one is tied to a particular area.

David Moring: One of the ideas was to provide flexibility.

Steve Freedman: The Committee expanded the LUPC to have enough members to share the work and actually study all development proposals in depth.

Jodi Gusek: We did discuss doubling up areas.

L.J. Carusone: We've always had a quorum.

Phil Raider: Quorum is not a major concern.

David Moring: CPAC had 20 members and the meetings ran well.

Steve Freedman: A leader could say it's OK to not speak. Obviously inexperienced members should be encouraged to listen to discussion before speaking.

Stewart Oscars: It seems that the issue is 'coverage' vs 'manageability'.

Susan Rennie: What if you only find 8 people? And then the question is whether they are qualified.

Phil Raider: Bodies fill space.

Steve Freedman: What if the Board thinks a candidate isn't qualified to serve but there aren't enough volunteering to fill out the larger LUPC?

Susan Rennie: Asks Phil for his perception of Board.

Phil Raider: Many are probably not familiar with nuances.

Ivan Spiegel: How about 'no more than ___'?

Steve Freedman: There has been lots of talk about not allowing an interest group to take over the NC. If there aren't enough candidates volunteering for the LUPC, the Committee would be left open to takeover by an organized group or interest.

L.J. Carusone: 'Maximum' – would this solve the problem?

Steve Freedman Moves that the number of members on the proposed LUPC be reduced from 11 to 9. **Ivan Spiegel** Seconds the motion. It passes by unanimous vote (8 to 0).

(**Lisa M. Ezell** arrives, **Phil Raider** leaves. In the course of the remaining discussion, **David Buchanan** arrives, and **Jodi Gusek** and **Stewart Oscars** leave)

David Moring: Upon completion of [LUPC discussion] Moves:

That the Committee adopt the Bylaws as amended to this date and submit these amended Bylaws to the Board of Officers as its final report.

Susan Rennie: Seconds the motion.

The question was called & determined by voice vote as follows:

For	8
Opposed	0
Abstain	0

Motion passes unanimously

(Discussion ends)