



Serving the Silver Lake Community Since 2003

P.O. Box 26385
Los Angeles, California 90026

Phone 323-413-SLNC (7562)
Email board@silverlakenc.org
www.silverlakenc.org

Co-Chairs Nick Fox Robbins
Anthony Crump
Vice Chair Nora Goudsmit
Treasurer Maebe A. Girl
Secretary Tina Lin

SPECIAL GOVERNING BOARD MEETING AGENDA

DRAFT MINUTES

Monday, December 21, 2020 - 7:00 pm - 10:00 pm

Zoom Online Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84881179451>

or by telephone by calling (669) 900-6833 and entering Webinar ID: # 848 8117 9451#

**TIMES ARE FOR REFERENCE ONLY. ITEMS MAY BE ADDRESSED OUT OF THE ORDER LISTED.
ALL ITEMS ARE FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.**

1) Call to Order: 7:04 p.m.

2) Roll Call

- a. Nicholas Robbins
- b. Anthony Crump
- c. Nora Goudsmit
- d. Maebe A. Girl
- e. Tina Lin
- f. Sarah Ullman
- g. Ianthe Zevos
- h. Barbara Ringuette
- i. Samantha Danner
- j. Seth Copenhaver
- k. Imran Syed
- l. Ben Cassorla
- m. Jeremy Black
- n. Lena Najarian Kaderali

3) Welcome and Rules for Action on Virtual Meeting

- **Nick Fox Robbins:** More and more, when someone doesn't like an idea, they don't allow a discussion of that idea. If an idea is introduced at our governing board meetings that someone doesn't agree with, they would prefer to table or filibuster the suggestion to run out the clock so that no conversation can take place, rather than have a discussion. There are things as bad and good ideas, but I don't claim to be the authority or arbiter. There are many good ideas that have sprung from discussing good ideas, and there are many bad ideas formed from things that have sounded like good ideas. Good ideas are found by shining a light on them and deciding their merits. It takes a great deal of courage to defend an idea that you think is right, and it takes courage to challenge an idea that you think is wrong. But it takes no courage to discard an idea before a

suggestion has been had. Let this council be a place where ideas for the community can be discussed. Do not accuse people's ideas as stupid or tyrannical or malicious. Defend your ideas well and listen to those who disagree with you rather than simply sticking steadfastly to an idea simply because it is not your idea. Be open to having your mind changed. In the words of Salman Rushdie, a mature society understands that at the heart of democracy is argument. This is the environment I hope to cultivate at this council. That being said, let's start the meeting.

4) **Welcome and Rules for Action on Virtual Meeting**

- a. **Anthony Crump:** Just as a reminder, if you are using Zoom you can raise your hand to make a comment, and you can hit *9 to make a comment on phone.

Public and Board comment on all agenda items is limited to 1 minute per speaker INCLUDING answers to any questions posed. Pausing of speaker time will not be permitted. Time may be extended at either Co-Chair's discretion.

5) **General Public Comment (Non-Agenda Items) – 1 Minute Per Comment**

- a. **Albert:** I'm the Election Committee Co-Chair for the Silver Lake City Council. I wanted to get a motion on the agenda for Jan 6 regarding putting up posters and fliers. We have meetings on January 4th and 25th about this. We are also looking for a Region 2 representative to join, and would love for anyone to join. Have a great holiday break.
- b. **Phone Number ending in -1770:** Dina Sorkin: I'm glad I'm following Albert. At the December board meeting I requested that the election issue be placed on tonight's agenda, and was disappointed to see it was not, especially since the candidate's filing is in a month, and this hampers us in doing the outreach. I also had an issue with whether the small business committee was functioning at this time. I heard on the news that the Akhbar had a gofundme because they were struggling, and I'm wondering if the Small Business Committee is surveying our area for what's being done for things like that.
 - i. **Nick Fox Robbins:** Akhbar has been in touch with us, but they reached out to us after the agenda was finalized.
 - ii. **Anthony Crump:** We also mentioned when we were having a special meeting it was to go over the standing rules updates.
- c. **David Wheatley:** I did some research into the first amendment, "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech" and I've been harping on this that the public has not been given the ability to put up posters that match and oppose to other people. I'm asking that people fix that, and also question whether this special meeting needs to take place.
 - i. **Sarah Ullman:** Feel free to email me and I would happily show you how to get a poster put up.
- d. **Maebe A. Girl:** I want to reiterate that Akhbar is in a region that I'm a representative for and is a longterm LGBTQ+ establishment. I don't know if we can take an official stance on the board, but as an individual, anyone on this call who is concerned about queer space, to make a donation and help the cause.
- e. **Barbara Ringuette:** I am enormously disappointed that this is the third meeting in December, and we're having a meeting on Christmas week, and we have so much work to do and haven't discussed the real issues affecting the community. I don't see the need here, and I am so disappointed in anyone who thinks this is a special meeting. I relish the time I spend on the board, and I care for you, and I feel you've lost focus. Thank you.

6) **Announcements/Updates**

- a. **Anthony Crump:** We do have a regular governing board meeting taking place on Jan 6th. I know it's right kind of in the middle of the holidays, so please make sure if you have committee meetings taking place in the next week or so, that you get those to Nick and I by next Wednesday so we can start to compile that over the New Year's Weekend. Just

a reminder that the meeting is Jan 6th and to think about getting those motions in there, including motions mentioned tonight or brewing otherwise, please just start working on those so we can get those drafts and items on the agenda as quickly as possible.

- b. **Nicholas Robbins:** Tina, is there a change in the way people would need to get ahold of their council members?
- c. **Tina Lin:** There is not, all the emails for committees and board members are forwarding correctly. I apologize to the constituents out there, but if you sent anything in the last week to a group email, such as chairs or boards@nc.org, It has probably bounced back and I encourage you to resend them.
- d. **Nicholas Robbins:** I've been working on the annual report, and the deadline passed for including the items in the report. That said, that really was just a deadline to make sure people were getting their stuff in. If you have something to add, please submit it. We want to share what you've done, whether it's through committee or otherwise. I won't close doors on entries until I complete a first draft, but at this point I'm open to any and all entries.

7) New Business

- a. **(Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee)** Motion to include language at the top of SLNC Standing Rules document relating to Standing and Ad Hoc Committees under a new heading "Definitions and Terms." Motion was passed by the SLNC Standing Rules and Bylaws Committee on December 16, 2020 with a vote of 32 Yes votes, 0 No votes, and 2 Present not voting:

PROPOSED ADDITION: For the purposes of this document, Standing and Ad Hoc Committees are referred to as "Advisory Committees." Advisory Committees are defined as being recommendation-giving to the SLNC Governing Board for the purpose of aiding Governing Board members in discussion, debate, and taking action by majority vote.

- Nora motions. Sarah Ullman seconds.
- **Debbie Slater:** I put this forward for continuity between our documents. They're currently only labelled as standing or ad hoc, but in our rules they're referred to as advisory, so this is for clarity to people reading our documents to what those things are. Our hope as well is that we will include more descriptors of committees in the bylaws for the future. For the most part, it had very little discussion, just grammatic discussions, and it passed overwhelmingly in committee.
- The Vote:
 - **Nicholas Robbins - Yes**
 - **Anthony Crump - Yes**
 - **Nora Goudsmit - Yes**
 - **Maebe A. Girl - Yes**
 - **Tina Lin - Yes**
 - **Sarah Ullman - Yes**
 - **Ilanthe Zevos - Yes**
 - **Barbara Ringuette - Yes**
 - **Samantha Danner - Yes**
 - **Seth Copenhaver - Yes**
 - **Imran Syed - Yes**
 - **Ben Cassolia - Yes**
 - **Jeremy Black - Yes**
 - **Lena Najarian Kaderali - Yes**

14 Yes, 0 No, 0 Present not Voting. Motion Carries.

- b. **(Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee)** Motion to amend SLNC Standing Rule #10 as described below. Motion was passed by the SLNC Standing Rules and Bylaws Committee on December 16, 2020 with a vote of 24 Yes votes, 2 No votes, 11 Present not voting:

CURRENT STANDING RULE #10. Meeting Location Unless otherwise notified, all regular monthly meetings of the SLNC Governing Board will be held in the auditorium of Ivanhoe Elementary School, located at 2828 Herkimer Street, Los Angeles, CA 90039.

PROPOSED ADDITION TO STANDING RULE #10: Neighborhood Councils must comply with policies set forth by the individual agency when utilizing their facilities. Meeting locations must be ADA compliant to host Neighborhood Council meetings. Duly notified alternative locations to hold SLNC Regular or Special Meetings of the Governing Board are based on the following criterion: (a) all meetings shall be held within the Council boundaries at a location, date and time set by the Governing Board; (b) all meeting locations shall comply with laws pertaining to accessibility e.g. ADA compliant; compliance extends to, but is not limited to, bathroom(s), meeting room(s), parking; (c) all alternative SLNC Governing Board meeting locations that meet ADA compliance requirements shall be approved by the Governing Board, in accordance with DONE, and added to a formal list of compliant alternative meeting location(s); list to be maintained and updated yearly by the SLNC Secretary.

Accordingly, the Governing Board can choose to utilize for any Regular or Special Meeting of the Governing Board an alternative location from the approved list. SLNC Standing and Ad Hoc Committees can draw from this list of approved locations for meetings, in addition to regularly used locates such as: Silver Lake Recreational Center and Silver Lake Public Library.

Additionally, granting the option for SLNC Advisory Committees and/or Governing Board to schedule Zoom meetings at the discretion of the Advisory Committee and/or Governing Board in accordance with the Governor's Executive Order.

- **Nora motions to pass. Ben Cassorla seconds.**

Public Comment:

- **Nina Sorkin:** I thank you for this opportunity, and thank you Nick on your opening comments. In 2019, and I believe I sent this to the board members, I really questioned the ability to use Ivanhoe and cited that it was not an ADA compliant facility. Even though construction has stopped, it is still not ADA compliant due to lack of railings and parking. If you read my letter that I sent to Nora, I clearly state what was the problem then, and the problem continues. I really feel the board should be aware of what the law really states, and it's not only access to the building but also the parking. I feel that by continuing to have Ivanhoe listed as the primary site is really violating the law, and if nothing happens then I will have to take the next step and file a grievance.
- **David Wheatley:** I'd like to point out that the bylaws committee had a meeting, but the bylaws committee did not get through anything because there was much to discuss and the motions were controversial, so it comes as a shock to me that it was moved to the governing board when it should've been done at the committee level.
 - **Nicholas Robbins:** The comment has to be related to the motion.
 - **David Wheatley:** This needs to be researched and tabled, and the whole definition of ADA needs to be researched and put in here. This needs to be reworked, thank you. I really was right on topic as well with what I was about to say but you did not let me finish.
 - **Nicholas Robbins:** It felt that the comment was speaking specifically about the meeting as opposed to the agenda items.

- **David Wheatley:** I think it's wrong to restrict my speech like that and you need to be more careful.
- **Janelle Levin:** I have an issue with a matter of grammar. The name of the Silverlake Recreation Center is improper. It is not recreational, it is "Recreation Center" which is how they all are named.
 - **Nicholas:** Because this was voted by the Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee and I don't know if we can just fix it or if we have to vote on it and fix it.
 - **Anthony Crump:** We'd have to vote to amend it but I have a few items to also fix grammatically so I'll bring that up after public comment.
- **Jerome Courshon:** Nina is incorrect about Ivanhoe, it was thoroughly vetted by an earlier board of the NHC, so you can go back to the history of the first change or the change a few years ago and verify that it's ADA compliant. Some people had a preference for Mayberry School, but that one is not ADA compliant and they won't open up the parking there either.
- **Debbie Slater:** I would like to echo what Barbara said, that these don't have any immediate action required, so calling this meeting the week of Christmas is disrespectful and unnecessary.
- **Nina Sorkin:** I don't know if my name was mentioned, but the site I would really like to have the board consider is the Silverlake Independent Jewish center. I did go to visit Mayberry. In terms of parking, I don't think Mr. Courshon is aware of what the checklist is. There has to be a designated parking place, which Ivanhoe does not have, and there has to be railing, which Ivanhoe does not have.

Board Member:

- **Maebe A. Girl:** I just wanted to make a point of information about this motion as treasurer. Normally the NHC would be under contract with LAUSD for a particular location. We were reached out to by the city clerk to have a location with LAUSD, and one of the questions that was asked was "If we enter a contract to LAUSD is it specific to location", the answer is yes. When in person meetings resume, we will need a contract and to continue meeting there. We're currently not under contract, so we have a choice between a number of locations currently.
- **Sarah Ullman:** I think the beauty of the way this motion is written is it does allow a diversity of locations and it takes the choice of whether a location is ADA compliant out of our hands and has to be specific to the city. I think we can have this conversation at a later date.
- **Lena Najarian:** Ivanhoe specifically did have parking in the lower yard. Towards the end of the time we were meeting in person, they were doing construction, but that has been completed. They also have handrails on the ramps.
- **Anthony Crump:** I agree with Nina that we need to look at other locations as well. We've also looked at Mitchell Trainor, where we used to have meetings. The beauty of this change is that it gives us the flexibility to choose a number of other locations. I think this motion is in the spirit of keeping us as accessible as possible by not holding us to one location.
 - **Anthony Crump:** Before we move forward I wanted to go over the grammar changes. I would propose the following amendment: in the second paragraph where it says "In addition to regularly used locates" to "Locations" and in the first paragraph, "In accordance with DONE" be changed to "In accordance with Department of Neighborhood Empowerment", and to change from "Silver Lake Recreational Center" to "Silver Lake Recreation Center."
 - **Anthony motions the amendment, in the Seconds.**
 - **Nicholas Robbins - Yes**
 - **Anthony Crump - Yes**
 - **Nora Goudsmit - Yes**

- Maebe A. Girl - Yes
- Tina Lin - Yes
- Sarah Ullman - Yes
- Ianthe Zevos - Yes
- Barbara Ringuette - Yes
- Samantha Danner - Yes
- Seth Copenhaver - Yes
- Imran Syed - Yes
- Ben Cassorla - Yes
- Jeremy Black - Yes
- Lena Najarian Kaderali - Yes
 - 14 Yes, 0 No, 0 Present Not Voting

- **The Vote for the MOTION:**
 - Nicholas Robbins - Yes
 - Anthony Crump - Yes
 - Nora Goudsmit - Yes
 - Maebe A. Girl - Yes
 - Tina Lin - Yes
 - Sarah Ullman - Yes
 - Ianthe Zevos - Yes
 - Barbara Ringuette - Yes
 - Samantha Danner - Yes
 - Seth Copenhaver - Yes
 - Imran Syed - Yes
 - Ben Cassorla - Yes
 - Jeremy Black - Yes
 - Lena Najarian Kaderali - Yes
 - 14 Yes, 0 No, 0 Present Not Voting

- c. **(Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee)** Motion to amend SLNC Standing Rule #16 as described below. Motion was passed by the SLNC Standing Rules and Bylaws Committee on December 16, 2020 with a vote of 32 yes, 1 No, 5 Present not voting:
 - i. Nora Goudsmit Motions, Sarah Ullman Seconds

CURRENT STANDING RULE #16. “Board Member Use Of Title/Position”

No officer or member of the SLNC or any of its advisory committees shall represent him/herself as speaking on behalf of the Council or committee, or act to committing the Council or its’ committees to any action, unless s/he has been authorized by the SLNC Governing Board, or by the SLNC Executive Committee when approval by the full Board would not be timely. Members are permitted to do research and make exploratory calls in their official capacity without express approval of the Governing Board, so long as they do not commit the Council to any kind of action.

Such authorization may be limited or revoked at any time by the Governing Board.

PROPOSED ADDITION TO STANDING RULE #16: All Officer(s), SLNC Board members, Advisory Committee co-chair(s), both Standing and Ad Hoc, or the like are required to follow SLNC Standing Rules procedure to seek and obtain “Official Positions” as defined by Standing Rule #39 should they be interested in making representations on behalf of the SLNC to City agencies or any other outside group, body, or entity.

Public Comment:

- **Debbie Slater:** I have a small edit, but would like to reemphasize again that this does not require immediate action, and just because you announced the meeting doesn't mean it requires a special meeting. We should capitalize "Advisory Committees" because that's how changes are made going forward, so that phrase needs a capital A and a capital C.
- **David Wheatley:** The line "such authorization may be limited or revoked at any time by the governing board", I think there needs to be public motion and input, I want to make sure that line doesn't mean that the governing board can secretly change these rules. If you could clarify that for me that would be great thank you.
 - **Nicholas Robbins:** Like if that line were to be changed in the future? All those lines mean can be revoked any time, with a governing board vote, right?
 - **Nora Goudsmit:** That's already included in the current standing rules and not the proposed, so that is not actually relevant.
 - **David Wheatley:** Then knowing that I would like that to be edited to prevent action by the governing board outside the governing board meeting.
 - **Anthony Crump:** To clarify, there is no secret process fundamentally where we can revoke. All agenda items must be done in a public forum, so there's nothing that could be done out of the public view.
 - **Nicholas Robbins:** So we don't need an amendment to that line because those are already based on the guidelines being currently followed.

Board Comment:

- **Sarah Ullman:**

"I'd like to take a step back and give my colleagues some context as I see it, and tell you why you should support the standing rule amendments before us tonight.

Last summer, a group of stakeholders used threats of legal action, obstruction tactics and abuses of their positions as Committee Chairs to advance a personal agenda and prevent the Governing Board from voting on a construction project.

I'm not sure what their motivations were: Perhaps they think the rules don't apply to them or perhaps they mistakenly thought that the committee co chairs are empowered to speak for this governing board without approval, or perhaps they have a paternalistic view of which stakeholders deserve to have a vote on construction projects in our neighborhood — whatever the reason --

It is our responsibility to make sure no one ever abuses their position or our process for personal gain ever again.

The amendments before us tonight are not an attack because they are not punitive; they are forward looking and fair. These amendments aim to prevent such abuses of position and abuses of process in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support the standing rule amendments before us tonight."

The Vote:

- **Nicholas Robbins - Yes**
- **Anthony Crump - Yes**
- **Nora Goudsmit - Yes**

- Maebe A. Girl - Yes
- Tina Lin - Yes
- Sarah Ullman - Yes
- Ianthe Zevos - Yes
- Barbara Ringuette – Present, Not Voting
- Samantha Danner - Yes
- Seth Copenhaver - Yes
- Imran Syed - Yes
- Ben Cassorla - Yes
- Jeremy Black - Yes
- Lena Najarian Kaderali - Yes
- 13 Yes, 0 No, 1 Present, Not Voting
- **Anthony Crump:** Just as a reminder to everyone, you can hit *9 to raise your hand on phone, and the raise hand function on Zoom to participate.

- d. **(Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee)** Motion to amend SLNC Standing Rule #29 as described below. Motion was passed by the SLNC Standing Rules and Bylaws Committee on December 16, 2020 with a vote of 38 Yes votes, 1 No vote and 0 Present not voting:
- i. Nora motions. Sarah Ullman seconds.

CURRENT STANDING RULE #29 “Advisory Committee Co-Chairs Elected Annually*” All SLNC advisory committees shall elect co-chairs within four (4) weeks of the seating of the first Regular SLNC meeting of the newly elected Governing Board and every twelve (12) months thereafter.

PROPOSED ADDITION TO STANDING RULE #29: Advisory Committee co-chairs are required to indicate **“**CO-CHAIR ELECTIONS WILL BE HELD**”** – [to be located at the TOP of the COMMITTEE AGENDA above date/time/location]. Failure to notice the meeting and public properly of agendized committee co-chair elections may result in: (1) cancellation of the Committee meeting and/or (2) nullifying the result of the co-chair election held, following the advice of DONE and/or the City Attorney and/or the City Clerk.

Committee Co-Chair Elections to be held as the first action taken on the Agenda.

Public Comment:

- **No Public Comment**

Governing Board:

- **Samantha Danner:** I had a situation that came up last week during the Ad Hoc committee. The board didn’t actually meet until last week for the first time. In those situations, the rule amendment as written wouldn’t exactly cover that where the committee hasn’t formed at the new time of the board being set, and wouldn’t have the ability to be re-elected for 12 months. I think this requires an amendment that includes any newly formed ad hoc or committees in general.
- **Nicholas Robbins:** This is in reference to the language regarding an ad hoc committee forming and the 12 months thereafter line, correct?
- **Samantha Danner:** Yes, I think it may not apply in certain ad hoc situations. I think it can be amended.
- **Nicholas Robbins:** For newly created or ad hoc committees, it must be added – I don’t know if that’s redundant.
- **Samantha Danner:** It can be amended to say that for ad hoc committees specifically.

- **Nora Goudsmit:** Suggested changing “Governing Board” to “any newly elected committee.”
- **Maebe A. Girl:** I think the language as it is is not really achievable to have all committee co-chairs elected within four weeks. We have about 21 committees. If all of them were to elect their co-chairs within four weeks, it would literally be meeting after meeting every day, and I think there’s a lot of overlap. There’s no way all committees can meet in a four week period after an election. I make a motion to amend it to 8 weeks so we don’t have multiple elections on one night.
- **Anthony Crump:** You could modify it, you can change it. It’s germane. I kind of agree with Maebe but, are there any other comments?
- **Debbie Slater:** With all due respect to Maebe that doesn’t really benefit the stakeholders to delay that long. New committees, these changes, they will know they need to meet within the first month, and they’ve known that for years. I think 8 weeks is too long and if you’re going to amend it it should be no longer than 6. I’m not in support of changing the existing language.
- **Scott Plante:** I agree with Maebe, I think it’s a good suggestion, but I also understand Debbie’s point, so I think 6 weeks is a good compromise.
- **Anthony Crump:** You can make an amendment that would change the language as long as it’s germane to what was considered. There’s two areas that need to be addressed – the four weeks from Maebe and the retooling of the language from Samantha. We can amend it in the same amendment.
- **Ben Cassorla:** I feel like 6 weeks seems like a reasonable compromise for this to address the issues brought up by everybody, but it sounds like we need to address what Samantha brought up first.
- **Debbie Slater:** If we’re going to make changes to the current rules, then that’s where Samantha’s point needs to be brought up. And regarding elections, that needs to be brought up at their first meeting.
- **Nicholas Robbins:** So the only change would be the current standing rule paragraph. Nora, do you have an amendment?
- **Nora Goudsmit:** We can make an amendment regarding the committees and then an amendment regarding the 6 weeks.
 - **Nora makes a motion to amend** – “Shall be applied to any new committee” and updating to “6 weeks” – seconded by Maebe.
 - **Debbie Slater:** Since we’re physically changing this one, don’t we need to capitalize Advisory Committee for consistency?
 - **Nora Goudsmit:** I will include that in my amendment.
 - **The Vote on Amendment:**
 - **Nicholas Robbins - Yes**
 - **Anthony Crump - Yes**
 - **Nora Goudsmit - Yes**
 - **Maebe A. Girl - Yes**
 - **Tina Lin - Yes**
 - **Sarah Ullman - Yes**
 - **Ilanthe Zevos - Yes**
 - **Barbara Ringuette - Yes**
 - **Samantha Danner - Yes**
 - **Seth Copenhaver - Yes**
 - **Imran Syed - Yes**
 - **Ben Cassorla - Yes**
 - **Jeremy Black - Yes**
 - **Lena Najarian Kaderali - Yes**
 - 14 Yes, 0 No, 0 Present Not Voting

- **The Vote:**
 - **Nicholas Robbins - Yes**
 - **Anthony Crump - Yes**
 - **Nora Goudsmit - Yes**
 - **Maebe A. Girl - Yes**
 - **Tina Lin - Yes**
 - **Sarah Ullman - Yes**
 - **Ilanthe Zevos - Yes**
 - **Barbara Ringuette - Yes**
 - **Samantha Danner - Yes**
 - **Seth Copenhaver - Yes**
 - **Imran Syed - Yes**
 - **Ben Cassorla - Yes**
 - **Jeremy Black - Yes**
 - **Lena Najarian Kaderali - Yes**
 - 14 Yes, 0 No, 0 Present Not Voting

- e. **(Co-Chair/Goudsmit)** Motion to amend SLNC Standing Rule #33 as described below. This item was not acted on by the Standing Rules and Bylaws Committee:
 - i. Nora motions, Sarah seconds.

PROPOSED AMMENDMENTS TO CURRENT STANDING RULE #33. "Definition of an Advisory Committee Member" TRACKED BELOW:

- a. Any stakeholder in attendance of a SLNC Advisory Committee (or Ad Hoc Committee) ~~an advisory committee~~ meeting may discuss, debate, and vote on any issue under consideration at the Committee meeting.
- b. ~~The SLNC Urban Design & Preservation Advisory Committee shall establish a specifically defined process of its membership, based on the committee subject and extended responsibilities it holds on behalf of the community. In order to become an eligible UD&PAC "voting member" a stakeholder shall have attended and signed in three (3) meetings in a four (4) month period and will be eligible to vote at the third (3rd) meeting. UD&PAC "voting membership" lapses after three (3) consecutive absences. In order to encourage stakeholders' participation in the decision-making process at ALL SLNC Advisory Committee meetings (inclusive of Ad Hoc Committees), a straw poll vote of all stakeholders in attendance, who do not have a direct conflict of interest (e.g. are not directly involved or affiliated with the presented project being brought to Committee or item being considered, will be taken prior to a final vote on a given motion and considered as the Committee vote. NOTE: For SLNC Urban Design & Preservation Committee meetings, neighbors that are in attendance and live within the specified radius of presented projects are NOT considered to have a direct conflict of interest, rather these Silver Lake stakeholders are encouraged to attend UDP meetings and vote.~~
- c. Procedure for voting: (1) each stakeholder in attendance, including Advisory Committee co-chairs and those in regular attendance of Advisory Committee meetings (and for UDP, members who previously were considered to have "voting rights") are each allotted one vote. Votes are taken by roll call and voters can express either: "yes" or "no" or "present not voting" on any agenda item considered (2) Advisory Committee co-chairs record the vote (3) The outcome of the straw poll vote shall be recorded into the Committee meeting minutes, published Ceity wide.

Public Comment:

- **Debbie Slater:** This committee functions on a different level than every committee in our community. One, all our neighborhood land use councils are approved for actions. Public comment is always considered before taking a vote. Land use committee members must take a class on this. This new requirement still has issues to address should someone choose to take a class beyond the expired window.
- **Scott Plante:** I propose the board attend an upcoming UDP meeting before voting on this. Only 38% have attended a UDP meeting and will help the board establish a vote. There's a lot of misinformation about UDP that should be discussed first. The membership rules are to prevent packing a vote from lobbyists, but this amendment can allow for that. BONK states anyone that doesn't complete the training will be ineligible to serve, so what happens if someone votes and then doesn't complete the training?
- **Peggy Gorelick:** I just wanted to say that I support making UDP requirements open to more stakeholders.
- **Cliff Towne:** I just wanted to point out that the perception that UDP is not open to stakeholders is not really correct. If you come on down and attend three meetings then you get to be a voting member under the existing rules, which have been working well. This hasn't had the opportunity to have any discussion prior to this with the public. We've heard allegations of corruption tonight and that's a surprise, and we need to have more discussions and there's no rush on this, so you don't need to be voting on this tonight.
- **Janelle Levin:** I just want to point out on the agenda that this item was not acted on by the Standing Rules and Bylaws committee. It should be included that there was some discussion and the item was tabled because there was not enough time to vet it. Please note it for this item and the next item.
- **Shmuley:** I would like to thank the board for holding this meeting. I would specifically like to speak to standing rule 33. All board meetings should be open to stakeholders. This class requirement will allow a more educated electorate, and makes it harder to pack the votes.
- **Mike Goetz:** I'd just like to reiterate what the last speaker said. I'm a homeowner and stakeholder who has been interested in joining the UDP Committee but the fact that membership takes 3+ months has always struck me as an excessive barrier to entry and prevents the inclusion we should be looking for. I feel like training to vote should be enough and we shouldn't limit participation with this 3+ month requirement. No other NHCs have this requisite.
- **David Wheatley:** I've been on UDP for several years. These land use issues are extremely complex and can take years to understand how it works. The planning 101 is not enough information. It was not acted on by standing rules, so whoever said this needs to be tabled shows me there's something not right here.
- **Allison Grey:** I just wanted to reiterate that I, as well, have lived in Silverlake for a long time and would like to be a UDP member, but the 3 months I feel is too restrictive.
- **Jerome Courshon:** I hope you all on the board read my letter. Secondly, the membership requirement is not onerous despite what some people say or think it is. It's three meetings over the course of a year and we meet once a month. These committees are also chosen by the board generally, but here we don't have those protections. We're much different in Silver Lake than any other committee.
- **Carol Cetrone:** I'm an 8 or 9 year member of the UDP. I've taken both the land use training programs. I feel that this is not an onerous thing to ask. I was a member for about two years before I felt comfortable and I go to every meeting. It took about two years before I felt like I understood and had my voice. How specifically do you plan to determine if there's a direct conflict when an attendee comes in?
- **Betsy Isroelit:** I just wanted to agree with Carol, I feel these are complex matters. I know if I attended a meeting I could speak my mind. However, I'm not an architect so if I didn't attend meetings I wouldn't know or understand the language. I would like for the UDP and the committee to meet together and discuss this.

Board Member Comments:

- **Nora Goudsmit:** I think this rule requires amending. Specifically, item B adds a contingency for people to become stakeholders. However, I'd like to ask the board to set specific voting rules for some and not others, and how that may limit the votes of some people while making voting more accessible for others. I don't believe that one committee is above another.
- **Maebe A. Girl:** This is a really important matter and has been in discussion with the committee for a while now. We've received a number of letters and I want you to know I've read them. This is a tricky situation, and while I understand, many stakeholders pointed out that this would allow developers to enter the meetings and make changes. My issue is that if people have to be present at 3 out of 4 meetings, it's disenfranchising. The way I joined this committee is because of a letter I received in the mail. Had I attended that meeting as a first timer I wouldn't have been able to vote on it. I'm in favor of the motion.
- **Seth Copenhaver:** As someone who is a voting member of UDP I actually don't think that the current rules for the committee members are completely over the top. We're talking about in some cases, other NHCs are appointing members, so I think this is allowing people in the community to participate, and ensures that people aren't jumping into meetings just to load votes either. I think voting on this tonight heightens the relationship between UDP and this committee and I make a motion to table this for further discussion. I'll let other people speak before we vote on a motion but I firmly believe we need to discuss this further before bringing to vote.
- **Jeremy Black:** I'm in favor of this. I find it curious that a lot of the folks that are concerned about meeting packing have employed that in their own meetings.
- **Samantha Danner:** I have stated my sentiments in previous meetings that UDP should have a different or privileged position that don't apply to other committees. I realize it's complex dealing with issues of development in our city, but in order to enfranchise as many of our stakeholders as possible, they're certainly not similar to the requirements of other committees. I applaud the idea that everyone should take a class to vote, and I think that's something that could benefit other committees as well. It's hard for us, even as board members, to attend all we want to attend. I think the class plus not being a registered lobbyist should suffice.
- **Nicholas Robbins:** I'm really on the fence here. I think that a three meeting waiting period does seem like a barrier to involvement in that it takes a lot of privilege to even attend those meetings. Does that mean that parents who can't afford childcare, or people who work evenings, don't have a vote since they can't attend? That said, I see need for protection against developers who would stack the votes a certain way. I don't think we've found the solution yet. I don't think the solution has been spoken tonight, but I do think there are better ideas that haven't been spoken yet.
- **Imran Syed:** I'm struggling with this one because I do see both sides. I've also tried my best to read some of the letters. For me, what would help are some questions like, if the city is having people take a course, how do we know that they completed the class when they come to a meeting? Do they have to be three consecutive meetings? What is the day and time of these meetings?
- **Anthony Crump:** It's three meetings in a four month period of time, not entirely consecutive but due to the time constraints some have to be. UDP meetings are generally in the evenings on Wednesdays and Tuesdays, usually Wednesdays.
- **Seth Copenhaver:** It's the second Wednesday of every month at 6:30 p.m.
- **Barbara Ringuette:** Anyone can participate in conversation and can also participate in straw polls. I agree with Nick, there should be an honest exchange of ideas. It is not understandable and seems conflictual that there has been no discussions between the co-chairs and individual committees. A developer who brings to a meeting every professional and client they work with drowns out both the voices and the votes of neighbors who are significantly impacted by these projects. You should table this and move it onto discussion with every member of the committee.

- **Ilanthe Zevos:** I'm actually a UDP member and I'm torn by this motion because I do take to heart the comments the community have made about three meetings being a barrier. That said, the people coming before us proposing these projects have a difference in that they're bringing forward a large financial investment. They were designed to and have been effective at evening the playing field. It might be beneficial to do a joint meeting to find out what the right way is and keep an open process while keeping the financial concerns in check.
- **Anthony Crump:** You're saying a joint meeting of whom?
- **Ilanthe Zevos:** The governing board and UDP. Although I suppose it is a standing rules and bylaws thing so I'm not sure how that would work.
- **Sarah Ullman:** I would like to remind my fellow governing board members that UDP is an advisory committee and any vote they make is not binding and has to be ratified by the governing board, so if there's anything suspect, the UDP chairs can let us know and the governing board can hear the items again. They're supposed to do a straw poll as well, but currently they do not do that so we need to make that happen. I think it's also paternalistic to tell stakeholders they don't have a vote because they're not familiar with the planning and land use training. I don't think you need that much knowledge to give an opinion.
- **Ben Cassorla:** I'm torn as well. This is something that needs to be discussed, and there is a compromise somewhere. One to two meetings might be an effective compromise. Maybe there's somewhere in the middle that we could meet to ensure as many people as possible are enfranchised.
- **Joe:** I disagree with this motion. I think at the very least it should be discussed at the urban design level, it was never discussed with us and was sprung on us, and found out the night before that it was on the agenda for the bylaws committee. If we got rid of this rule and anyone can vote, most people vote on their emotions. When it involves money, it's personal. That's not legally binding. You can't use that basis to make decisions for the community. I think that if you allow everyone to vote on this, regardless of if they know anything about this, then people will vote on things such as their view, that are not legally binding.
- **Anthony Crump:** These bylaws amendments have been circulating up to 3 months now and have been agendaized twice now. They're not new, they've been circulating for at least a couple of months now. These have been going on for some time now.
- **Jill Cordes:** My only thought is that I know the other committees don't have the same rules as this committee. I definitely don't want developers to jump in and make decisions on someone's lot. That said, the meeting attendance requirement is not feasible for all members of the community. There has to be a way to keep people like developers out of it while still including the community in an accessible way.

Public Comment:

- **Debbie Slater:** No one in the community had issues with these rules for the past 10 years, and because of one development that was highly controversial, it has sprung this change for a very functional role. You need knowledge to vote on these matters as they have serious ramifications for our neighborhood and urge you to not vote on this today.
- **Cliff Towne:** I would urge you to table this too. This is the first time there's been any substantive comment upon it. NHCs usually appoint people and there's no access for stakeholders. We currently have the most democratic version in the city.
- **Joe:** I just want to reiterate what Debbie said and although this has been on the agenda for a few months, this is the first time we've had any discussion. We've been to multiple meetings and wasted our time because these haven't been on the agenda. I'm open to compromise as well. It used to be 3 in a row but a few years ago we changed it to 3 out of 4 meetings. I think this should be tabled for tonight.

- **Jerome Courshon:** I want to reiterate that some of the board members have proposed discussing this further and I think that's what you should do. You and the community could find a compromise but again I want to reiterate that if there is no membership requirement then people can bring anybody to the meeting to make changes, even as a member of the community. It's a double-edged sword.
- **Scott Plante:** There's a lot of discussion that needs to happen about this, and I think there's misunderstanding about what goes on with UDP to understand how UDP works.
- **Shmuley:** I was thinking we could adjust the language so that the city requires that people who vote are required to attend Land Use 101 and show it to participate in voting. Just like land developers, there are people in the community who can pack the meeting as well because they don't like something.
- **Mike Goetz:** I agree with the last commenter. I feel also that this discussion was tabled at the last meeting, and it seems like a delay tactic for those who want to keep the three month rule. I think we have enough information to take a vote.

Board Member Comment:

- **Seth Copenhaver:** I've certainly been critical of UDP when it's warranted. One thing we shouldn't be critical about is community feedback – at the last meeting, the committee went out of its way to help out someone during a meeting last week regarding procedures.
 - **Seth motions to table this to next meeting. Barbara seconds.**
 - **Anthony Crump:** When would you like to table it to?
 - **Seth Copenhaver:** I think that's up to the co-chairs. Just as someone who has sat on that committee and is trying to be a positive board member, I think this is a pretty controversial vote and this will create some issues with the relationship between the two committees.
 - **Anthony Crump:** This is the first time it's been brought up, this is the first time we've heard commentary from the public, we want an open discussion and debate on this. The structure of our meetings lends itself better to this kind of matter. We can bring this again before the governing board, a special meeting, whatever format people desire. But I do think it's important we continue this discussion before voting.
 - **Nicholas Robbins - Yes**
 - **Anthony Crump – Present, Not Voting**
 - **Nora Goudsmit - No**
 - **Maebe A. Girl – Present, Not Voting**
 - **Tina Lin - Yes**
 - **Sarah Ullman - No**
 - **Ilanthe Zevos - Yes**
 - **Barbara Ringuette - Yes**
 - **Samantha Danner - Yes**
 - **Seth Copenhaver - Yes**
 - **Imran Syed - Yes**
 - **Ben Cassorla – Present, Not Voting**
 - **Jeremy Black - No**
 - **Lena Najarian Kaderali – Present, Not Voting**
 - 7 Yes, 3 No, 4 Present, Not Voting. Motion is tabled.
- **Anthony Crump:** Nick and I will discuss this and how we will approach it again, but for now I suggest people think of some ideas and continue the discussion.
- **Nicholas Robbins:** I want to reiterate that this was the most thorough discussion about this, so let's talk about this. Let's not kick the can down, let's have the discussion, please.

This was a wonderful debate tonight where everyone had a chance to talk about their ideas, and let's see more of that.

- f. **(Co-Chair/Goudsmit)** Motion to amend SLNC Standing Rule #37 as described below. This item was not acted on by the Standing Rules and Bylaws Committee:

CURRENT STANDING RULE #37. Excused Absences Defined for SLNC Board Members
"Please refer to the SLNC Bylaws Article V, section 9. A(7)."

PROPOSED ADDITION TO STANDING RULE #37: Governing Board Co-Chairs will be required to: (1) reach out via email to Board member(s) who have missed 3 Regular Meetings of the Governing Board in a 12 month period, and prior to the next scheduled Governing Board meeting, to address and discuss absences informally. No formal action, per SLNC Bylaws Article V, section 9. A(7), will take place prior to gathering information from individual Board member(s) regarding attendance by SLNC Co-Chairs; (2) proceeding to formal discussion of Board member attendance at an Executive Committee Meeting shall always be preceded by informal discussions between respective member(s) of the Governing Board and Governing Board Co-Chairs; (3) further actions, per SLNC Bylaws Article V, section 9. A(7), to follow if deemed necessary by the Executive Committee after an informal process has taken place.

NOTE: Secretary and/or Assistant Secretary is responsible for maintaining and monitoring attendance records to determine if a Board member has missed 2 or more absences. Co-Chairs shall be informed of attendance records as needed by Secretary and/or Assistant Secretary.

Stakeholder interest or inquiry into Board Member attendance will be acknowledged via email by the Governing Board Co-Chair(s) to the interested stakeholder(s) within a 2 week period of receipt and email correspondence will indicate that the Co-Chairs have initiated an informal discussion with respective Board Member(s) within this 2 week period.

Nora Motions, Lena Seconds.

Public Comment:

- **Debbie Slater:** As the co-chair of the committee in which this was heard, this item was also tabled due to redundancy and legal viability and it was encouraged that you verify with the city regarding the validity of it in case the board was unable to view the minutes. The bylaw period to amend is locked, and because that's laid out very clearly and you would yield to the bylaws in any inconsistency.
- **Cliff Towne:** I think this would alter the bylaws so that they can't be altered. I'd like to know the background behind this edit.
- **Anthony Crump:** Previously in our bylaws there was a section that dealt with excused absences, but there was a rewrite of it some years ago where that was removed. The reference to it was put in the bylaws, which pointed back to the standing rules, where that bylaw was deleted, and this is an attempt to address that hole.

Board Member Comment:

- **Nora Goudsmit:** It doesn't alter the bylaws in any way, this would precede any type of formal removal process in the bylaws. This would make it so the co-chairs and committee can find out more information from a member regarding missed meetings. I'd just like to point out that the city has no appetite to remove members of a neighborhood council, so the removal process doesn't help the council put someone on the board that actually

wants to be there. This allowance lets the council to not allow someone to be on the board but without removing them.

- **Nicholas Robbins - Yes**
- **Anthony Crump - Yes**
- **Nora Goudsmit - Yes**
- **Maebe A. Girl - Yes**
- **Tina Lin - Yes**
- **Sarah Ullman - Yes**
- **Ianthe Zevos - Yes**
- **Barbara Ringuette - Yes**
- **Samantha Danner – Not Present**
- **Seth Copenhaver - Yes**
- **Imran Syed - Yes**
- **Ben Cassorla - Yes**
- **Jeremy Black - Yes**
- **Lena Najarian Kaderali – Yes**
 - **13 Yes, 0 No, 0 Present Not Voting.**

- g. (Co-Chair/Goudsmit) Motion to amend SLNC Standing Rule #39 as described below. This item was not acted on by the Standing Rules and Bylaws Committee:

PROPOSED AMMENDMENTS TO CURRENT STANDING RULE #39. Policy on Communication of Official Positions to Government Agencies **TRACKED BELOW:**

- a. Definition of “Official Position: Any advisory opinion, guidance, or recommendation arising out of an Advisory Committee meeting or otherwise requires adopted by a majority of the SLNC Governing Board to shall be considered an “Official Position” of the Council. No opinion, guidance, or recommendation offered to any governmental agency, body or official by a Governing Board member shall indicate that it is the Council’s Official Position unless it has been adopted by a majority vote of the Governing Board.
- b. Governing Board members and ALL A advisory Ccommittee co-chairs seeking adoption of an Official Position by the Governing Board are required to submit the motion in the form of a completed draft letter, stating the position and supporting arguments and any recommendation(s) for action, to the Governing Board for adoption by majority vote at a Regular or Special meeting of the Governing Board; this action is required prior to any letter or any form of communication submitted to appropriate government agency(ies) or individual(s). Letters shall include the signature(s) and titles(s) of the author(s) followed by the phrase “On Behalf of the Silver Lake Neighborhood Council Governing Board” when submitted by Advisory Committees. Any letter or written correspondence (including, but not limited to electronic communications) if, if adopted by the Board, ~~the letter~~, in full, shall be considered the Official Position of the SLNC and signed and submitted by the Secretary certifying that it represents the Board’s position.
- c. Responsibility of Delivery of Positions to City/State Agencies. Official Positions, as defined above, offered to the City or State shall be delivered by the Advisory Committee or individuals Advisory Committee members working on its behalf. The Secretary of the Governing Board shall be bedeemed authorized to post any letter voted upon, passed, and approved by the Governing Board.

- d. Permission to Draft Summary Statements. All Advisory Committees are authorized to draft and deliver documents detailing Official Positions of the Governing Board to appropriate city/state agency(ies) or individual(s) as necessary. NOTE: Summary Statements of the Silver Lake Neighborhood Council must be adopted as such by majority vote of the Governing Board prior to ANY and ALL communications between Advisory Committee and/or Governing Board to City/State Agencies or like bodies/groups/entities. Such documents may include Community Impact Statements, summary letters, position papers or other documents, recommendations or determinations from Urban Design & Preservation Advisory Committee or any other SLNC Committee (Ad Hoc or Standing) that is advisory to the Governing Board. The Advisory Committee **shall not** deliver a summary of any position unless it has been previously adopted by the Board. Such documents shall be submitted on the SLNC letterhead (except when submitted through an electronic web-form).
- e. Statements Reported to Governing Board. All summary statements/documents/papers drafted, adopted, and delivered to the City/State by the Advisory Committee should be included in the Advisory Committee's subsequent approved minutes to the Governing Board. Should the Board alter or amend the statement(s) or documents(s) as submitted, a revised statements/document shall be submitted in a timely fashion.
- f. Communication of Official Positions in Public Comment. A sitting Governing Board member or Advisory Committee co-chair is encouraged to communicate Official Positions (defined above) of the SLNC in public comment before the relevant city/state agency. Any individual who represents the Official Position of the SLNC before any governmental body is requested to notify the Co-Chairs of the SLNC. (Note: All stakeholders, including Board and committee members, are encouraged to provide their personal views in public comment before City/State agencies but must state for the record he/she is not speaking on behalf of the SLNC unless designated to do so by the Board.)
- g. Executive Committee Oversight of Official Position(s). The Executive Committee shall oversee ANY and ALL communication(s) of SLNC Official Positions, including but not limited to Community Impact Statements, summary letters, position papers or other documents to ensure that any and all Official Positions have been heard and adopted by the Governing Board by majority vote in full view of the public during a duly noticed meeting of the Governing Board (Regular or Special). If Advisory Committee co-chairs, committee members, stakeholders, and/or Board members make representations on behalf of the Silver Lake Neighborhood Council **without** following procedure, as defined above, those parties shall be held accountable in accordance with the SLNC Bylaws (including but not limited to Section(s) 8 & 9; Article XIV). Any action taken by the Executive Committee to hold Advisory Committee co-chairs and/or Board Members accountable will be taken in accordance with DONE and the City Attorney, and SLNC Bylaws (Section 8 & 9) [NOTE: SLNC Bylaws will be applied to Advisory Committee co- chairs that have been appointed into such roles and not limited to Governing Board Members e.g. elected members]; formal action may rise to the level of removal of Advisory or Ad Hoc Committee co-chair(s) from respective roles, such action would require an agendaized motion and majority vote of the Governing Board and must comply with SLNC Bylaws.

- Nora Motions, Sarah Seconds.

Public Comment:

- **Nicholas Robbins:** This was a lot to take in, so I think we should do what Anthony did for the last big item, wherein people can have an extra 30 second round if discussion is still ongoing.
- **Debbie Slater:** I have some editorial comments. The dialog in one of the paragraphs should be changed to majority vote. In section B you don't need to reference Urban Design specifically, and finally in section G I think you will have to remove this section from consideration at this time because you have reference an incorrect bylaw. The sections you are referencing is article V not article XIV and because you have posted incorrect information you cannot keep this as part of the agenda.
 - **Anthony Crump:** Because this is a typographical error we can proceed.
 - **Debbie:** Then if you choose to proceed I have some other notes, including needing a two thirds vote, updating the articles this references, and more.

Board Comment:

- **Sarah Ullman:** I would like to speak in hardy support of this amendment to our standing rules. We saw over the Summer that a committee co-chair used his position to make a letter that was inappropriate and to outline some consequences for people that do use their positions inappropriately to progress any agenda they might have. I just think corruption is an issue in all of government and we should root it out when we see it, so I support this heartily.
- **Barbara Ringuette:** I have a general and a specific comment. I find this quite complex despite me being used to government speak. Is there anyone who's going to create an advice board for advice on how to follow all these rules? I'm puzzled. And specifically, on section D, I'm wondering if this board considered the statements presented by the Urban Design Committee regarding timing and requests for a continuance and things like that. Joe can explain that and I'd like him to.
- **Nora Goudsmit:** I just wanted to respond to a comment made about a comment being incorrect in section G. Article XIV is in compliance, it's just a different section of the bylaws. As far as the complexity, most of what is written is already in the bylaws, notwithstanding Section G which adds oversight for the standing committee.
- **Tina Lin:** I just want to let the other councilmembers here know that this is as critiical if not moreso as Section 33. We received many emails about this, and I do want to say that I believe that the letter sent to planning by the UDP co-chairs did not state SNLCE's position, and I don't think they were acting maliciously and there was no corruption. The process in the city is already long to develop and get things approved for both developers and homeowners and UDP is responding to these in a timely manner.
- **Seth Copenhaver:** In my last comment I had times where I was critical of UDP and this is one of them. They should not be sending letters without sending them through the governing board first. No committee should be sending any letters regarding anything without going through the governing board.
- **Anthony Crump:** This is an important change that'll just clarify and reduce the ambiguity that's occurred in the past. I think we could just change the language to "terminations from any select neighborhood council committee" and I'd be grateful to make that change after any public comment.
- **Nicholas Robbins:** The key words in Section G are "to ensure that any and all official positions have been heard and adopted by a governing board in a vote" so there's no iron fist coming down, it's just to ensure that all positions have been heard. When it talks about formal action may rise, it's important to note that no rule is worth the paper it's written on if there's no consequences. Lastly, to point out a governing board member who is an elected member as opposed to a committee which is working on the public's behalf but was not elected by them to do so.

- **Debbie Slater:** So again, back to Section G, you do need to include article V sections 8 and 9 because compliance doesn't have sections 8 or 9. And it's referenced twice in there. If a layman is looking for that and they try to dig it out of the bylaws they're not going to be able to find it. And Barbara the oversight on this would probably fall on the government affairs committee.
- **Barbara Ringuette:** Because Debbie has asked for a form letter to request for additional time, I think that matter should be discussed with the board and UDP along with the other section that was discussed during this meeting.
- **Lena Najarian:** I just wanted to say that that form letter was approved for UDP at the last governing board meeting, so I'm not sure where the gap in info is there but it was approved.
- **Nicholas Robbins:** We also discussed how the letter asked for more time so they could make a determination, it was past giving people a lot of confidence because it was asking about more time and not putting forward an official position.
- **Anthony Crump:** I have a proposed amendment. I would move to amend it so that in section D instead of saying "such documents may include impact statements" to remove the "From Urban Design Committee or" section.
 - **Barbara seconds.**

Public Comment on the Amendment:

- **Debbie Slater:** So you're not going to make changes to Section B regarding Article XIV vs Article V?
- **Anthony Crump:** We can include that as an amendment as well. For the board to adopt anything, it has to be by majority vote. My understanding with Section G is that it's not necessary.
- **Debbie Slater:** That language refers to Section V.
- **Nora Goudsmit:** I think she just means that we need to cite where the Sections come from in the amendment.
- **Anthony Crump:** I'd be happy to include that. In section G, we can add Article V, Section 8 and 9 to the language. The amendments proposed are in Section B, where it reads "When submitted by advisory committees... if adopted by the board, removing in full, the board shall be in considered the official position of the Silverlake Council." In section D removing the words "Urban Design committee or" and Section G where it makes reference to Sections 8 and 9 adding "Article V Sections 8 and 9" in both places.
- **Barbara Ringuette:** Barbara seconds the motion.
 - **Public Comment:** No comments.
 - **Board Comment:** No comments.
 - **Nicholas Robbins - Yes**
 - **Anthony Crump - Yes**
 - **Nora Goudsmit - Yes**
 - **Maebe A. Girl - Yes**
 - **Tina Lin - Yes**
 - **Sarah Ullman - Yes**
 - **Ilanthe Zevos - Yes**
 - **Barbara Ringuette - Yes**
 - **Seth Copenhaver - Yes**
 - **Imran Syed - Yes**
 - **Ben Cassorla - Yes**
 - **Jeremy Black - Yes**
 - **Lena Najarian Kaderali - Yes**
 - 13 Yes, 0 No, 0 Present, Not Voting
- **Debbie:** I just want to take a moment to thank Chase. We also weren't able to thank him for the joint committee meeting but thank you for the notes you took.

- **Chase Newman:**
 - The Vote:
 - **Nicholas Robbins - Yes**
 - **Anthony Crump - Yes**
 - **Nora Goudsmit - Yes**
 - **Maebe A. Girl - Yes**
 - **Tina Lin - No**
 - **Sarah Ullman - Yes**
 - **Ianthe Zevos - Yes**
 - **Barbara Ringuette - Yes**
 - **Seth Copenhaver - Yes**
 - **Imran Syed - Yes**
 - **Ben Cassorla - Yes**
 - **Jeremy Black - Yes**
 - **Lena Najarian Kaderali - Yes**
 - 12 Yes, 1 No, 0 Present, Not Voting
- **Anthony Crump:** Since we're coming up on time, can we take on item J?
- **Nicholas Robbins:** I think extending this meeting would be a mistake but if you'd like to we can extend it, I can't stop you.
- **Nicholas:** We could extend just for item J.
- **Nora Goudsmit: I would like to motion to complete Item J.**
 - **Seconded by Barbara**
 - **Nicholas Robbins - N**
 - **Anthony Crump - Yes**
 - **Nora Goudsmit - Yes**
 - **Maebe A. Girl - Yes**
 - **Tina Lin - No**
 - **Sarah Ullman - Yes**
 - **Ianthe Zevos - Yes**
 - **Barbara Ringuette - Yes**
 - **Seth Copenhaver - Yes**
 - **Imran Syed - Yes**
 - **Ben Cassorla - Yes**
 - **Jeremy Black - Yes**
 - **Lena Najarian Kaderali - Yes**

11 Yes, 2 No, 0 Present Not Voting

- h. **(Co-Chair/Goudsmit)** Motion to amend SLNC Standing Rule #42 as described below.
This item was not acted on by the Standing Rules and Bylaws Committee.

CURRENT STANDING RULE #42 Posting of Agendas and Minutes

In addition, any Advisory Committee holding co-chair elections must list "and Co- Chair Elections" along with the date of the meeting and name of the advisory committee, in the email subject line: "[Advisory] Committee, [Month, Day, Year] & Committee Co-Chair Elections will be held".

PROPOSED ADDITION TO STANDING RULE #42: "ENS communications shall reflect in the subject/title line of the ENS email and body/content of the email that **Co-Chair Elections will be held**, this notice will accompany the name of the Committee [e.g. SUBJECT/TITLE LINE: XX/XX/20XX 07:00PM – Silver Lake NC Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee meeting **Co-

Chair Elections will be held**]. The SLNC Website will also indicate on calendar page(s) that respective ** Co-Chair Elections will be held**. These notification measure shall be undertaken by current Committee co-chairs when submitting Agendas for public noticing procedure and are intended to provide information to the public along with the date/time/location of the Committee meeting.

Further, to properly notice the public of items for consideration on SLNC Agendas: any and all SLNC Agendas (Governing Board and Committees) are required to include supplementary information to support agenda items. Supplementary information shall be labeled, where applicable, to match the agenda item being considered and agenda items shall reflect the intent of the motion as related to the supplementary information and documentation provided. Documentation for any and all Agendas, including documentation provided to the Governing Board Co- Chairs, Committee co-chairs, members of SLNC committees and/or Governing Board shall be provided to the public on the posted agenda.

- i. **(Co-Chair/Goudsmit)** Motion to amend SLNC Standing Rule #44 as described below. This item was not acted on by the Standing Rules and Bylaws Committee.

CURRENT STANDING RULE #44. Advisory Committee Co-Chairs

Advisory Committee co-chairs must complete the ethics and funding training and sign the Code of Civility. Failure to abide by all of these requirements will invalidate any action taken at any Advisory Committee meeting.

PROPOSED ADDITION TO STANDING RULE #44: Advisory Committees are defined as being Advisory (e.g. recommendation giving; nonactionable), including both Standing and Ad Hoc Committees, to the SLNC Governing Board. Recommendations are to aid Governing Board members, who are solely empowered as members of an elected body, to take action upon agendized items (e.g. motions for consideration) via majority vote that come before the Board at Regular and/or Special Meetings of the SLNC Governing Board.

Advisory Committees are considered to be part of the SLNC, including Advisory Committee co-chairs who are either seated Governing Board members OR stakeholders who are NOT currently sitting on the SLNC Governing Board.

Accordingly, Advisory Committee co-chairs shall follow the SLNC Bylaws and Standing Rules in their entirety as written.

The roles and responsibilities of Advisory Committee co-chairs shall be in accordance with SLNC Bylaws: Article XIV Compliance: The SLNC [including Advisory Committee co-chairs] and its Governing Board will comply with all DONE guidelines, and with all local, state, and federal laws, including but not limited to the Ralph W. Brown Act regarding Open Meeting Forum Laws, all applicable Conflict of Interest Laws, the Political Reform Act, and all applicable regulations including the City of Los Angeles Governmental Ethics Ordinance. In the event of a conflict with these Bylaws, Los Angeles City Charter, Los Angeles City Code, and DONE regulations supersede SLNC bylaws.

NOTE: Stakeholders serving on the Urban Design & Preservation Committee shall complete the Project Planning 101 training that is required of all serving on Neighborhood Council Planning and Land Use Committee per the Leadership Orientation Policy. Completion of required training(s) for SLNC Standing Committees shall be monitored and maintained by Committee co-chairs.

- j. **(Co-Chair/Goudsmit)** Motion to amend SLNC Standing Rule #47 as described below. This item was not acted on by the Standing Rules and Bylaws Committee.

PROPOSED AMMENDMENTS TO CURRENT STANDING RULE #47. Silver Lake Reservoir Committee. TRACKED BELOW

~~The~~ SLNC Region(s): 1, 6, or 7 Board Representatives may serve as one (1) of two (2) co-chairs of the Silver Lake Reservoir Advisory Committee. If one (1) a Region: 1, 6, or 7 Board ~~member~~member is unable to serve, the Board will ~~appoint an~~appoint one (1) At-Large Board Representative(s) to serve as co-chair until no longer needed.

Motioned by Nora Goudsmit, Seconded by Sarah Ullman.

Public Comment:

- **Debbie Slater:** Having such restrictive rules for this committee, I wanted there to be more fair rules to being a part of this. As it stands, this could be a deterrent.

Board Comment:

- **Sarah Ullman:** I am in support of this but would the motion maker be open to a friendly amendment to make it any board member. I don't think that regions 1, 6 and 7 have some sort of undue ownership over the reservoir over another member, since it's a public space, and we should edit the motion to read any member.
- **Nicholas Robbins:** It sounds like what Debbie wants to do is similar to what you mentioned, so I'm going to go with Debbie on this since I'm assuming you've craced through the language.
- **Debbie Slater:** Because of how it was on the agenda we kept her name in place, but I'd be in support as long as Nora is in agreement as the other co-chair.
- **Nicholas Robbins:** Can you articulate the amendment as you wish it to be, Sarah?
- **Sarah Ullman:** I think it shouldn't specify regions 1, 6 or 7, but rather that one of the positions is open to a board member, and for the other, we should say that the second co-chair position is open to a co-chair or a stakeholder.
- **Nicholas Robbins:** So any member can serve as a co-chair on the committee? Any board member may serve as a co-chair on this committee. The remaining co-chair position may be filled by either a board member or stakeholder.
- **Nora Goudsmit:** I think it should say open to board members or stakeholders.
- **Nicholas Robbins:** The other co-chair position is open to a board member or stakeholder.
 - **Any board representative may serve as one of two co-chairs of the reservoir committee. Period. The other co-chair position is open to a board member or stakeholder.**
- **Sarah Ullman:** Are we assuming the co-chairs are elected at a reservoir meeting?
- **Debbie Slater:** I believe it's implied.
- **Anthony Crump:** The Silverlake Reservoir Committee is a bit special since it's been founded but in the end it'd be like electing any other committee.
 - **Vote On This Motion**

- **Nicholas Robbins - Yes**
- **Anthony Crump - Yes**
- **Nora Goudsmit - Yes**
- **Maebe A. Girl - Yes**
- **Tina Lin - Yes**
- **Sarah Ullman - Yes**
- **Ianthe Zevos - Yes**
- **Barbara Ringuette - Yes**
- **Samantha Danner**
- **Seth Copenhaver - Yes**
- **Imran Syed - Yes**
- **Ben Cassorla - Yes**
- **Jeremy Black - Yes**
- **Lena Najarian Kaderali - Yes**
 - **13 Yes, 0 No, 0 Present Not Voting**

8) Future Agenda Items

9) Adjournment* 10:08 p.m.