



NORTH HILLS WEST NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
General Board Meeting Minutes Thursday, November 16, 2017
New Horizons, 15725 Parthenia St., North Hills CA 91343

NHWNC (and all other) Meeting Minutes are a summary; Minutes were not, are not and are never meant to be an exact, verbatim, word-for-word transcript or comprehensive record of what was said at a Meeting. Exceptions: Motion(s) (included as stated at the Meeting, or, if not stated, as written on the Agenda); quotes (words that have quotation marks ("") at the beginning and ending of a word or words); and Agenda wording copied into the Minutes.

1. Welcome and Pledge of Allegiance.

President Dan Gibson called the Meeting to order at 7:08 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was said.

2. Roll Call and announcement of Quorum and Voting Eligibility.

Roll Call was taken by the Secretary. Ten of the 11 Board Members were present at the Roll Call: Dan Gibson (President), Jay Beeber (Vice-President), Dave Brown (Secretary), Madlena Minasian (Treasurer), Garry Fordyce, Punam Gohel, Carol Hart, David Hyman, Sam Kwasman and Kreshell Ramey. Maggie Elliott was absent. The NHWNC quorum (the minimum number of Board Members needing to be present to take binding votes on Agendized Items) is seven (see the Bylaws at <https://lacity.quickbase.com/db/bj3apxsp3?a=q&qid=32&qskip=0&qrppg=1000&dlt=su46~>), so the Board could take such votes. Quorum was announced. Mr. Brown reported that all Board Members were eligible to vote. Eleven of the 13 Board Seats were filled (by election or appointment). Two Board Seats were vacant (both Residential); to apply, email Secretary@nhwnc.net. Also attended: approximately 35 Stakeholders and guests.

3. Announcements and Comments – President.

Mr. Gibson encouraged attending Civic University 2.0 seminars on Mondays from mid-January through the 1st two Mondays in February from 6:00-9:00 p.m. at City Hall Council Chambers, and applying for a vacant Residential Board Seat.

4. Discussion and possible action to approve the October 19, 2017 General Board Meeting Minutes.

MOTION (by Mr. Gibson, seconded by Mr. Kwasman): The North Hills West Neighborhood Council approves the Minutes of its October 19, 2017 General Board Meeting with amendments.

The following amendments were requested by Mr. Fordyce on page six, Item #18. g.: "Monroe High School Homecoming Court; "it was very successful" and he presented

to Court members” was amended to “Monroe High School Homecoming Parade; “it was very successful” and he presented certificates to Court members.”

MOTION PASSED; zero opposed; one abstained (the NHWNC does not count abstentions as votes) (Minasian).

5. Public Agency Speakers and Announcements.

Matt Hernandez, Public Safety Deputy for L.A. City District 12 Councilman Mitch Englander (818-882-1212; Matt.Hernandez@LACity.org; <http://CD12.LACity.org>), replacing Erich King, described recent legislation. [*This Agenda Item was continued after Item #7.*] Jose Galdamez, Neighborhood Empowerment Analyst, L.A. Dept. of Neighborhood Empowerment (DONE; 818-374-9895; Jose.Galdamez@LACity.org; www.EmpowerLA.org), replacing Gibson Nyambura, reported on DONE activities and deadlines. He reported that the City Council revised the meanings of the words “substantial” and “ongoing interest” in the Stakeholder definition. DONE is working on the funding equity issue of how much funding is allocated to each Neighborhood Council in relation to each Council’s population.

6. General Public Comment

Naveen Bhardwa, 7-Eleven Franchisee, would like to present to the Planning and Land Use Committee (PLUC); Mr. Beeber invited him and explained the process. Stakeholder Anita Goldbaum announced that the Mid-Valley Regional Library will be closed from December 5th-8th. Kevin Osborne, brewery owner, will present to the PLUC. Stakeholder Mikkie Loi, Community Relations volunteer, LAPD Devonshire Division (http://www.LAPDOnline.org/devonshire_community_police_station), announced a November 30th, 6:00-8:00 a.m. Coffee with the Captain at the Chatsworth Train Station. A CERT [Community Emergency Response Team; 818-756-9674; www.cert-la.com; lafdcert@LACity.org] class will start January 10th at 6:00 p.m. and be held for seven Wednesdays at Our Community School [10045 Jumilla Ave., Chatsworth]. Stakeholder Chris Carle reported that homeless people are “still using our backyards as bathrooms” and doing “drug deals”; again he requested City action. Joe Benitez, Haskell Ave. resident, was concerned about traffic affecting mail and trash pickups, and that “you can’t see the cars as you’re pulling out” of residential driveways. Victor LaFontaine was concerned about speeding drivers and lack of street sweeping; he long ago requested action but has not seen any.

7. Presentation from Leah Garland of Stand LA - a coalition of many community groups in LA concerned with the lack of zoning laws regarding urban oil drilling in LA and sensitive areas. For further information see: <http://www.stand.la>.

[*This Agenda Item was addressed after Item #8.*] Copies were distributed of Stand-L.A. information and a proposed Resolution. Ethan Senser presented for Ms. Garland. He said there are “currently no regulations” and explained that the coalition wants the City to establish a “health and safety zone buffer of 2,500 feet” between residential areas and oil and gas drilling. He believed that such a zone could reduce negative health experiences of residents living near wells. Mr. Senser reported that

the coalition is “looking for the support of all [Neighborhood] Councils” and the City Council just voted to support such a buffer. SoCal Gas Co. and other oil and gas organizations oppose this.

8. **Discussion and possible action** to ratify the President’s recommended Chair and Member appointments and changes to Standing and Ad Hoc committees.

MOTION (by Mr. Gibson, seconded by Mr. Beeber): The North Hills West Neighborhood Council will change the name of its Ad Hoc Aqueduct Ave. Committee to the Ad Hoc Aqueduct / Haskell Ave. Committee.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Gibson urged Stakeholders to work with the Committee. Mr. Beeber explained that Neighborhood Council Board Members are liaisons to the City; Stakeholder help is needed.

MOTION PASSED; zero opposed; zero abstained.

9. **Homelessness Liaison Report** – Kreshell Ramey

Ms. Ramey wanted the President to consider combining this Committee with the Outreach Committee. The November 6th Homelessness Alliance meeting discussed winter shelter information, which is available at Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA; 213-225-6562; www.facebook.com/lahsa.org).

10. **Report from Budget Advocates.**

Brian Allen, a Budget Advocate [<http://ncbala.com>], reported that they are working with the City regarding the budget and encouraged feedback. He said that there are an estimated 60,000 homeless people living in the City and that we need “to stop it, not just house them.”

11. **Discussion and possible action** to approve the NHWNC October 2017 Monthly Expense Report.

Copies were distributed of the “Monthly Expenditure Report” for October 2017.

FUNDING MOTION (by Mr. Gibson, seconded by Ms. Hart): The North Hills West Neighborhood Council approves its Monthly Expenditure Report for October 2017.

FUNDING MOTION PASSED unanimously by a roll call vote of the ten eligible voters present with all ten in favor (“Yes” or “Aye”) (Beeber, Brown, Fordyce, Gibson, Gohel, Hart, Hyman, Kwasman, Minasian and Ramey); zero opposed; zero abstained.

12. **Discussion and possible action** [see the below Motion].

FUNDING MOTION (by Mr. Gibson, seconded by Mr. Gohel): The North Hills West Neighborhood Council allocates up to \$1,000.00 for the annual NHWNC Holiday party to be held in conjunction with the regularly scheduled Board meeting of 12/21/17. Expenditure to include food, refreshments, paper goods, and incidentals.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Kwasman reported that, last year, \$200 was spent. Volunteers are needed.

MOTION to CALL FOR THE QUESTION (by Mr. Gibson); no opposition.

FUNDING MOTION PASSED unanimously by a roll call vote of the ten eligible voters present with all ten in favor (“Yes” or “Aye”) (Beeber, Brown, Fordyce, Gibson, Gohel, Hart, Hyman, Kwasman, Minasian and Ramey); zero opposed; zero abstained.

13. Discussion and possible action to [see the below Motion].

MOTION (by Mr. Gibson, seconded by Mr. Beeber): The North Hills West Neighborhood Council approves sending a letter to Councilmember Englander regarding the board's disappointment that the Councilmember failed to inform the Board on his position regarding the 15-bed Congregate Living Health Facility at 16052 Chase Street prior to the public hearing on October 17th.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Goldbaum stated that “I am very much in favor of you sending a letter and it’s a very kind letter . . . he really needs to know. Councilmember Englander sent a representative to the November 17 Hearing meeting with a letter with glowing praise of their [the Facility company’s] work. We were never questioning the work that they did; what we were all questioning was the size of the facility and the 300% increase in patients in a residential community. He never once ever addressed that issue; he only talked about the services that they provide, but never addressed our concerns. The [Planning Commission] Hearing was today.”

Mr. Beeber explained, saying “This issue had come before the Board a number of times. The Board had taken a position asking to limit the number of beds to their [the Facility company’s] by right number of six beds. They were originally requesting 18 beds and then they reluctantly reduced that to fifteen. We had been in communication with Councilmember Englander’s office and his Planning Deputy on a number of occasions . . . we were told that the Councilmember was taking everything under consideration and that he had not come up with any sort of decision, and then on the date of the Hearing itself what occurred was he sent a representative to support the applicant’s request for 15 beds. This was an issue that obviously the neighborhood and the Neighborhood Council cared about and we spent many, many hours on. I think sending a letter, letting him know that this is not a question of whether we agree or disagree with his decision, but in terms of his engagement with the Neighborhood Council and I think is the issue here . . . we have a role in advising the Elected Officials as to what the Community is interested in, what the Community wants, and what the Board’s considered decision is on some of these matters . . . I think we should let him know that respectfully. That is what this letter does.”

Mr. Fordyce stated that “it has been my observation that whatever is asked usually gets the same answer: ‘I haven’t decided yet.’ There’s nothing different now than

there has ever been in the past; maybe rarely he may have let the cat out of the bag, but generally he doesn't. This is suicidal. We're going to chastise our Councilmember? We're going to chastise him and bully him, and burn our bridges, and to what avail? It is my understanding he actually visited one of those sites and was extremely impressed and wished that his own sister had had such a facility . . . But he is not subject to our whims; he is subject to an entire CD12 District, not just doing what North Hills West bullies him into. Why does he have to succumb to whatever we say goes? He didn't, he has no obligation to respond, for whatever reason."

Stakeholder Jim Cockerell stated in response to Mr. Fordyce's comments that "The very first meeting that they had at the Van Nuys Courthouse . . . we were submitting our complaints about this project . . . Garry voted against the Council, he voted in favor of this [the Congregate Living Health Facility] project, so I don't think his comment should represent the Board here at any time on this project."

MOTION to CALL FOR THE QUESTION (by Mr. Gibson); no opposition.

MOTION PASSED; one opposed (Fordyce); zero abstained.

- 14. Discussion regarding board member conduct and responsibilities** during board meetings and outside of board meetings in response to an email dated 10/18/17 from stakeholder letter Debra Francisco.

Mr. Gibson described the issue. Stakeholder and former Board Member Ms. Francisco was concerned that no Board Member attended the Hearing regarding the proposed Congregate Living Health Facility at 16052 Chase St. Mr. Gibson replied, "So the Officer may not have understood that we had had multiple Committee meetings and multiple Board meetings on that." Ms. Francisco responded, "Exactly, that could definitely be the case as well and you know he may have everything in the file but he may not read that and if you are there saying, 'you know, we've had four meetings on this, we've voted to not support it at every single one,' maybe that would have had some impact."

Mr. Gibson noted, "just as a reminder, this discussion is in order to make sure we address your concerns as Stakeholder, that we are a Board that does so in an effort to be always more functioning and functional, and that's what this discussion is about. There's a second half, though, to your email; while we did not have a Board Member that was appointed to be there, we did have a Board Member there, Mr. Fordyce." Ms. Francisco replied, "Yes . . . he proceeded to conduct himself, in bashing the North Hills West Neighborhood Council, in stating that you as a Council did not provide certain documentation and certain information and make it available to everyone including him . . . he proceeded to go on and continue to bash the Council and then his comment was that 'you all held secret meetings and that any vote that you have taken has been tainted' . . . There should be no bashing the North Hills West Neighborhood Council stating that your vote is 'tainted.' Indirectly, that comment could be taken by the Hearing Officer and say, 'well geeze, did they

vote? Was it tainted? Did you all have serial secret meetings?' When you put that out there, you put that into his head that that could be what you all have done. So, by doing that, I think that that could be, could have been detrimental. I don't think any Board Member, if you're up speaking as an individual . . . you do not bash your Council. You do not say that your Council has had secret meetings and your vote is 'tainted.' That can be extremely problematic when you're up and you're presenting . . . when you come up and you start to say something like that you sound like you're speaking on behalf of the Council and, anyways, Mr. Peshaway [the Hearing Officer] stopped it after we said 'this has got to stop.' He [Mr. Peshaway] finally put an end to that and then he [Mr. Fordyce] finished up his statement. That wasn't a proper thing to do, it was an inappropriate place to do it and it could've caused a lot of problems." Ms. Goldbaum stated that "I agree with Deb."

Glenn Bailey, "speaking as an individual" who "wasn't at the Hearing," said that the Hearing "is not the proper forum" for Mr. Fordyce's comments about the Board. Mr. Bailey recommended that such things be voiced at BONC meetings [L.A. Board of Neighborhood Commissioners; Commissioners@EmpowerLA.org; www.EmpowerLA.org]. He believed that Stakeholders' and Board Members' concerns about Mr. Fordyce's comments "should be brought to the City Attorney." Mr. Allen said that "decorum may be limited in terms of Code of Conduct . . . What I see is a request to demand loyalty . . . this is more of a question of loyalty than a question of duty."

Mr. Beeber stated that "the comments that were made at [the] Hearing . . . are very very serious charges . . . there were no secret meetings. At least one Board Member went and met with the applicant outside of our Committee meetings and outside of our Board meetings . . . I don't know . . . whether that's any sort of violation . . . We were invited to do so and we declined to do so because we did not want to have secret meetings and we do not want to be accused of meeting backdoor with applicants . . . Everything that we met about and discussed was done in an open forum, either in a Committee meeting or at a full Board meeting . . . I don't know specifically what supposedly was withheld, but I do know that there was a Board Member who sent information around to the Neighborhood Council Members and, apparently according to the City Attorney or the Department, I'm not sure who, felt that that Board Member violated the Brown Act. In doing so, he attempted to have a serial meeting with the Neighborhood Council Members to garner support for this project and that Board Member . . . had to recuse himself at one of the times that Board Member was here when that issue came before the Board . . . that Board Member is the same Board Member who is accusing the Board of doing things that are in violation of the Brown Act and accusing members of the Board of doing those sorts of things . . . we, because we didn't want to take just one person's word for what occurred at this Hearing, we did communicate with the Hearing Officer and asked them to confirm this information and for the most part they confirmed this information, that these things were stated and were said . . . There is no requirement here for loyalty to the Board and to the Board's position . . . I don't believe that these statements are truthful. I don't believe also that the Hearing was the right place to do that . . . taking a public stance and saying . . . that

this thing happened . . . and another thing happened can constitute slander and you're accusing people of breaking the law . . . I take it very seriously when myself or Members of the Board are accused of breaking the law. I don't think . . . it's appropriate and it may be actionable on some level when someone goes in public and makes a public statement that certain Members broke the law, broke the rules and [says] that what they did shouldn't count . . . accusing people of wrongdoing . . . in a public forum I don't think is appropriate . . . I was certainly the Chair of the Committee that held these [meetings] and I was the person who conducted the discussion here before the Board and so, by extension, these comments do fall on me to some extent and I think they're highly inappropriate . . . these things should be addressed . . . I feel that these are not true statements and I feel that it is inappropriate to go in public and make statements of accusations against people that are not true."

Mr. Gohel said "it's good idea to bring this issue to City Attorney . . . I haven't done anything wrong. I haven't done what he has accused me of doing and I think he is violating my rights."

Ms. Hart said "my biggest concern is for the Stakeholders who live in that neighborhood. They made their opinions very clear to us . . . we have to take into account that it's their neighborhood and they live there . . . if we're negating the zoning in a residential neighborhood that's really a very serious decision to make and it cannot be entered into lightly . . . I would ask for the City Attorney's advice on this and I would also attest to the fact that there were no secret meetings of which I am aware. We heard this over and over and over again here. We debated it at length and we decided that we have to vote in best interests of the people most closely affected by this development."

Mr. Brown noted that "the only 'no' vote at the Hearing came from this Neighborhood Council and that particular vote of 'no' was tainted by a Board Member who was present, representing himself as an individual. I think [it] is nothing short of a stab in the back to the Board . . . Obviously we will take it to the City Attorney, but this has been a chronic, ongoing, repeated thing."

Mr. Gibson said that "the Hearings that we held . . . were very thorough. They were just . . . representative . . . open and transparent. The representative actually came and thanked me for the way that the meetings were handled . . . I felt good about the process. This was news to me, the secret meetings, some of these accusations that are made and I agree, it seems to be a direct attack upon the Board and to be a functioning Board that's not healthy . . . there's no code of loyalty here, not at all . . . We were invited, by the people with the Congregate Living House to come to an Open House and see what was going on there. I consulted with the City Attorney; they recommended against it. I actually had an Attorney General's opinion that spoke pretty specifically to that. So it was not like that we're even negligent, even just absent minded walking into secret, there were no secret meetings. We worked very hard for nothing to be tainted and for those accusations to be made in that public forum I think is very serious . . . [lacking] common decency with a Board that's

trying to work together. I think it's completely wrong and uncalled for . . . it's just not healthy for us as a Board as we work to represent our Stakeholders.

Ms. Hart had "concerns about the Stakeholders' will being circumvented, but I'm also very deeply concerned because I would not consider this, as previously characterized, as 'a breach of decorum'; [it] could be considered, depending on what the City Attorney has to say, as a violation of Ethics. I just don't think it's a good idea to ever behave in this manner . . . I would ask that we pursue further answers from those who are experts.

Mr. Gibson noted that "this is not a particular attack upon one Board Member. This is an instance that needs to be addressed no matter whose name is involved." He will refer the matter to the NHWNC Executive Committee.

Mr. Beeber added that "for those members of the public that are here, maybe hearing about this sort of thing for the first time, I will assure you . . . everybody on this Board conducts themselves with, for the most part, with the utmost ethics and we endeavor to do everything by the book . . . these types of things that are being alleged are simply not accurate and not true . . . this is an isolated incident with one particular Board Member making these accusations. There are no overall accusations against this Board regarding our ethics or our openness or our willingness to hear things and conduct ourselves with the utmost in decorum and also ethics."

15. Discussion and possible action regarding paid security at all North Hills West meetings.

Stakeholders expressed concern regarding walking to and from these meetings through the relatively dark parking lot. Mr. Gibson noted that while there have been no specific threats there have been some comments over a period of time. Mr. Brown noted that paid security probably would cost around \$30 per hour per guard; a volunteer might be found. Mr. Bailey recommended talking with the Senior Lead Officer. Mr. Gibson referred this to the Public Safety Committee.

16. Discussion and possible action to [see the below Motion]. For further information see: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=14-0655-S5>.

Ms. Hart explained the issue.

MOTION (by Mr. Gibson, seconded by Mr. Gohel): The North Hills West Neighborhood Council will submit a Community Impact Statement regarding Council File 14-0655-S5, the LA City Council's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the County of Los Angeles (County) and the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) to establish roles and align resources needed to develop permanent supportive housing.

Board Member Kreshell Ramey left at this time (9:35), making nine Board Members present (the NHWNC quorum is seven).

DISCUSSION: Ms. Hart stated that “It has passed the City Council; in fact, Mayor Garcetti has signed off on it already, so it’s going to happen . . . this is an important first step in establishing this MOU [Memorandum of Understanding] with the City of Los Angeles Housing in order to properly oversee the expenditure of those monies to establish housing for the homeless . . . what they’re doing by setting up a partnership with multiple agencies is they’re finding what’s already out there that doesn’t need to be built . . . they have to have oversight . . . they’ve already signed it into law. It’s an easy CIS to render . . . I believe their plan is to coordinate what they’re all already attempting to do in an effort to be more efficient, and get people into homes; especially with the winter coming they have to start acting quickly. This MOU simply creates the conduit thru which things can happen because referrals can be made. Monies can be allocated and spent properly with proper oversight. Experts already exist in the City; we don’t have to create new departments. We already have County and City departments that are equipped to deal with this since this has already been signed and approved into law; it would be good . . . to say ‘thank you for doing something to begin addressing this homeless crisis in LA.’” She noted that the entire printed text of the MOU was present and available for referral.

Mr. Fordyce stated that “I . . . am questioning this thing about roles and aligned resources. Whose resources and how big is that planned check? We have no details, we have no documentation; there’s such a lack of information here. I have attended the Homeless Liaison meetings with Kreshell; I’m totally in support of doing something, but there’s no information and this is not the way to conduct business.” Ms. Hart reported that “this recommendation came through the homeless liaisons throughout the City of L.A.; it was their recommendation to issue Community Impact Statements giving our approval of some action being taken, so this has been fully considered . . . and they thoroughly endorse this Motion . . . it’s already been approved and signed into law, so it’s just a matter of us saying thank you for doing something.” Mr. Gibson said that “Yes, I agree; the idea is that the homeless is a huge issue. It takes everyone and I would like to applaud the County and the City working together.”

MOTION to CALL FOR THE QUESTION (by Mr. Beeber); Mr. Fordyce objected to ending the debate over the source of funding, asking “Is this HHH? Is this H? Is this the Linkage Fee or is this a new fee that we’ve yet have not heard from?” Mr. Beeber requested, “there’s a Motion on the table, call the question please.” Mr. Fordyce replied, “I know, you control everything by jumping into it and you speak multiple times.” Ms. Hart replied “Garry, it’s [Measure] HHH, if you read it, it’s HHH.”

MOTION PASSED; one opposed (Fordyce); zero abstained.

Ms. Hart will write the Community Impact Statement.

17. **Discussion and possible action** to [see the below Motion]. The Los Angeles Housing + Community Investment Department (HCIDLA) proposes to launch a new, creative and collaborative program to preserve and stabilize the city of Los

Angeles' (LA) affordable housing stock. A significant amount of affordable housing in the city operates without subsidy and is referred to as Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (NOAH). NOAH multifamily rental properties provide housing at rates affordable to low-and moderate-income households. However, many suffer from poor maintenance and negligent management, making them unappealing, unfit and unsafe for occupancy. The NOAH loan program has been developed to provide mission-driven affordable housing providers financing tools to acquire, rehabilitate and maintain smaller multifamily properties as affordable housing for the long term. For further information see: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=17-1258>.

MOTION (by Mr. Gibson, seconded by Ms. Hart): The North Hills West Neighborhood Council will submit a Community Impact Statement regarding Council File 17-1258, Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (NOAH) Loan Program.

DISCUSSION: there was discussion of the meaning of the Motion and issue. Mr. Fordyce asked "once again, where's the documentation?" Ms. Hart observed that "it's available to anybody."

MOTION PASSED; one opposed (Fordyce); one abstained (the NHWNC does not count abstentions as votes) (Beeber).

Ms. Hart will write the Community Impact Statement.

18. Website Report – Dave Brown

Mr. Brown reported that "the website recently had an upgrade" and that "we surpassed 1,800 people in our" database.

19. Committee Chair Reports

a. Executive -- Dan Gibson

Mr. Gibson reported that the Committee will meet in December.

b. Outreach -- Sam Kwasman

Mr. Kwasman reported that the Committee will meet Nov. 21st at the Library.

c. Beautification -- Carol Hart

Ms. Hart reported that the Committee has been communicating with Council District 12 and working with the Street Services Department regarding hiring the L. A. Conservation Corps [323-224-2550 x301; PCardoso@LACorps.org; www.LACorps.org] to perform work on behalf of the NHWNC.

d. Emergency Prep/PS -- Dave Brown

Mr. Brown reported that there have been many vehicle break-ins and thefts; he urged installing clubs on steering wheels and would like the NHWNC to consider funding this.

e. Planning and Land Use -- Jay Beeber

Mr. Beeber reported that the Committee will meet Tuesday, December 5th at a location to be announced. He encouraged joining the Committee.

f. Rules & Elections -- Punam Gohel

Mr. Gohel reported that the Committee will meet November 22nd and discuss Standing Rules and Bylaws. He encouraged joining the Committee.

g. Education -- Garry Fordyce

Mr. Fordyce reported that he will attend a meeting at Vintage Magnet School.

h. Budget & Finance -- Madlena Minasian

Ms. Minasian urged Board Members to submit all expense invoices and receipts in pdf form and to submit separate event documents as separate files.

20. Board Member Comments

Mr. Gohel will miss the next two Board Meetings. Mr. Beeber encouraged Board Members and others to use Agenda information links to get more information, saying “not everything has to be put in an Agenda.” Ms. Hart noted that 20 Stakeholders at tonight’s Ad Hoc Aqueduct / Haskell Ave. Committee Meeting signed up for more information. She encouraged, for the next Board Meeting, researching Council File #17-1092 regarding public toilets. Mr. Fordyce will attend the Budget Advocates meeting.

21. Requests For Future Agenda Items

Mr. Gibson encouraged emailing future Agenda Item requests.

22. Motion to adjourn

MOTION to ADJOURN (by Mr. Gibson, seconded by Mr. Kwasman).

MOTION to ADJOURN PASSED; zero opposed; zero abstained.

The Meeting was **ADJOURNED** at 10:16 p.m.

The first paragraph of some Items, Motions/Resolutions and other wording may have been copied from the Agenda. Minutes written by DL, possibly edited by NHWNC. The NHWNC Minutes page is <http://www.nhwnc.net/agendas-minutes/minutes-and-agendas>.

North Hills West Neighborhood Council
General Board Meeting
November 16, 2017
Agenda #'s 13 & 14 verbatim discussion included

Agenda item # 13

**Regarding sending a letter to Councilmember Englander
Regarding his support of the Congregate Living Facility on Chase Street
In a letter he had presented to the Zone Commission Hearing**

Stakeholder Public Comments and then Board Member Comments:

Ms. Goldbaum 1:07:23

I would like to say that I am very much in favor of you sending a letter
And it's a very kind letter, I would use some stronger words
I am truly very disappointed in him (Mr. Englander)
Because he never ever in the whole year and a half
That this process was going on
Ever communicated with this Neighborhood Council
He received tons and tons of communication from Stakeholders
And never once addressed the residents, or this Neighborhood Council
I do not think he should get a pass, I think he really needs to know
That it's no way to treat a Community

Mr Englander sent a representative to the Nov 17 Hearing meeting with a letter
With glowing praise of their (Congregate Living Health Facility) work
WE were never questioning the work that they did
What we were All questioning was the size of the facility
And the 300 % increase in patients in a residential Community
He never once ever addressed that issue
He only talked about the services that they provide
But never addressed our concerns

Mr. Beeber 1:05:08

So this issue had come before the Board a number of times
The Board had taken a position asking to limit the number of beds

to their by right number of six beds. They were originally requesting 18, and then they reluctantly reduced that to 15.

We had been in communication with Councilmember Englander's office and his Planning Deputy on a number of occasions.

In discussing the issue we were told that the Councilmember was taking everything under consideration and that he had not come up with any sort of decision
And then on the date of the hearing itself
What occurred was he sent a representative to support the applicants request for 15 beds.

This was an issue that obviously the the neighborhood and the Neighborhood Council cared about and we spent many many hours on.
I think sending a letter, letting him know that this is not a question of wether we agree or disagree with his decision.

But in terms of his engagement with the Neighborhood Council I think is the issue here
We have Elected Officials, and We have a role in advising the Elected Officials as to what the Community is interested in, what the Community wants, and what the Board's considered decision is on some of these matters. If the Elected Official acts in a way in which we feel either slights us or feels that we didn't get the appropriate amount of consideration or response, I think we should let him know that, and I think we should let him know that respectfully. That is what this letter does. So I would ask that the Board approve the sending of the letter on behalf of the Board, not on behalf of any individual, but on behalf of the Board. And let him know we are disappointed in the way that this was handled, that we would like a response from him, and we would hope that things would be handled differently in the future.

Mr Fordyce 1:00:52

Councilmember Englander has been in office for quite a number of years
And it has been my observation that whatever is asked usually gets the same answer:

I haven't decided yet
There's nothing different now than there has ever been in the past
Maybe rarely he may have let the cat out of the bag
But generally he doesn't

This is suicidal, I mean, we're going to chastise our Councilmember ?
And we're going to chastise him, and bully him ?
And burn our bridges, and to what avail ?
It is my understanding he actually visited one of those sites
And was extremely impressed and wished that his own sister had had such a facility

Mr. Gibson :59:59

Right, but it's the process that is the concern here

Mr. Fordyce :59:55

But he is Not subject to our whims
He is subject to an entire CD 12 District
Not just doing what North Hills West bullies him into
I mean. why does he have to succumb to whatever we say goes
I mean, he didn't, he has no obligation to respond
For whatever reason
Maybe he wasn't decided
Maybe he was giving it serious thought
Maybe after considering all the information
But, he is an Elected Official, he's entitled to his opinion
He's entitled to his vote and he did so

Mr. Gibson :59:16

Ok, fair enough, and I would like to know if he takes the Neighborhood Council seriously
We will find that out by the response to the letter, if so approved.

Mr. Cockrell :59:07

In response to Garry's comment there
The very first meeting that they had at the Van Nuys Courthouse
When we all went down there
We were submitting our complaints about this project
Within the 5,000, 1,000 feet, whatever it is to the neighborhood
Garry voted against the Council
He voted in Favor of this project
So I don't think his comment should represent the Board here

At any time on this project.

Call for Vote

Motion passed 9 to 1, (Fordyce opposed)

Agenda item # 14

Discussion regarding Board member conduct and responsibilities during Board meetings and outside of Board meetings, in response to an email dated 10/18/17 from Stakeholder Debra Francisco.

Mr. Gibson :58:05

Next item on our agenda is item # 14

This is a discussion only, there will be no motion or voting

Discussion regarding Board member conduct and responsibilities

During Board meetings and outside of Board meetings

In response to an email dated October 18, 2017

From Stakeholder Debra Francisco

We have Ms. Francisco here with us tonight

She is a previous Board member I believe Secretary at one time

So you're familiar with the process we have here

The email that you sent out addresses a couple of specific things

But then it also kind of addresses a big overarching issue

And that's where, where do we begin and end as Board members when we are in public

And how do we address Stakeholders concerns

What is relevant between those two ?

In your email, your first concern with the Board

Was that there was not a Board member, Committee member or Executive person at the meeting, the Hearing.

Yes, if you would expand upon that please

So your concern was that someone was not there

And so that go ahead and please explain your thinking

Ms. Francisco :56:22

Well of course it's a very touchy issue here in our area
It's going in in North Hills, it's going into a single family area
I would have hoped that someone was designated from the Board
To show up in person to at least address Mr. Peshawa
So that they would at least think that well we've got a representative from the Board
Maybe that would have, he would have taken that into consideration
That's kind of my opinion
I was disappointed that no one was selected to do that
I know everyone's busy, I get that, I understand, me too
But you know I did show up
I would have liked to have seen someone there
I know you did the letter, and for that I thank you
But I really wish someone was there so that if there was you know
They could offer any assistance to us and it might have been helpful
That's kind of my issue
Something that was this contentious should have had a Board member represented
Not that I find any of you in error
I just think someone should have attended to at least help the Community
By being there in person

Mr. Gibson :55:07

You were there and several other Stakeholders were there as well
These great because it takes everyone

Mr. Beeber :54:58

Where any of the Stakeholders that were at that Hearing, here tonight ?

Ms. Francisco :54:56

Fran Potaski no, Beverly Woodward no, Robin Tyler no, ? Beger no
I'm it, no one else is here
So I felt it's important that at least I made my comments
And I just think it's really important if you have any other
Issues that are Community contentious as this
I really would suggest that somebody please designate
Someone to attend those hearings
And represent the Board, and speak on behalf of the Board
I think it really goes a long way for the Hearing Officers

When they see that you've taken the time
To at least be there and address them
So that was kind of my concern

Mr. Gibson :53:53

So the Officer may not have understood that we had had multiple Committee meetings and multiple Board meetings on that

Ms. Francisco :53:45

Exactly, that could definitely be the case as well
And you know he may have everything in the file
But he may not read that
And if you are there saying you know we've had 4 meetings on this
We've voted to Not support it at every single one
Maybe that would have had some impact
But as I said, we've lost that one
And I'm sure we probably lost with the CUP Hearing this morning
I wrote to JoJo Peshawa to find out to find out
What that is so I'm waiting to find out
I'm sure that it was to approve
So it's an issue

Mr. Gibson :52:05

And that opens up a little bit larger issue about
When these meetings are held
And how so many of us have jobs during the day
And how do we make those and represent as you would like us to represent

So it seems it may be in order to prepare some communication about that issue
as well I think to Councilmember Englander about when these meetings are held
Can they be held at a more amenable time

Ms. Francisco 52:32

We've asked that question many times
And part of the reason is, well they're held during normal hours
They're held at this, they're held at 8:30 (am)
They're held in downtown LA
It's really inconvenient for a lot of us
Cause you know, everybody works

And you have to make a living
You have to eat
So, when they make these meetings such as the time that they are
It does make it difficult for people to come and represent the Board

Mr. Beeber :51:58

Yes, I would just like to just generally comment on the issue
of when these hearings are held
I think, and this is my personal opinion
That while the City often times makes a big deal of wanting Stakeholder input
They really don't
I think their actions show that by how they set these things up
To make it difficult for the Community to engage
I think they do that in many cases with the Neighborhood Council
And they certainly do it with regards to City Council meetings
To hearings
That doesn't mean that the Commission has to hold their meetings
at night all the time or whatever.
But this was a Hearing, my understanding,
a Hearing of one person who worked for the Department
That person could have held a Hearing at 6:30 at night, 7:00 at night
It's inconvenient for him, maybe, but he gets paid a lot of money from the City
City employees get paid a lot of money and they get very good pensions, they get
health care, and they get all sorts of things
And those of us who are worrying about paying our bills every month
Have to get out there and work and hustle
I think that it's indicative not just what the City and the Elected Officials say they
want,
but what they actually do
What they actually do, is thrown up roadblocks, I think, in many many instances
in terms of the Community being able to give meaningful input and have the time
to do so.
When something the City Council wants they push it thru quickly as possible
So the Community, Neighborhood Councils in particular cannot engage,
don't have the time to engage on these things
This is just another example of the of the kinds of things that they do
To make it difficult
The applicant they're going to be there because it's their job
Their representative is going to be there, he's getting paid to be there
For us, we're Elected Officials, but we are not paid for this
And we all have other jobs and other commitments in our lives
We can't always be available, especially during the daytime

So I think it behooves Us as a Neighborhood Council
But also the Community and the Community members that are here
To take note of these sorts of things
And to the extent that we engage with City Elected Officials
And the people that make these decisions is important
And when people run for office we should hold their feet to the fire
When, again not on their individual decisions
But on how the City runs
And how, how difficult it is for the Community to have input
Especially when they claim they want more people voting
They want people voting for Neighborhood Councils
They want people running for Neighborhood Councils
They make a big deal out of all that
But when it comes time for meaningful input on something of this nature
They make it difficult for the Community to come down and give their input
That's my thoughts on that part of what we're discussing here

Ms. Francisco :48:39

That is true, that's the way it's been, when I was on the Board
and it's still true today, it never changes

Mr. Gibson :48:31

Very good, just as a reminder, this discussion is in order to make sure we
address your concerns as Stakeholder. That we are a Board that does so in an
effort to be always more functioning and functional, and that's what this
discussion is about.

There's a second half though to your email
While we did not have a Board member that was appointed to be there
We did have Board member there, Mr. Fordyce

Ms. Francisco :48:02

Yes

Mr. Gibson :48:01

And he spoke and made some comments that seemed to be concerning to you
Would you elaborate on that

Ms Francisco :47:56

What concerned me of course he did do it properly
Where he said I am speaking as an individual
Though he is a member of the NHW NC
And he was on the Veterans group
I suppose as well, I can't remember the group he said

Um, he did continue and provided as an individual his support
For their 15 CUV, which is fine

What is not fine, is that as an individual,
He proceeded to conduct himself,
in bashing the North Hills West Neighborhood Council
In stating that you as a Council did not provide certain documentation
and certain information and make it available to everyone including him
On something that I don't know what this is, an Olmstead Act ?

And then he proceeded to go on and continue to bash the Council
And then his comment was that you all held secret meetings
and that any vote that you had taken has been tainted

And, we spoke up and we got JoJo's attention
We told JoJo this has to stop
Um, while a Board Member can speak as an individual
Which is fine
There should be a sense or whatever you wish to call it
There should be no bashing the North Hills West Neighborhood Council
stating that your vote is tainted

Indirectly, that comment could be taken by the Hearing Officer
And say well geeze did they vote ?
Was it tainted ?
Did you all have serial secret meetings ?

When you put that out there
You put that into his head
That, that could be what you all have done

So, by doing that, I think that that could be, could have been detrimental
I don't think any Board Member if you're up speaking as an individual
Which we all have done
Which I had done when I was on the Council
You, you do not bash your Council

You do not say that your Council has had secret meetings and your vote is tainted

That can be extremely problematic when you're up and you're presenting
You know, your statement

Whatever your statement is, whatever your individual

Whether you support it, I don't care

That's perfectly fine, that is your total right

But when you come up and you start to say something like that

You sound like you're speaking on behalf of the Council

And anyways, Mr Peshaway stopped it after we said this has got to stop

He finally put an end to that

And then he finished up his statement

Um, you know I don't care whether it was Mr. Fordyce

Or any of you who had done that

I would be just as upset with any of you who would do something like that

That just isn't the proper thing to do

It was an inappropriate place to do it

And it could have caused a lot more problems

Um, you know whether he heard that or not

Whether he took that into his thinking I can't tell you

But I think that, that was inappropriate and should not have been done

Mr. Gohel :44:33

You are very right, thank you

Mr. Gibson :44:31

Then the vote then went against what the Board had recommended

After that, or his recommendation, not his vote, but his recommendation

Ms. Franciso :44:23

Exactly,

And Mr Peshawa's recommendation was to support the CUV for 15

Of course it went to the area Commission today for that vote

In downtown LA at 8:30

However, again as Mr. Beeber said

We have no idea when it would be on the schedule

So you have to sit there all day
Waiting til this comes up on the schedule
And that's an issue
So that's kind of where I am
And I mean that's just, it was inappropriate
And it should not have been done

Mr. Gibson :43:50

Thank you for coming this evening and speaking out

Ms. Goldbaum :43:41

I agree with Deb, and Jay
But I did speak to them
And I asked why wasn't it here in the Van Nuys office
And he said it wasn't in the Van Nuys office because these hearings
are held every other Thursday, and because it was Thanksgiving next week
They did both hearings downtown
That was the comment I got from JoJo

Glenn Bailey :43:02

Glenn Bailey, speaking as an individual
So I assume the hearing today was the full City Planning Commission ?
Because the Area Planning Commission do meet at 4:40 at Braude Center
I wasn't at the Hearing, but I do want to just share my
Just want give a few thoughts, ok, that might be helpful down the road
And I haven't heard both sides of the story, I've only heard one side
But I've know Debra for awhile, and I know she's a straight shooter

I have been in a similar position, not, at a planning commission level
But at a level that where there are maybe deficiencies
in the way a Neighborhood Council operates
And I would agree that presenting that to, in a forum dealing with a planning
issue
Is not the proper forum, or not the best forum to do that

But there are places to do it
One is the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners
They oversee the policies,
the enforcement policies in the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment
And so it seems to me, and it certainly has been done by many folks over the

years

Is that, if there's a deficiency about the method in which a Neighborhood Council is functioning, either a specific instance or an ongoing situation, that would be an appropriate venue, insofar as a public commission. And obviously the sooner that's done rather than letting it linger and fester, the better.

The second thing is, I heard some assertions of, well I'm not really sure what to call it

And I don't want to put words in anyone's mouth

But it really sounds to me like these sort of things should be brought to the attention of the City Attorney. And that's not a public setting. But it just seems to me, I would say this to all Board members on any issue. That if there's things of this concern, that that should be brought to the City Attorney because they then, would then make an investigation in terms of what happened or didn't happen, and advise the Board so that you know going forward.

Obviously, all of us in the Neighborhood Council system would like to learn from other people's experience's, both good and bad.

And we're working on trying to make that happen

We used to have a, you may recall we had several North Valley Roundtables With our Deputy City Attorney where representatives from the Neighborhood Councils

could get together and deal with questions and concerns about a whole variety of issues: committees, quorum, quorum of quorum, all these sorts of things They've heard from our Deputy City Attorney, Elise Rudin, who serves our councils here in the Valley, all the way up to Mike Feuer when he came to the Valley Alliance of Neighborhood Councils, that we wanted to have that opportunity.

So I'm just throwing out there's two venues that I would suggest that would be appropriate to raise these sorts of questions rather than the middle of a Planning Hearing if that's in fact what happened since I wasn't there, so for whatever that's worth.

Mr. Allen :39:03

I'm listening to all this and it's disturbing, no question about it

If it was I, I know that I would take a much more tactful approach

But I have to be honest with you

When I heard about this, I looked up the Brown Act

And, I gave thought to this

And, I will say I'm speaking as an individual, but with NC knowledge

The Brown Act is very clear that a individual whether it be a Board member or

otherwise

Can meet anywhere, say what they want

We're not limited, our free speech is not limited because we're Board members

Our decorum may be limited in terms of Code of Conduct

But the freedom to say what they want to say, is guaranteed under all circumstances

Now this as I understand it

And I do not have any more knowledge than Glenn has

But I can tell you what I see and what I've heard

Is, legitimate comments of information that was not presented

Was not available

The information that was not available to be discussed is pertinent to the decision making

The fact that you don't know about it does have some cause for consideration

Because if, if you are inadvertently ignoring a requirement

Then that in it's own right is is a problem

It's a problem for anyone

If I was to make a decision on something that just because I want it that way

And what I've seen and what I feel is that way

But I don't recognize that there's a law that says you can't do that

Then I should at least consider it

So I think that should be taken into consideration with regards to what has transpired here

And I don't mean to say that it's appropriate

But, what was done

But I can tell you what I see, and I don't know that I'm right

But what I see is a request to demand loyalty

But there is no such thing as loyalty

We all as NC members have a right to say and think as individuals

And the way it comes together as a group is we vote

And the majority vote wins

And that doesn't mean we agree

Some of us will disagree many times and not have our way

So I just want to throw that out so that we understand that there is a possibility

That this is more of a question of loyalty than a question of duty

And that's about as far as I'd like to take it

Mr. Beeber :35:36

I would like address a couple things that were brought up in the Public Comment arena

As well as the specifics of this

First of all, with regard to the comments that were made at this Hearing

(by Mr. Fordyce)

These comments are very very serious charges

These are charges that the Neighborhood Council violated the Brown Act

That the Neighborhood Council had, I don't know who, supposedly had secret meetings

That certain information was willingly withheld from a Member of the Board who requested it

As the person who chairs the Committee that heard this issue

And as the person who handled that item when it came before the full Board

I take those allegations very seriously

Because that reflects upon myself and my conduct

Nobody's perfect, and we certainly can all make mistakes in things

But in my estimation I certainly know in my case

That there were no secret meetings that I held

So I can't speak for anybody else who might have had a secret meeting

But I can tell you that I held no secret meetings

I don't know of any secret meetings that were held

I do know that certain Board Members, or at least one Board Member

Went and met with the applicant outside of our Committee meetings

And outside of our Board meetings,

Which they are I guess they are entitled to do

I don't know what the requirements are, whether that's any sort of violation or not

We were invited to do so and we declined to do so

Because we did not want to have secret meetings

And we do not want to be accused of meeting backdoor with applicants

Everything we that we met about and discussed was done in an open forum

Either in a Committee meeting or at a full Board meeting

With regards to things that were not considered

Actually the specific Olmstead issue was actually brought up by a Board member

That does go to whether there is discrimination regarding people with disabilities

And we had very full discussions at this Board meeting

And also at our Committee meeting

I asked the applicant very directly what would constitute discrimination

So those sorts of issues Were discussed

I don't know specifically what supposedly was withheld

But I do know that there was a Board Member (Mr. Fordyce)

Who sent information around to the Neighborhood Council members

And apparently according to the City Atty or the Department, I'm not sure who

Felt that that Board Member violated the Brown Act

In doing so, he attempted to have a serial meeting with the Neighborhood Council members to garner support for this project
And that Board member, I don't know what the exact outcome was
But that Board member (Mr. Fordyce) had to recuse himself at one of the times that Board member was here, when that issue came before the Board at one of those times.

And that Board member (Mr. Fordyce) is the same Board member who is accusing the Board of doing things that are in violation of the Brown Act and accusing members of the Board of doing those sorts of things
I think that Board member should be given an opportunity to explain their thinking on these sorts of things

But I can also say that we, because we didn't want to take just one person's word for what occurred at this Hearing
We did communicate with the Hearing Officer and asked them to confirm this information
And for the most part they confirmed this information, that these things were stated and were said

Any Board member certainly has the right to speak on their opinion of something
They have the right to take a position on something publicly that is against what the full Board took a position on.

There is no requirement here for loyalty to the Board and to the Board's position
In my particular instance here, my feeling of a concern for this set of things that are alleged to have occurred are questions of truth.
They are questions of, can somebody go ahead and make a public comment about things that are not truthful
I don't believe that these statements are truthful
I don't believe also that the Hearing was the right place to do that, even if they personally thought that they were truthful.

But taking a public stance and saying something that this thing happened
This happened, and this happened, and another thing happened
Can constitute slander
And you're accusing people of breaking the law basically
Because there is a law called the Brown Act
that prevents these things from happening

And I take it very seriously when myself or members of the Board
Are accused of breaking the law
I don't think, and this is my opinion

I don't think it's appropriate, and it may be actionable on some level
When someone goes in public and makes a public statement that certain
members broke the law, broke the rules
And that what they did (vote of opposition to increase) shouldn't count

Now, if you have an opinion that it shouldn't count for various reasons that's one
thing
But accusing people of wrongdoing
Which in a public forum I don't think is appropriate
And I think it's important for this Board to have had this discussion and discuss
this

And I think this is not a personal thing for me insofar as anybody who has made
comments or whatever
But I take such that we as a Board and perhaps me as an individual
Although I was not named but I was certainly the Chair of the Committee that held
these hearings and I was the person who conducted the discussion here before
the Board
And so by extension these comments do fall on me to some extent
And I think they're highly inappropriate and I think that these things should be
addressed

And again this is not a personal thing in any way shape or form
It would matter not who it was that had made these comments
I feel that these are not true statements
And I feel that it is inappropriate to go in public and make statements
of accusations against people that are not true
And that's my position on this

Mr. Gohel 28:25

I think it's good idea to bring this issue to City Attorney
Because we don't know what's right or wrong
It's not ? issue
Accusing the whole Board of doing something wrong
I haven't done anything wrong
I haven't done what he (Mr. Fordyce) has accused me of doing
And I think he is violating My rights, My rules
Next time anybody wants to do this thing, they will think twice
So best thing to do is to bring it to attention of City Attorney
And get their advice, that's what I suggest

Ms. Hart 27:39

When I was first made aware of this
That is in fact what I did I wrote initially to our former Neighborhood Council Advocate
And I asked, what could we do
Because there were serious issues at stake
The phrase, "the fruit of a poisoned tree" comes to mind
Because it does seem as if by making this sort of testimonial in front of someone who is making a decision could certainly poison the outcome
Their decision is then passed down,
and is then in turn tainted possibly by such an occurrence
And I think it needs to be looked at by people who have greater expertise
Than we have
And that's why I did ask that our Neighborhood Council Advocate actually at the time, was Gibson, I asked him if he would assist us and advise and seeing if perhaps the City Attorney could weigh in on this and let us know what should we do.
My biggest concern is for the Stakeholders who live in that neighborhood.
They made their opinions very clear to us
And even if we as individual members didn't agree with all their opinions
We have to take into account that it's Their neighborhood
And they live there

And the biggest concern is that are we opening the door to a brand new zoning code to making it possible for commercial development in residential neighborhoods.
And that's what they were so concerned with
It wasn't the matter so much as whether it's six beds, which they had by right
Or 16 or 18 or whatever were asking for
But this becomes then a commercial enterprise
And if we're negating the zoning in a residential neighborhood
That's really a very serious decision to make and it cannot be entered into lightly
And so I would ask for the City Attorneys advice on this

And I would also attest to the fact that there were No secret meetings
Of which I am aware
We heard this over and over and over again here
We debated it at length
And we decided that we Have to vote in best interests of the people
most closely affected by this development

Mr. Brown :25:03

Good evening

The fact that the only no vote at the Hearing came From this Neighborhood Council

And that particular vote of no, was tainted by a Board member who was present representing himself as an individual I think is nothing short of a stab in the back to the Board, pure and simple. Obviously we will take it to the City Attorney. But this has been a chronic ongoing repeated thing in all it's little flavors and varieties and idiosyncrasies, and I think it's gotten to the point where it's time to hit this particular nail on the head.

Mr. Gibson :24:19

Well I will say that the hearings that we held I thought were very thorough
They were just, the representative, they were open and transparent
The representative actually came and thanked me
for the way that the meetings were handled
And unlike other meetings I that I have seen from him
From other agencies, so I felt good about the process

This was news to me, the secret meetings, some of these accusations that are made

And I agree, it seems to be a direct attack upon the Board
And to be a functioning Board that's Not healthy
And it's not, there's no code of loyalty here, Not at all
Every reason and right to disagree
But if a Board member wants to be taken seriously
This is probably not the way I would recommend going about that

We were invited, by the people with the Congregate Living House (on Chase)
to come to a Open House and see what was going on there
I consulted with the City Attorney, they recommended against it
I actually had an Attorney General's opinion that spoke pretty specifically to that
So it was not like that we're even negligent, even just absent minded walking into secret

There were no secret meetings
We worked very hard for nothing to be tainted
And for those accusations to be made (by Mr. Fordyce) in that public forum
I think is very serious
First Amendment rights, ok, maybe
But just common decency with a Board that's trying to work together
I think it's completely wrong and uncalled for
And I think it's hard to want to take a fellow Board member seriously
And if we see a pattern of that going on

And it's just not healthy for us as a Board
As we work to represent our Stakeholders

Ms. Hart :22:08

I addressed the issue previously because of my concerns about process
And my concerns about the Stakeholders will being circumvented

But I'm also very deeply concerned because I would not consider this,
as previously characterized as more than "this is a breach of decorum"
And could be considered, depending on what the City Attorney has to say
as a violation of Ethics

I just don't think it's a good idea to ever behave in this manner
As Mr. Bailey commented there are places.

If we have questions, we have resources, we have places we can go
And people to advise us, and that's the way the process works
It works if you use the tools we have and we use them the right way,
Within The Law

That's all that we need to do

And so I would ask that we pursue further answers from those who are experts

Mr. Gibson :21:06

Yes, you can take out Mr. Fordyce's name and put my name in
The same discussion needs to happen

This is not, this is not a particular attack upon one Board member
This is an instance that needs to be addressed

No matter whose name is involved

So I will refer this issue to the Executive Committee for further investigation
And these things need to be discussed in an open forum

As painful as it can be for some of us

I think it's ultimately healthy to do so

Mr. Beeber :20:30

For those members of the public that are here
maybe hearing about this sort of thing for the first time.

I will assure you by myself and I certainly know many of the members of this
Board

I have been on the Board for a little over a year

Everybody on this Board conducts themselves with, for the most part
With the upmost Ethics and we endeavor to do everything by the book,
What is right

Again, we can certainly make a mistake
And there is a process for correcting those mistakes if they happen
But I want to assure the Public that these types of things that are being alleged
Are simply not accurate and not true
And I consider that categorically for myself
and for what I know about the other Board members on this Board

So please be aware that while I think that this is an isolated incident
with one particular Board member (Mr. Fordyce) making these accusations,
there are no overall accusations against this Board,
regarding our Ethics or our openness or our willing to hear things
and conduct ourselves
with the upmost in decorum and also Ethics.
Thank you

Mr. Gibson :19:06

Thank you Jay, well said

We will move on to item # 15

Discussion and possible action,
regarding paid security at all North Hills West meetings
Do I have a second ?
PG 2nd
Open Discussion
Referred to Public Safety Committee

Agenda item # 16. (9:30pm) CIS in support of CF14-0655-55

Mr. Beeber :07:06

Call for the question

Mr. Gibson :07:04

Any opposed to this Motion passing ?

Mr. Fordyce :07:01

I'd like to ask a question, is this HHH, is this H, is this the Linkage Fee ?
Or is this a new fee that we've yet have not heard from ?

Mr. Beeber :06:52

There's a motion on the table, call the question please

Mr. Fordyce :06:50

I know, you control everything by jumping into it
And you speak multiple times

Ms. Hart :06:46

Garry, it's HHH, if you read it, it's HHH

Mr. Beeber :06:44

Garry, there's a Motion on the table, can we call the question ?

Mr. Gibson :06:44

We have a motion on the table
I have asked if there are any opposed to this Motion ?
Are there any opposed ?

Mr. Fordyce :06:36

I'm opposed, you just handed this to me after the question

Mr. Gibson :06:32

Any abstentions ?

Ok, very good, the Motion passes

Carol, would you write up the CIS ?

Thank you