

# SLNC GOVERNING BOARD SPECIAL MEETING

Tuesday, June 18, 2019 - 7:00pm-10:00pm  
Ivanhoe Elementary School Auditorium / 2828 Herkimer Street

## 1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 PM

## 2) Roll Call

### Attending (18):

Mark Duncan  
Paul Emmons  
Nicholas Fox Robbins  
Lorraine Getz  
Nora Goudsmit (*Vice Chair*)  
Elaine Harris Roark  
Dulce Stein  
Samantha Danner (*Arrived at 7:10 PM*)  
Barbara Ringuette  
Seth Copenhaver (*Secretary*)  
Jennifer Dibs  
Ilanthe Zevos  
Jeremy Black  
Maebe A. Girl  
Lena M. Najarian Kaderali (*Treasurer*)  
Taryn Poole  
Sarah Ullman  
Joanna Pawlowska

### Absent (3):

Doug Loewy  
Anthony Crump  
Douglas Reed

## 3) Welcome and rules for actions on agenda items

**Nora Goudsmit:** Introduced herself, explained the rules of the meeting and welcomed the stakeholders. She said that during her time as co-chair she hoped to create a space for open commentary, where people could be heard. She challenged the board to move beyond personal issues and biases. She said she would not leave anyone out of this conversation. She hoped this respect would create a positive atmosphere.

## 4) Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

None.

**[NOTE: Certain relevant supporting documents for the Budget agenda items, including the Budget Proposal, Draft Administrative Packet and MER, were be posted to <http://silverlakenc.org/budget-finance/> in advance of the meeting]**

**5) Presentation by the Budget and Finance Committee**

- a) 2019-2020 budget proposal [NOTE: 10-minute presentation by Committee Co-Chairs and 15-minute discussion period]**

*The on the SLNC 2019-2020 Budget Proposal Analysis and related documents were projected onto a screen overhead. See: <http://silverlakenc.org/budget-finance/>*

**Lena Najarian Kaderali:** Said that she and Samantha Danner were co-chairs of the Budget and Finance Committee as of June 11<sup>th</sup>. She said the proposed budget analysis presentation also came about from the June 11<sup>th</sup> meeting. She hoped to adopt a budget for the next fiscal year beginning July 1<sup>st</sup> at the current meeting, so that it would be adopted before the deadline. If they did not adopt the budet at this meeting, they would have to wait to consider it until July 10<sup>th</sup> and they would have a maximum budget of \$333 a month until it was adopted. The Budget Proposal Analysis document included the SLNC's 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 spending to date and a compilation of 2017-2018 spending for all neighborhood councils, east-side NCs alone and CD 4 and 13's averages. She used 2017-2018 because it was a full non-election year. In that year the SLNC's spending was out of line compared to other NCs. The new budget proposal should make SLNC's budget more similar to other NC's budgets. \$12,100 was proposed for office expenses, which were comprised mostly of fixed and estimated-fixed expenses such as the space at Ivanhoe Elementary, AppleOne minute takers services, GoDaddy, printed material and office supplies. She wanted to highlight considering reserving funds for refreshments at SLNC meetings. Other NCs often light refreshments such as pizza and drinks. The budget proposed \$100 a month for those refreshments. SLNC business cards were also in the budget, printed only on request. The "General Office TBD" funds were reserved for renting other spaces in the event in which the board needed another location for meetings. And there was \$500 for renting a space for the mandatory funding training that came out of the funding audit last term. A \$13,600 budget was proposed for outreach, including \$900 to MailChimp and \$2,100 to Christina who does the web hosting and email administration for the SLNC. The board typically paid Doug Epperhard \$200-300 to publish the SLNC's newsletters but Seth Copenhaver and Sarah Ullman had been able to produce the newsletter for \$0 for the past two months. Najarian Kaderali said she left \$100.25 for the newsletter just in case they needed it and perhaps for general graphic design and branding expenses. There was also \$6,000 for as of yet undetermined Outreach events and \$2,000 for the Community Improvement Projects (CIP) budget. CIP funds are used to beautify and add clean public spaces. And there was \$14,300 for Neighborhood Purpose Grants (NPGs), which are funds they could make available to local 501c3s, public schools and religious organizations. She asked if anyone had any questions about the Proposed Budget Analysis

**Mark Duncan:** Asked if between MailChimp and webhosting they were spending \$4,300 on email.

○

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said no, it was for both email and web administration. The SLNC's email distribution list is quite large and there was no negotiating on the price with GoDaddy as she understood it. She asked Samantha Danners if it was the Webmail aspect or the web hosting administration that cost more.

○

**Samantha Danner:** Said she spoke with Christina, who does the website administration. The service is quite expensive and there are services that not everyone was using, such as the calendar. Apparently, it was not clear when the service was purchased that there were certain items with separate costs such as the Calendar. Danner said that was something the board could revise or move to a different service. However, there would be additional costs in the time-consuming process of migrating the website and email to a new service. Christina had expressed an interest in working with the outreach committee to consider changes to the site. Danner said she thought the cost was a little high now, but if they could work on making it more affordable.

○

**Jeremy Black:** Asked what the SLNC's contractual obligations were with GoDaddy.

■

**Maebe A. Girl:** Said she had used GoDaddy for websites and domain hosting in the past and normally you purchase the service in advance for one or two years. So, she imagined the board was likely locked in for at least a year depending on when they purchased it.

**Sarah Ullman:** Said that for MailChimp they paid a specific subscription fee based on the size of their email list. She believed they could add two-factor identification to bring the cost down by 10%.

**Seth Copenhaver:** Said, as a point of clarification, that adding two-factor identification would result in a 10% discount, but only for 3 months. It was a temporary discount.

**Nicholas Fox Robbins:** Asked them to elaborate on the use of the CIPs.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said the CIPs could be for things as simple as cleaning up a specific public space, such as Sunset Triangle plaza for example. They would have to go through the city to get permission. They could also go toward beautifying a public space, such as installing art or a mural.

**Robbins:** Asked who took initiative for CIPs. Was it up to the SLNC or stakeholders?

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said either could take the initiative. They would just have to place a motion on an agenda and the board would consider it.

**Robbins:** Asked if they had to be a 501c3 to request it.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said no, it was not like a NPG.

**Black:** Asked if are there things already earmarked for NPGs currently or if the budgeted amount was just an estimate? He said he felt that there was a lot of potential for CIPs.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said they could look into revisiting the amount. Last year the SLNC only allocated \$3,664 to NPGs, which was much lower than other NCs. They plan to revisit the budget in August anyway, because \$250-750 will roll over from the current fiscal year and will need to be allocated.

**Black:** Asked if any outreach events were earmarked yet.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said all those funds were unallocated

**Danner:** Said she wanted to clarify that the NPGs were funds that the board could offer to people in the community that want to do events and projects for everyone in the community. In her experience, it has been generally good to allocate as much money as possible to NPGs because they can really increase the NC's visibility in the community. For example, the East Hollywood NC allocated a NPG to Shakespeare in the Park last year which got them a lot of exposure. In general, she said it was good to use as much money as possible for both the NPGs and CIPs.

**Poole:** Asks Danner to expand on the difference between a NPG and a CIP.

**Danner:** Said that NPGs are monies given to outside organizations that do not have any City-related strings attached – less than when you do it on your own.

**Poole:** Said that two years ago board had tried use funds for a private driveway for a pre-school. She asked if that would be a CIP.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said that it would have likely been a NPG unless the pre-school was a public school.

**Danner:** Said an example they got of a CIP was something like putting up a new sign-posting board up in front of a community center. CIP funds can be used to buy supplies to repaint public spaces for example.

**Ullman:** Said a constituent had reached out to her that was interested in mosaic to beautify the posting area by the dog park. People have expressed interest in these types of CIPs.

**Duncan:** Asked where "Slow Down Silverlake" signs would fall.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said the signs would fall in Outreach.

**Danner:** Said she would love for the board to consider doing some sort of request for proposals from the community for CIPs, so they can consider how best to use those funds. **Najarian Kaderali:** Said she thought that was a good idea.

**Girl:** Asked if Stakeholders or board members could propose CIPs. **Najarian Kaderali:** Said either could.

**Black:** Asked how set in stone is the budget currently was and if they could make motions to amend it in the future.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said they could amend it in the future if they decided they need to.

**Duncan:** Asked if NPGs could only go to 501c3s.

**Robbins:** Said that there was process called fiscal sponsorship in which an individual could be under the umbrella of a 501c3 nonprofit organization that could receive money on the individual's behalf.

**Duncan:** Said he thought the CIPs might make it less onerous for residents to access that money because they may find an artist or group that is not a 501c3.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said that they had to keep in mind that CIPs had to be tied to public spaces. She also added that any NPG funds can only be used for an event if that event is free to the public.

**Robbins:** Suggested having community education about the CIP and NPG processes, which can be daunting. He reiterated that individuals under the umbrella of a 501c3 organization can receive funds. For example, the Silver Lake Picture Show, under the umbrella of the Silver Lake Improvement Association, started with a \$500 from the SLNC.

**Duncan:** Said that was why he thought it would make more sense to split the CIP and NPG funds evenly.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said they could look into reallocating. They could do a straw poll to see how they want to reallocate. Her personal opinion was that they probably should not split the funds half and half because the CIP monies can be more difficult to deploy than the NPG. But they could still look into exactly how difficult it would be and then consider splitting the funds.

**Black:** Asked for examples of outreach that would cost \$6,000. Was that consistent with what the SLNC had done before?

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said it was not consistent with what the SLNC had done before. The primary use of the outreach money for the prior two years was to fund LMU Reservoir Survey. \$12,000 went toward the survey each fiscal year, and took up the bulk of the SLNC's total budget the last two fiscal years. The \$6,000 is similar to what other NCs typically use for community outreach events like music festivals

**Ianthe Zevos:** Point of Information – she said that funds for something like the flier, for the community workshop about the reservoir, comes from the outreach budget

**Black:** Said outreach money could fund graphic design and ads on Facebook. He asked what events that constitute as outreach events.

**Danner:** Said there was a misconception that events do not cost money. The costs stack up fast for things like AV systems and food for an event involving larger group of people. She thought \$6,000 was actually a pretty small amount for events.

**Duncan:** Said that \$6,000 was a small amount for events but was a large amount of their budget. He asked if printing was part of event budgets.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said that printing came out of Outreach. Outreach is fairly broad category.

**Danner:** Said she liked the idea of townhalls that came out of the budget meeting. Town Halls could be a great way to engage with the constituents outside of these meetings which are strictly regulated by the Brown Act in terms of how they can interact with the stakeholders.

**Ullman:** Said there are several different types of outreach events that other NCs do. For example, the Los Feliz NC does CERT Training. They could also do community resource fairs. And, putting on their own outreach events are less restrictive than giving NPGs to events.

**Copenhaver:** Said that when you break it down, the outreach budget is \$500 a month.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said it both is and isn't a lot of money. They did NPGs in the \$500-750 range in the last month of the last term alone and it made a big difference to local organizations. So, they needed to spend it wisely.

**Lorraine Getz:** Asked if they could we promote NPGs in the Newsletter. **Copenhaver:** Said yes, they could. **Getz:** Thanked Seth and Sarah for taking the time to do the Newsletter because it saved the council money that they could now spend elsewhere.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Asked if public had any comment. No one did. She then took a straw poll on whether the board wanted to adopt the proposal now as is or not. All of the board said that, yes, they did want to adopt it as is except for Girl, who said she agreed that maybe they should consider reallocating a little more to CIPs. But, she said she would not mind revisiting it later.

**Duncan:** Said he liked idea of putting it out to the community that NPGs are available. Those interested could apply quarterly and the board could choose the best of the applicants – rather than giving the money to the first person that came in.

**Robbins:** Said he liked the idea of doing an NPG workshop, because it can be confusing. They could promote the NPGs in the newsletter and then schedule the workshop.

**Copenhaver:** Said they talked about promoting NPGs in the newsletter during the Budget and Finance Committee meeting. They also thought they could put a basic form on the website that people could use to apply for NPGs. They could work to make the process as simple and not daunting as possible for the community.

**Zevos:** Suggested promoting CIPs and NPGs equally in the Newsletter, so they could gauge the community's interest in both based on the response they got.

**Dulce Stein:** Said have come with their proposals to the Arts and Culture Committee. Her question is how much of it is in her purse. They did not have training in terms of what they can and cannot spend money on. She said she thought applying directly might be a good way to avoid that confusion.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said they can only grant funds in the context of NPGs and CIPs.

**Robbins:** Said Heather Carson mentioned that, in her role as the Arts and Culture chair, she was really proactive about getting NPGs and other committees started to feel that Arts and Culture was getting too money compared to their committee. He wondered if it would behoove them to specify in dollar amounts how much each committee could be allocated.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said they could consider that idea, they would have to agendize it.

**Zevos:** Said that she agreed that a framework of timing for applying for NPGs would be useful as would education on the process for the community.

**Goudsmit:** Said that she was hearing that putting an application process in place would be useful as would organizing how NPG funding is distributed whether that's from committee perspective or otherwise. Whether or not it is formalized, they should talk through and develop how to put a process in place because there were some very good points made. Because it was not on the agenda they could not do that at the current meeting but they could agendize it for a future meeting.

*Emmons moved to consider Item 5b. Barbara Ringuette seconded.*

**b) (Treasurer) Move to adopt 2019-2020 budget. Approval of 2019-2020 "Office of the City Clerk Neighborhood Council Funding Program Fiscal Year Administrative Packet," including Budget Allocations as follows:**

- 1) Office: \$12,100 (refer to Budget Proposal Presentation for detailed line items)**
- 2) Outreach: \$13,600 (refer to Budget Proposal Presentation for detailed line items)**
- 3) Community Improvement Projects: \$2,000**
- 4) Neighborhood Purpose Grants: \$14,300\***

**\*Contemplates supplementation with excess rollover funds from FY 2018-2019 Balance Forward less amounts needed to satisfy outstanding FY 2018-19 commitments. Once rollover amounts are finalized by the City Clerk's office in August 2019 (anticipated to be approximately \$500), Budget reallocation will be agendized for Board Approval.**

*Najarian Kaderali moved the motion.. Robbins seconded.*

**Roll Call Vote:**

**YES:** Black, Copenhaver, Danner, Dibs, Duncan, Emmons, Getz, Girl, Goudsmit, Najarian Kaderali, Pawlowska, Poole, Ringuette, Harris Roark, Robbins, Stein, Ullman, Zevos **(18)**

*The motion unanimously passed with 18 yes votes.*

- c) **(Treasurer) Election of Second Bank Card Holder: Effective July 1, 2019, Neighborhood Council's may opt to elect a Second Bank Card Holder to act as alternate to the primary Bank Card Holder (Appointed Board Member must complete in-person Funding Training conducted by the City Clerk's Office). [NOTE: Paul Emmons nominated at the Budget and Finance Committee Meeting on June 11, 2019, should another Board Member want to be 2<sup>nd</sup> Signer they will have an opportunity to be heard during this motion prior to Roll Call Vote].**

**Goudsmit:** Asked if anyone besides Emmons wanted to be considered for the Second Bank Card Holder position. No one did.

*Zevos nominated Emmons to be the Second Bank Card Holder. Barbara Ringuette seconded.*

**Danner:** Said Emmons is very responsible and she thought he would be an excellent bank card holder.

**Roll Call Vote:**

**YES:** Black, Copenhaver, Danner, Dibs, Duncan, Emmons, Getz, Girl, Goudsmit, Najarian Kaderali, Pawlowska, Poole, Ringuette, Harris Roark, Robbins, Stein, Ullman, Zevos **(18)**

*The motion unanimously passed with 18 yes votes.*

- d) **(Treasurer) Approval of May Monthly Expenditures Report (MER) (Beginning Balance \$10,430.76 | Total Spent \$0.00 | Outstanding Expenditures \$7,170.68 | Net Available \$3,260.08)**

*Najarian Kaderali moved to approve the May MER. Black seconded.*

**Robbins:** Asked, just to be clear, if the outstanding expenditures were what they voted on to pay the previous board's business. **Najarian Kaderali:** Said that was correct.



**Duncan:** Asked where the rest of the \$42,000 was. He asked if that came in throughout the year.

**Najarian Kaderali:** Said they had the full \$42,000 now. This MER was what they had at the beginning of May, but that the second to last month of the previous fiscal year.

**Duncan:** Asked if the new money comes in June. **Najarian Kaderali:** Said it came in July. Then they would get rollover from whatever was left in August after the estimated expenses were paid.

**Roll Call Vote:**

**YES:** Black, Copenhaver, Danner, Dibs, Duncan, Emmons, Getz, Girl, Goudsmit, Najarian Kaderali, Pawlowska, Poole, Ringuette, Harris Roark, Robbins, Stein, Ullman, Zevos **(18)**

*The motion unanimously passed with 18 yes votes.*

**6) Unfinished Business**

- a) **(Secretary) Move to schedule a Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee meeting before the scheduled July 10, 2019 Regular Meeting of the Governing Board. The Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee, per SLNC Standing Rules, is to be held on an as needed basis [NOTE: March 5, 2019 last meeting of record].**

*Copenhaver made the motion. Emmons seconded.*

**Goudsmit:** Said she would like the meeting to take place on the sooner side. She said she would like to schedule it based on who would be interested in attending.

**Duncan:** Asked if the meeting was just for board members.

**Goudsmit:** Said no, it was for everyone. It is an advisory committee like all others. It was scheduled on an "as needed" basis because of the interpretation of the DONE seating policy, some of the issues having to do with the board not having committee co-chairs, and the need to amend some of the bylaws and standing rules that are not currently in line with various aspects of DONE's expectations.

**Ringuette:** Suggested that they look at how it is agendized because only less than a majority of a majority, meaning only five board members, were allowed to speak at the meeting.

**Goudsmit:** Asked if Ringuette had a potential date in mind and if she would you attend the meeting. **Ringuette:** Said she would like to attend but was not sure if she could.

**Goudsmit:** Asked people who wanted to go to raise their hands so she could get a general idea of the number of people. 12 people raised their hands. Goudsmit said that in the next couple of weeks they should have the meeting at the rec center on a Tuesday or Thursday.

**Black:** Asked if they needed a quorum for a joint meeting.

**Goudsmit:** Said that in a regular meeting you would need a quorum of 11 people.

**Ringuette:** Said that maybe they should ask John Darnell of DONE.

**Emmons:** Said if there were other agenda items, then yes they would need quorum.

**Black:** Said, to Ringuette's point, that if more than 5 people want to speak at it then it needs to be a regular meeting.

**Danner:** Said she concerned about that statement because she had tried to schedule a joint committee meeting but John Darnell told her it could not be a joint, rather the meetings had to be back to back.

**Emmons:** Point of Order – he said that a board member could attend the meetings as a member of the public but they were not allowed to participate in voting.

**Goudsmit:** Said board members could not speak and could only be observers.

**Robbins:** Asked if they could schedule a special meeting and not a committee meeting and then just amend the bylaws. **Poole:** Said that could work

**Ringuette:** Said she knew that the Echo Park NC did that recently. She did not know exactly how they went about it but she said she could look into it.

**Goudsmit:** Suggested that they find a date and then she could sort through the DONE process.

**Duncan:** Asked if they are we defining stakeholderhood with the changes to the bylaws.

**Goudsmit:** Said no, stakeholderhood was defined legally by DONE. But the way stakeholderhood was defined in SLNC's current bylaws and standing rules is not in alignment with DONE's definition. So, that definition needed to be stricken entirely.

**Ullman:** Point of Clarification – she said that stakeholderhood was actually defined by the City Council, and then adopted by DONE as policy

**Robbins:** Proposed Tuesday July 2<sup>nd</sup> for the meeting.

**Goudsmit:** Said that date sounded reasonable. They had access rec room starting at 6 PM. She asked if that worked with people's schedules.

**Girl:** Asked if this would be a special meeting or committee meeting?

**Goudsmit:** Said the purpose of the meeting would be for the bylaws and standing rules. But because there is so much interest from the board she wanted to be as inclusive as possible. If there is a lot of interest from the public, they could get a larger room at the rec center. She asked who was available for July 2<sup>nd</sup>, 6 PM. Everyone except for Ringuette, Danner and Jennifer Dibs was available. She asked if there was another day that worked for those who were not available.

**Copenhaver:** Said they could also book library community room.

**Duncan:** Said he thought City Bank used to have a room that the NC could use.

**Emmons:** Said the library closes at 7:45 PM.

**Getz:** Suggested the 9<sup>th</sup>. Dibs and Ullman said they would not be available on the 9<sup>th</sup>.

**Goudsmit:** Said that since about the same amount of people would not go with the 9<sup>th</sup>, that they should keep the meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Girl:** Said she was planning on the scheduling LGBTQ committee meeting for the 2<sup>nd</sup> or the 9<sup>th</sup>. **Goudsmit:** Asked Girl to have the LGBTQ committee meeting on the 9<sup>th</sup>, if it did not impact that committee. **Girl:** Said it would not impact the committee and she would schedule the meeting for the 9<sup>th</sup>.

**b) (Secretary) Move to select at least one member (up to 2 members) of the Governing Board to be Co- Chair(s) of the Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee.**

**Goudsmit:** Said that typically the co-chairs are selected in committee, but because the Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee is so important she thought they should take the opportunity to discuss the nominees for those rolls at this meeting and then allow the public to hear the nominees. Traditionally in committee the public would be allowed to also vote so she said they would allow the public to vote in this setting to broaden the voting base. She asked if there were any nominees.

*Black nominated Emmons. Najarian Kaderali seconded.*

*Emmons nominated Goudsmit for Co-Chair.*

**Duncan:** Asked who was interested in the position.

**Goudsmit:** Said she was interested in the position and asked if she and Emmons could talk about their interest in the positions if there were no objections. There were no objections.

**Emmons:** Said he also served on several other boards. He said briefly looked over the SLNC bylaws and saw a number of things that needed to be changed. He had experience changing bylaws for his other boards. In those instances, they changed the bylaws language if it was unclear, confusing, open to interpretation, or stated something that

was simply not allowed. Often, they would have to revise the bylaws multiple times because they would discover something in the language they missed in the first revision. He stressed that you had to study the language and eliminate any vagaries. He said he had a background in contract law in school and writing contracts for a company he worked with.

**Goudsmit:** Said she had really enjoyed figuring out and navigating the bylaws and standing rules since becoming Vice chair. She found it interesting and kind of thought provoking. She said she would love to work with Paul. She was eager to get the bylaws and standing rules in a better, more inclusive place. She would love for the public to contribute to their opinions on the bylaws to the SLNC because the council existed to serve the public. She also enjoyed the academic aspect of it and organizationally learning how the council is run.

**Robbins:** Said he had great faith in both of them.

**Goudsmit:** Asked if anyone from the public wanted to comment. No one did.

*Black moved to accept both nominees by acclamation. Elaine Harris Roark seconded.*

**Goudsmit:** Asked the public if they were okay with this motion. The members of the public present said they were fine with it.

*Without objection the motion to accept both nominees by acclamation was unanimously approved.*

*By acclamation the board unanimously voted to appoint **Goudsmit** and **Emmons** as Co-Chairs of the Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee.*

**Emmons:** Said he would contact DONE to find out if they could have governing committee meeting as well so that more than five members of the governing board could participate.

- c) **(Secretary) Move to select (5) Community Impact Statement Filers. Filers will file through EmpowerLA.org. More information can be found at: <http://empowerla.org/self-serve/> with regard to the filing process. EmpowerLA allows for 5 filers, for efficiency, filers to be considered may want to be Advisory Committee Co-Chairs that will likely be writing CIS. [Standing Rule #38, "The SLNC Co-Chairs and the Secretary will be granted the password to access the Early Notification System to submit Community Impact Statements (CIS)."] Currently, Board Secretary is (1) of (5) filers, (2) filers will be selected during this motion, when Co-Chairs are seated both will become filers per SLNC Standing Rule #38]**

*Copenhaver made the motion. Emmons seconded.*

**Goudsmit:** Said that currently Copenhaver, as secretary, was 1 of 5 as CIS filers. The SLNC needed to select two more and the co-chairs would become the remaining filers

when they were seated. She asked if anyone was interested in becoming a filer. Ullman, Girl and Danner said they were interested.

**Ullman** nominated Maebe, Sam

**Zevos:** Asked for a description of what the filer actually did. She was not familiar with the process.

**Goudsmit:** Said there was a dashboard on Empower LA's website on which CISs could be uploaded. Each CIS is attached to a city-file number. So, when the City Council considers the council file the CIS will be available to them.

**Ullman:** Said sometimes the process involves writing the CISs documents themselves.

**Danner:** Said there was a very basic form to fill out and that one could also write CISs for things besides city-files. They could submit CISs for anything that the city can hear a motion on such as public works, building safety. It is a broad ability to make comments on their community.

**Goudsmit:** Said, to clarify, that they could write a CIS based on anything under the SLNC's purview. Submitting a CIS on behalf of the SLNC makes it an official position of the SLNC, which is why they discuss and vote on CISs before submitting them. She said you did not have to be filer to write a CIS.

**Girl:** Withdrew her interest in the filer position.

**Goudsmit** moved to select CIS filers. **Black** seconded. Without objection the motion passed.

**Copenhaver** moved to do a voice vote to appoint **Ullman** as a CIS filer. **Black** seconded. Without objection the motion passed.

**Ullman** was appointed a CIS filer by unanimous voice vote.

**Copenhaver** moved to do a voice vote to appoint **Danner** as a CIS filer. **Black** seconded. Without objection the motion passed.

**Danner** was appointed a CIS filer by unanimous voice vote.

- d) (Secretary) Move to discuss and take potential action on filing, with regularity, Community Impact Statements coming out of Advisory Committees (SLNC Standing Rule #39). Potential Community Impact Statements from Committee(s) to be discussed with the Governing Board at the July 10, 2019 meeting for approval:

**Copenhaver** made the motion. **Robbins** seconded.

*Poole moved to amend the motion to discuss and take potential action on the community impact statement on page 7 of 8 of the agenda. Joanna Pawlowska seconded. Without objection the motion was amended.*

- i. **(Secretary) Move to discuss and take potential action on Transportation and Neighborhood Safety to add Community Impact Statement [see supplemental document attached] to Council File # 11-2130- S4 in reference to Councilman Ryu’s letter to the City Council Transportation Committee supporting the road diet on Rowena and calling for further safety measures. [NOTE: On June 12, 2019 City Council Transportation Committee moved to approve Councilman Ryu’s funding request and letter with additional recommendations based on LADOT report and improved safety measures that will go before City Council for approval: [\[https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=11-2130-S4\]](https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=11-2130-S4)**

**Goudsmit:** Said the last paragraph of the CIS was a summation of the SLNC governing board would strongly support. She read the paragraph aloud.

**Public Comment:**

**Scott Kenzin:** Introduced himself as a co-founder of “Keep Rowena Safe.” He said 4 years ago the then co-chair of the Transportation and Public Safety Committee proposed a similar statement but it was tabled. He thanked the current SLNC board for actually considering this CIS now. He wanted to highlight some data he thought the board would find interesting. Rowena was reconfigured in 2013. Since then the number of collisions has decreased 37%. The number of collisions involving walking or biking pedestrians has decreased 33%. The number of collisions resulting in serious injuries decreased 33% and there have been no fatalities that they know of on Rowena since the road diet. By way of comparison, from 2015 to 2018 the number of bicyclists killed in traffic crashes in Los Angeles increased 24%. The number of pedestrians killed in traffic crashes in Los Angeles increased 55%. He wanted to remind them that many streets in Silver Lake remain dangerous. On September 5th, 2018, 35-year old-father of 2 Esdras Velasquez’s motorized scooter was struck from behind by a hit and run driver on Glendale Blvd, near Waverly. Mr. Velasquez later died of his injuries. On January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2019 mother and a grandmother Cristina Garcia, 57, was standing on the sidewalk on Hyperion when she was killed by a hit and run driver. In the past 10 years over 1,000 people have been killed on Sunset between Fountain and Dodger Stadium. He said this CIS would send a message to City Hall that communities like SLNC’s prioritize the safety of every person whether they are on foot or behind a wheel.

**Board Comment:**

**Poole:** Point of Clarification - she asked if this included turn restrictions from Griffith Park Boulevard onto Angus Drive. **Emmons:** Said he believed it did since they were already supporting the study.

***Emmons** moved to amend the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of the final paragraph of the CIS from "further assessing the feasibility of installing continuous sidewalks on Angus Drive." to "further assessing the feasibility of installing continuous sidewalks on Angus Drive and Waverly Drive." **Zevos** seconded. Without objection the amendment was approved.*

**Ullman:** Thanked Scott Kenzin for years of persistent activism on this issue. She said the Silver Lake community appreciated his dedication and persistence on this issue which shows showed what heart and courage he had. The board applauded for Kenzin.

**Black:** Asked if everything that they are voting on to support was included in the report or if there was anything extraneous in it.

**Goudsmit:** Said the Kimley-Horn study had recommendations that first took into consideration Rowena and then Angus and Waverly. After Kimley-Horn put out the study Councilmember David Ryu supported its recommendations to keep the current configuration of Rowena and make changes to Angus and Waverly. Subsequently at a meeting with neighbors impacted by Angus specifically and the transportation committee they discussed the section of this CIS that had to do with creating a one-way section between Kenilworth and Moreno in order to limit the speeding traffic that goes along Angus between Griffith Park Boulevard and then Silver Lake Boulevard. So, the CIS is not a summation of the Kimley-Horn study, rather it supports DOT's feasibility and recommendations that David Ryu supports.

**Black:** Asked what the feasibility was. **Goudsmit:** Said it was her understanding that if they support the one-way section between Kenilworth and Moreno then the turn restrictions are essentially are moot, but they will be included as far as City council's concerned in terms of their transportation committee because there would be signage off Griffith Park Boulevard that would indicate that it's not a through street. So drivers would not be able to turn off of Griffith Park Boulevard onto Angus to cut through. **Black:** Asked what the feasibility outcome of that piece by the DOT. **Goudsmit:** Said she did not that was studied.

**Scott Kenzin:** Said there were two different reports, including Kimley-Horn. LADOT noted some issues that could arise. David Ryu's letter noted that any change to Angus would happen due to community outreach. If the changes were made, appropriate signage and navigation apps would have to be changed accordingly. The restricted turns are not in the Kinley horn report, but are an alternative. **Black:** Asked what turns were restricted. **Emmons:** Said the turn restrictions were from Morena onto Angus. And all of it was considered feasible.

The only suggestion that was not feasible was installing angled parking and adding a sidewalk and curb on Waverly Dr. which was not feasible.

**Duncan:** Asked about the voting process. He said he is all for improvements but does not know anything about the repercussions of making a street one-way. How can he vote on something he is not familiar with like this **Poole:** Said there was an entire meeting on Angus Street that was pretty informative. **Duncan:** Said unfortunately he did not go to that, so he was unsure of how to make a decision. **Ringuette:** Said part of it was having confidence in the committee in studying all the aspects. Many people from the community bring many points of view to the committee. She said that she thought that all these matters should be worked out in committees and that the board could be more or less a rubber stamp unless people requested a second chance at discussing the issue because they do not agree with what came out of the committee.

**Zevos:** Point of information – she attended the transportation meetings that dealt with this issue and there were a lot of people in attendance. There was a lively discussion and a majority of those people voted to support this CIS. Yeah, because we did take a vote of the of those in attendance. If you don't feel comfortable with again sure you can if you can abstain.

**Getz:** Point of information – Asked if they could just not vote if they do not feel comfortable. **Goudsmit:** Said yes, they could abstain from voting. She also said that when agenda items come from committees that board members who cannot attend committee meetings can familiarize themselves with the committee's meeting minutes.

**Ringuette:** Said it may be part of the standing rules of the relevant committee minutes, relative to the topic that's part of the motion, should be included in a long form of the agenda.

**Goudsmit:** Said that committee reports could potentially fill in information for board members.

**Copenhaver:** Suggested reaching out to co-chairs of committees if they are unfamiliar with an issues. Co-Chairs are passionate and will make sure they are informed. **Duncan:** Said he full faith in Scott, he just wanted to understand how to get informed in the future.

**Black:** Asked if the one-way street was determined to be feasible. **Scott Kenzin:** Said yes, it was determined to be feasible. **Emmons:** Said has personal discussion with a DOT representative after the LA City Council transportation Committee meeting. He explained that they had approved it as feasible.

**Getz:** Asked which way the one-way would go. **Ullman:** Said it would go west.

**Getz:** Asked if it was determined if there would be a turn onto Angus. **Goudsmit:** There would be no turn.



**Harris Roark:** Asked how the one-way would impact other streets. **Scott Kenzin:** Said if the changes moved forward than they would study that. Their previous idea to make Angus one-way did not work. The limited one-way street would still allow residents on Moreno to utilize Angus in both directions. It would stop drivers from cutting through that neighborhood. As a resident on Kendleworth he knew it would affect how he gets home. But he also knew that when people come to Angus on Kendleworth they use it as an opportunity to speed **Harris Roark:** Said she imagined that if it eliminated the cut through for the 5 than further south off of Griffith Park Boulevard wouldn't be as impacted.

**Duncan:** Asked them to clarify if by "cut through", they meant going from Griffith Park across Angus to get to the 5 or people trying to bypass Rowena. **Scott Kenzin:** Said many were trying to bypass Hyperion. Because of the timing on lights Hyperion is backed up at rush hour.

**Zevos:** Point of Information – as she understood it, after this goes into effect there is a one-year assessment to see how it works out. So, it is not written in stone.

**Black:** Said he was all for the keeping Rowena on the road diet, but that the consequences of changing Angus are yet to be determined.

***Black** moved to amend the motion to keep the Rowena configuration but remove the recommendation to make Angus one-way. No one seconded and the motion failed.*

**Ullman:** Said the wording came through the committee and the community and to change it in the current meeting without their consent would be contrary to the process that the board had empowered the committees to handle. But, she said the wording was currently broad enough that it was not determinative.

**Pawlowska:** Asked if there has been a study into why the lights on Hyperion and why it gets so backed up. **Scott Kenzin:** Said there has not been one yet.

**Poole:** Thanked Ullman for her description of the committee process. It was a good global description.

**Girl:** Point of Clarification – she said she frequently takes lyfts and Ubers on Hyperion to get to the board meeting. Often the drivers are directed to Griffith Park which may contribute to the problem.

**Duncan:** Asked if the neighbors in the affected area who attended the committee meeting support this CIS. **Poole:** Said 20 of the 25 members of the public that attended the meeting were Angus residents. 18 of the 20 voted in favor of the one-way. Because it was apparent to them that the line of cars

starts at 4:30 and never ceases. And Angus is a tertiary street and was not built for that traffic width or weight-wise.

*Emmons called the motion.*

**Roll Call Vote:**

**YES:** Black, Copenhaver, Danner, Dibs, Duncan, Emmons, Getz, Girl, Goudsmit, Najarian Kaderali, Pawlowska, Poole, Ringuette, Harris Roark, Robbins, Stein, Ullman, Zevos **(18)**

*The motion unanimously passed with 18 yes votes.*

- ii. **(Danner) From Homelessness committee: Discussion and possible action to submit a Community Impact Statement [see supplemental document attached] in support of Council File 19-0450, recommending a report on the City’s strategy to address homeless encampment clean-ups (a.k.a. “Sweeps”), including “efficacy of existing clean-up efforts, detailing key objectives and providing metrics of success or failure”**  
<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=19-0450>

*Danner made the motion. Pawlowska seconded.*

**Danner:** Said in the CIS is in response to Bonin’s Council File 19-045. The City of LA currently spends \$30 million a year on clean-ups at homeless encampments. Unhoused people say it is disruptive and punitive and often results in the loss of tent sand personal ID. Residents and businesses near encampments repeatedly report that clean-ups are ineffective, have little impact in decreasing the amount of trash, minimizing public heath impacts or clearing the public right of way for public access. City employees repeatedly report that the clean-ups are tenses and sometimes confrontational. And the protocols are complex and time-consuming. The CIS calls for a report to actually evaluate how the clean ups are doing. Has been through Homelessness Committee. She read the entirety of the full motion aloud. She said that last week LASAN submitted a recommendation for their budget that basically adopted a number of these proposals including a regular scheduled trash collection day at encampments and more people for their clean-up teams. The larger teams would empower LASAn to employ people who are in encampments to help with clean-up efforts.

**Ullman:** Said she supports this CIS. She said it was hard to overstate the devastating nature of having your ID thrown out when you are homeless. There are very few things you can do without an ID. It is expensive and difficult to get a new one, especially if you do not have back up documents. This makes life even harder for unhoused people. She thought that whatever the board should what it could to help mitigate that situation.

**Duncan:** Said he did not understand how medication or ID would get thrown away, as he imagined they could just keep it in their pocket. He said he is concerned about all of the trash constantly piling up, so he is interested in how the CIS addresses that aspect.

**Danner:** Said that the issue is that unhoused people in the encampments have to clear out of the area for the clean-up. There is not usually not a long window of notification as clean-ups are scheduled on an as-needed basis. So, encampment residents often do not have enough warning or time to pack up their important belongings. Also, often the clean ups can occur when they are not in the camp to begin with. So regularly scheduled clean ups and advance notice could help prevent the loss of their important documents.

**Goudsmit:** Said she thought it was important to note that anytime the board can move something from incredibly dehumanizing to seeing someone's humanity and the import of any person's Humanity in any way is absolutely essential.

**Girl:** As one of the other Homelessness liaisons, she said she strongly supported this CIS. And if such changes were implemented they could have an outreach effort to the homeless Silver Lake residents to make sure they were informed of the scheduled clean-ups in advance.

**Robbins:** Said he supports this CIS. And he was curious in particular about the idea of giving jobs to the homeless. He asked if this was just an idea that was floated or a real plan, because, if real, he thought he that could benefit the unhoused a lot.

**Danner:** Said that the LASAN report stated that their plan was to partner with encampment residents to clean up the camps and start a pilot program with a job-training for those residents. She read from the LASAN report. She hoped that the pilot program would start sooner rather than later. Residents would have their own regular clean up schedule. The 101/Alvarado encampment residents already do a great job of keeping their area clean, so it would be good if their efforts were supported by the city.

**Robbins:** Asked if the jobs would be paid. **Danner:** Said the report did not specify. **Robbins:** Asked who technically would employ them. **Danner:** Said she believed LASAN would, in partnership with job training organizations.

**Duncan:** Said they should ask LASAN about metrics for their success with the pilot program and what their regulations would be.

**Roll Call Vote:**

**YES:** Black, Copenhaver, Danner, Dibs, Duncan, Emmons, Getz, Girl, Goudsmit, Najarian Kaderali, Pawlowska, Poole, Ringuette, Harris Roark, Robbins, Stein, Ullman, Zevos **(18)**

*The motion unanimously passed with 18 yes votes.*

- iii. **(Secretary) Transportation and Neighborhood Safety to consider writing a Community Impact Statement to be added to Council File for State the CA State Senate Bill SB127:**  
[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201920200SB12](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB12).SB127 would require [per/ Senator Weiner, a legislative author of SB127]:
- 1) Caltrans to incorporate "complete streets elements," such as new sidewalks, bike lanes and crosswalks, when making infrastructure improvements using highway maintenance funds.
  - 2) It would also require the agency to "interact with the local community" and "include representation from local bike and advisory committees on its project teams"
  - 3) The bill would also change Caltrans rules to make pedestrian and bicycle improvements the "default" rather than the exception in its projects. Whereas the agency is now often required to obtain a special permit to make such improvements, the bill would instead require a permit to forego them.

**Copenhaver** made the motion. **Robbins** seconded.

**Goudsmit:** Said that she wanted to add that this came up at the Transportation and Safety meeting. Wanted to bring it to the board to see if anyone was interested in writing the CIS. This motion is to write the CIS, not to submit an already written one.

**Zevos:** Asked if there was language in the bill that talks about what mandates "infrastructure improvements".

**Ullman:** Said her knowledge of this bill is not in depth enough to answer Zevos' question, but she would happily get back to her. Her understanding of the bill is that Caltrans already has this policy on its books, but it's not required and this bill would make it required. But she said she would look into it more and get more details.

**Emmons:** Said as he understood it, the bill was not so much to do with mandating changes to existing projects, but on any project that involves State highway funds going forward.

**Ullman:** Said the impacted streets in Silver Lake would be state highways, like Santa Monica Blvd. Her understanding is that if it is a route number. She said she can provide more complete list of the streets.

**Black:** Asked if once the CIS was written would it come back to the board to be approved

**Goudsmit:** Said the CISs always have to be approved by the board, but Ullman could write the first draft and bring it to the committee first.

**Emmons:** Said the bill itself was still in committee. It was just referred to the LA City Council Transportation Committee

***Black** moved to amend the motion so that when the actual CIS is written it first goes to committee for consideration. **Poole** seconded*

***Emmons** called the question on the amendment. **Zevos** seconded.*

***Emmons** moved for a voice vote on the amendment. **Zevos** seconded. Without objection the motion was approved.*

*The amendment was approved by unanimous voice vote.*

***Black** called the question on the amended motion. **Zevos** seconded.*

***Emmons** moved for a voice vote on the amended motion. **Robbins** seconded.*

*The amended motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.*

- e) (Secretary) Move to vote on including **Committee Reports** under Special Report(s) (Standing Rule #12, Order of Business) from Committee Co-Chair(s) or designated **Committee Reporter** of each SLNC Advisory Committee at Regular Meetings of the Governing Board. Committee Reports are intended to be summations of committee matters, should not exceed 2 minutes, and should provide information to the public about future Committee meeting dates and potential actionable items that may be presented to the Governing Board. Currently, there is no ongoing process, aside from minutes and a yearly review of goal(s), for Advisory Committees to report back to the Governing Board a summary of the people's business that is being discussed within Committee. [NOTE: Consideration for Work Group(s) to have a designated period of time (not to exceed 2 minutes) to provide a report to the Governing Board will be discussed during this motion.]

***Copenhaver** made the motion. **Emmons** seconded.*

**Goudsmit:** Said that they could start the meetings with committee reports to close the gap between the 15 different committees. She thought it would be a good way to bring pertinent information from the committees to the governing board.

**Danner:** Said she thought this was a good idea but because there are so many committees she worried there would not be enough time in the meetings for all the reports. She suggested splitting up or alternating the reports for different meetings.

**Emmons:** Said that many committees do not meet every month which would allow more time. And the motion limit the reports to 2 minutes each.

**Ringuette:** Said that keeping the reports to 2 minutes was a good idea but she was not sure it was realistic. She suggested written reports or minutes that could be reviewed by the executive committee.

**Girl:** Said she was also concerned about time management. She suggested making the reports optional. The committees could decide if they had pertinent information to bring to the governing board meeting each month.

**Stein:** Said she would like to submit report every month because it would give her training and inspiration. She was in favor of having the reports every month, but maybe not allowing comment on the reports during the meetings. But she felt it was important for the committees to be accountable.

**Poole:** Asked for consideration for task force group for Silver Lake reservoir complex master plan. It is a special task force, but she requested that they have their own 2 minutes to report to the board. **Robbins:** Said he would be interested in making sure there is no overlap with the Reservoir Committee report. Also, there may be situations where Reservoir Committee may not be able to share certain information with the public so their reports would be limited in that way.

**Ullman:** Said she thought incorporating the task force group into the overall reservoir committee report would make Admin sense. **Poole:** Said that would be fine with her.

**Girl:** Suggested that committee co-chairs submit reports that they could then include as attachments on their newsletter.

**Goudsmit:** Said the motion was to consider adding it as an agenda item. She suggested starting with a two-minute read out that maxed out at 30 minutes. They could try it at the next two governing board meetings to test how that works for them.

**Goudsmit** called the question. **Emmons** seconded.

**Emmons** moved for a voice vote **Zevos** seconded. Without objection the motion for a voice vote was approved.

**Voice Vote:**

**YES:** Dibs, Duncan, Emmons, Girl, Goudsmit, Najarian Kaderali, Pawlowska, Poole, Harris Roark, Robbins, Stein, Ullman, Zevos **(13)**

**NO:** Getz, Danner, Black, Copenhaver, Ringuette **(5)**

*With 13 yes votes the motion was approved.*

- f) **(Danner) Discussion and possible action on the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee on Housing and Homelessness (precise name of committee TBD), to meet at least 4x yearly for discussion of housing and homelessness issues affecting Silver Lake.**

*Danner made the motion. Girl seconded.*

**Danner:** Said the SLNC previously had back to back meetings of the housing, homelessness and mature adult committees because there are so many overlapping issues that are addressed by all of those committees. The goal of developing an Ad Hoc committee that includes all the groups would be to more easily agendize discussion that is ongoing between committees.

**Black:** Asked if one of the co-chairs of each committee would be willing to be co-chair of this new ad hoc so that there is always a clear dissemination of information. **Danner:** Said she had not brought it up with the co-chairs but would.

**Ullman:** Asked if it make sense to fully combinee the committees rather than developing a new ad hoc committee.

**Danner:** Said that was a good idea but there may be some fully separate issues that the committee chairs wish to address that she could not address.

**Ringuette:** Said there were two other options: to have joint committee meetings or consecutive committee meetings.

**Girl:** Point of Information – she attended the joint committee meeting with the homelessness, tenants’ rights and mature adult advocates committees and it was clear to her that they each had their own specific set of ideas and agenda items that they wanted to discuss. Also she remembered John Darnell saying that they could not have a joint committee meeting.

**Danner:** Said that the only issue with back to back meetings is that it can be difficult to incorporate different comments from different meetings.

**Ringuette:** Said there was a third option: it could be decided between the two committee chairs whose issue it was.

**Danner:** Said that Ad hoc committees only meet for specified time. It would be like a pilot program to see if it is worth-while. Experiment. It would not be a standing committee.

**Goudsmit:** Point of Clarification – asked if the current co-chairs were interested in this ad hoc committee.

**Danner:** Said this was brought up at this meeting. This was the solution that was proposed in that meeting.

**Black:** Said he supported the idea

**Girl:** Said she supported the idea supported idea and would take the lead on it.

*Emmons moved for a voice vote. Black seconded. Without objection a voice vote was approved.*

*The amended motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.*

- g) **(Danner) Discussion and possible action to create a housing and homelessness resources page on the SLNC website in collaboration with relevant committees such as Housing & Tenants Rights, Homelessness, and Mature Adults, and to distribute information about these resources via SLNC outreach channels such as the monthly newsletter and other outreach events.**

*Danner made the motion. Ringuette seconded.*

**Danner:** Said the idea arose from the committee meeting. Mature adult seniors often do not know what resources are available to them. This could be used to provide resources to them. They could also distribute it by other means, such as the booth at the farmer's market.

**Robbins:** Said his only concern is that it would add a lot of work for Copenhagen if committee chairs did not take initiative.

**Danner:** Said the motion was in collaboration with the other committees and– would not happen without the committee's contributing their resources to it.

**Copenhagen:** Said for this sort of project, he is happy to do the extra work.

*Emmons moved for a voice vote. Robbins seconded. Without objection a voice vote was approved.*

*The amended motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.*



7)

- a) **(Stein) Move to discuss and take potential action on the formation of a Latinx Committee. Mission statement and further discussion of the scope of the Latinx Committee to be presented at the July 10, 2019 Regular Meeting of the Governing Board.**

**Stein** made the motion. **Zevos** seconded.

**Stein:** Said she proposed a Latinx committee mostly for people that speak only Spanish. More than 30% of residents in Silver Lake are Latino. She said she knew that “Latinx” was a controversial term and that many in the community did not identify with it. But she wanted to provide information and resource to everyone in that community.

Ullman, Pawlowska, Poole and Robbins all expressed their support for the idea and their hope that it would make the SLNC more representative of the neighborhood.

**Zevos:** Said she also supported the idea. She had done a lot of canvassing in her neighborhood and realized that many Spanish-speaking families did not all have access to the internet. She suggested distributing fliers in Spanish throughout the neighborhood to get the word out.

**Girl:** Said she supported the idea and thanked Stein for using the inclusive term Latin, which is more encompassing of people that might be non-binary or not specifically identify with a specific gender. **Stein:** Said she was so excited to work with the Latinxs in Girl’s community as well. She felt it there would be an important collaboration between the two communities.

**Black** moved for a voice vote. **Robbins** seconded. Without objection a voice vote was approved.

*The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.*

- b) **(Duncan) Move to discuss and take potential action on the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee on LADWP Modular Building (Committee name to be determined), modular building to be constructed at the Reservoir Complex, breaking of ground scheduled by LADWP for November 2019. Mission statement and further discussion of the scope of the Ad Hoc Committee on LADWP Modular Building to be discussed on July 10, 2019. [NOTE: visit silverlakenc.org for LADWP presentation: <http://silverlakenc.org/silver-lake-project-update-6-5-19/> and June 5, 2019 Agenda and DRAFT Minutes for LADWP representatives’ presentation on this modular office building and comments from the public and Board: <http://silverlakenc.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/SLNC-June-5th-2019-Board-Meeting-Minutes-DRAFT-1.pdf>]**

**Copenhaver** presented the motion. **Poole** seconded the motion.

**Ullman:** Said that at the most recent reservoir meeting they voted unanimously to form this Ad Hoc committee. It was a uniting issue among the stakeholders in the room. She said it was great to see people come together on this. While it is the belief that LADWP that it is a given that the Modular building will be constructed, their committee disagreed and wanted to try to stop it. After voting to form the ad hoc committee they discussed methods such as going to LADWP commissioner meetings. She spoke with a commissioner over the weekend who was not aware of the plans for the building and felt that the rest of the commissioners were also likely unaware of it.

**Goudsmit:** Asked, to clarify, if there were people who were part of the public that wanted to potentially co-chair this ad hoc. **Ullman:** Yes, there were.

**Pawlowska:** Said the recent committee meeting was really unifying and energizing and people were already giving ideas and it gave her a lot of confidence that the ad hoc committee would be a very productive and effective.

**Black:** Asked if they had a LADWP liaison yet.

**Ullman:** Said she spoke quite regularly with Michael Ventre, a communications and public affairs officer, and Don Catrell, who is the contact for the Valley DWP office building. **Black:** Asked if there was a board liaison. He believed Anne-Marie was the previous liaison.

**Goudsmit:** Said that's an important thing to designate and her understanding of liaisons was that they could just be appointed without a vote. So they could potentially appoint one in this discussion.

**Duncan:** Asked how to find out about this sort of stuff.

**Ullman:** Said she posted the committee agenda a week in advance. **Duncan:** Asked if they were supposed to read the agenda of all 15 committees.

**Goudsmit:** Said yes, it is absolutely the responsibility of every board member to stay abreast of what's happening in every single committee.

**Ringuette:** Said there was early notification system they could sign up for to get all of the postings from the NCs, committees and City Council. She also said the DWP has a monthly program that NCs could participate in to keep track of the what the department was doing. Jack Humphrville meet at DWP.

**Black** moved to amend the motion to including appointing a LADWP Liaison. **Robbins** seconds. Without objection the motion was amended.

**Goudsmit:** Asked who was interested being the liaison. **Ullman:** Said she was interested.

**Ullman** was appointed the LADWP Liason.

*Emmons called the question. Zevos seconded.*

*Emmons moved for a voice vote. Robbins seconded. Without objection a voice vote was approved.*

*The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.*

- c) **(Secretary) Move to discuss and take potential action on adding *Office Hours* to SLNC website under Outreach Committee and to promote in SLNC Newsletter in an effort to increase community involvement and reach out to stakeholders in new and important ways to promote involvement in the SLNC. Hours are to be posted on the SLNC website in advance of scheduled *Office Hours* to provide adequate notice to the public. *Office Hours* are to take place within Silver Lake community boundaries and made available to *any* Silver Lake stakeholder regardless of Region or At-Large representation by holder of *Office Hours*. Stakeholders will be made aware of contact information of Region Representative and/or redirected to website and Committee(s) for specific issues raised during discussions with holder of *Office Hours*.**

**Copenhaver** made the motion. **Getz** seconded.

**Black:** Asked if this required everyone to have office hours, or just that everyone could have office hour.

**Goudsmit:** Said office hours were not required. This would just be a way to notify the public about holding office hours on the silver lake neighborhood Council website, so people where know where to go for office hours. Copenhaver would be in charge of listing out the office hours. But that would be left up to the holder of the office hours. This just formalizes it so the silver lake neighborhood Council can post and notify that there are office hours to be held.

**Robbins:** Said his only question was the formalization of the process. He typically does his office hours in a coffee shop. He was concerned formalizing on the website could be a cause of concern for the coffee shop and may force them to have to rent out a venue for the office hours

**Emmons:** Asked if there was a model for this. Have other neighborhood councils done this? Has this and has this been vetted by DONE and John Darnell? Is there potential for any sort of Brown Act violation.

**Goudsmit:** Said, no, there was no no legal question. There was no violation question. It's just a matter of allowing for board members to be able to hold office hours and for the public to be able to be aware that those office hours are being held.

**Ullman:** Said speaking to one's constitutes is at the core of what they do.

**Poole:** Said the outreach was considering holding one outreach meeting per region per month. Wondered why this was made separate from the outreach agenda.

**Copenhaver:** Said Office hours are one on one meetings with stakeholders. The outreach events intents are to make sure they were touching each region once a year. He saw them as two completely different things.

**Ringuette:** Asked if the ada requirements would need to be in place wherever they held their office hours.

**Goudsmit:** Said that office hours are not formal events, so no ADA rules apply. It is not an SLNC event – it is an informal method of reaching out to the public in a different way.

**Ullman:** Said that in the interest of making sure that this motion if past was not used as a sort of punitive effect on people's ability to have this, her suggestion was to amend the motion to read that the hours **can** be posted on the SLNC website. **Black** seconded. Without objection the amendment was approved.

**Goudsmit** moved to extend the meeting by 10 minutes. **Emmons** seconded. Without objection the meeting was extended.

**Goudsmit:** Said the idea is to notify as many people as possible that you will be doing this. You are not required to do this, but you are allowing people to know it is happening.

**Emmons** called the question. **Robbins** seconded.

**Emmons** moved for a voice vote. **Zevos** seconded. Without objection a voice vote was approved.

*The amended motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.*

## 8) Approval of the Draft Minutes

- a) Review and adopt minutes from Governing Board Regular Meeting on May 1, 2019. Draft minutes here: <http://silverlakenc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/SLNC-May-1st-Regular-Special-Meeting-Minutes-Suggested-Changes-Version.pdf>

*Emmons* moved to approve the minutes. **Black** seconded

*Without objection, the minutes were approved.*

## 9) Future Agenda Items

- a) (Secretary) Move to discuss and take potential action on selecting a Parliamentarian.
- b) (Secretary) Move to discuss and take potential action on selecting a Sargent-at-Arms.  
Tabled.

## 10) Announcements

- a) (Secretary) Move to discuss and take potential action that the Announcement period is used for Board announcements rather than Board members using the Public Comment Period for Non-Agenda Items as an opportunity to make announcements.

**Goudsmit:** Said she received a formal notification from Doug Loewy informing her that he would be resigning. She told him she was sorry to see him go. In a future meeting they will have to fill his seat.

**Ringuette:** Announced that Budget Day would be Saturday June 29<sup>th</sup>. More than half of the seats are filled. People who want to attend must register to get parking and breakfast

**Robbins:** Said that Make Music LA was happening all day next Friday at the Sunset Triangle Plaza. There will be music all day and Silver Lake Picture show is screening Selena that night. The producer of Selena would be there.

**Ullman:** Asked them to take Reservoir fliers for the master plan workshop.

## **11) Adjournment**

*Emmons moved to Adjourn. Poole seconded.*

*Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 10:05 PM*