

Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Coalition: A Coalition of Councils General Meeting Agenda

Saturday November 5, 2022 10:00AM

Update or download Zoom software version 5.11.9 (8040) (64-bit) or better. <https://zoom.us/download>

Join Zoom Meeting <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/99882612542>

Meeting ID: 998 8261 2542

Find your local number: <https://zoom.us/u/adzNSCxqhi>

Meeting ID: 998 8261 2542

1. Welcome and roll call of Neighborhood Council representatives. 5 minutes
2. Approval of outstanding minutes.
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1aXqQiejy_sYA7SVS6FvNNndGc8oVtheX?usp=sharing 5 minutes
3. Candidate Introductions. Candidates running for City office in the November 2022 General Election have two minutes to introduce themselves and tell the Neighborhood Councils how, if elected, will work with the Neighborhood Councils. **The candidate must be a certified candidate.** 10 minutes
4. Motions
 - a. Motion to amend the status of the Working Group for Constructive Change from an ad-hoc to a standing committee.
 - b. Motion to distribute the attached language to the Neighborhood Councils (along with a copy of David Ryu's original motion for reference) to allow them to craft their own CIS on missing elements of CF 18-0467, with a direction that the CIS be submitted as and noted on the filing that the NC takes a neutral position with separate opinions on different issues and, to avoid the character limitations inherent in filing a CIS, use the language as a basis to build their own CIS to be attached to the CIS filing.

The following is intended to provide guidelines for drafting a CIS on David Ryu's CF 18-0467 (also attached) so each NC can address the issues as they see fit. Since there is no clear support or oppose, we suggest submitting the CIS as "Neutral" with a note in the filing includes opinions on several issues and to please read the attached. Using an attachment will also get around the character limitation of standard CIS filings.

The David Ryu-proposed CF 18-0467 which technically was adopted by the City Council in August of 2020 leaves a lot of his most-welcome suggestions unaddressed.

Of the 12 points, one (holding NC elections on the same day as other County races) has a number of complexities that make it unfeasible without further significant study. Two more were passed as ordinances leaving nine blessed but ignored.

And the two ordinances, one adopting regulations to provide a uniform minimum voting age and board member age across the City and the other redefining the definition of "Community Impact Stakeholder," were less than satisfactory to a number of NCs as removing individual board independence.

In the months following the introduction of CF 18-0467, in addition to comments from the City Clerk, DONE, and BONC, there were over 40 submissions from NCs almost half with very detailed responses to the items enumerated and over a third of those suggested alternate or additional recommendations including codifying additional time for NCs to speak on issues before the City Council. The last was an ad-hoc change under Herb Wesson that was dropped during the pandemic.

_____ Neighborhood Council hereby requests the City revisit the following concerns with input from DONE and BONC but, primarily all the Neighborhood Councils and their stakeholders:

- developing and continually updating point of contact lists for key city departments and agencies, including DCP, DOT, Public Works' Bureaus, Aging, Disability, HCID, DCA, LADWP, Port, Airport, Cannabis Regulation, Emergency Management, Animal Services, LAPD, LAFD, Recreation and Parks, Zoo, Finance, Library, Economic and Workforce Development, as well as the Council District offices, Councilmembers' and the Mayor's office, the Budget Advocates, and BIDs, with assistance from those listed departments and agencies, and share those lists with Neighborhood Councils
- educating key personnel at those entities on the purpose and mission of Neighborhood Councils; and ensuring liaisons and other points of contacts are knowledgeable and respectful of the NC system and develop fruitful ways to assist and collaborate with Neighborhood Council members
- coordinating with Neighborhood Councils on procedures to maintain clear and effective communication
- establishing that the Neighborhood Councils are the locally elected representatives of the people of Los Angeles and that the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment exists to support the Neighborhood Councils, not to control them
- developing a process, with the assistance of GSD, the LAPL, the City Clerk and the LAUSD, to assist Neighborhood Councils with accessing shared space in facilities throughout the City
- generating from the Neighborhood Councils a compendium of best practices to be posted (without editing) on the DONE website and shared with all Neighborhood Councils, including 'how-to guides' for accomplishing NC functions

In addition, the _____ Neighborhood Council requests that the following be considered:

- TBD by each NC [delete section if none]

Finally, the _____ Neighborhood Council encourages the City to evaluate the following suggestions submitted subsequent to the initial CF 18-0467:

- placing a moratorium on all current and future NC subdivisions until such time that a full and complete analysis be done to address equity issues and appropriateness
- rescinding the existing ordinance language that defines Exhaustive Efforts, and establish a committee comprised primarily of past and present and including representative from the offices of the City Attorney

and City Clerk as well as DONE and BONC to operate in a transparent and accountable manner inviting input from all interested parties both within the NC system as well as stakeholder and others with whom NCs interact

- reviewing and revising the function and accountability of DONE and BONC including the process of appointing the Commissioners and the credentials required
 - emphasizing that DONE's primary role should be to support NCs in achieving what's best for their communities
 - updating bylaws so they reflect the NC's choices with one set of standing rules as established by the NC, and a separate set reflecting BONC and DONE policies; at a minimum section of Bylaws should indicate the source, be it DONE, BONC or City ordinance
 - re-evaluating the interaction between NCs and the City Attorney's office to ensure all responses are timely, and that all determinations are organized and amalgamated available to everyone on the DONE website
- c. Motion that, due to the greater-than-usual turnover in the City Council's members, that Neighborhood Councils seize the opportunity to submit a CIS on CF *TBD* [would CF 20-0668-S7 on redistricting be appropriate or is there something more suitable?] requesting that the City Council take immediate steps to (1) significantly expand the number of Councilmembers so that each represents a more manageable number of Angelenos, (2) set up an independent committee to redistrict the City appropriately, and (3) take steps as needed to ensure districts are more competitive and that there is more grass-roots participation and more equitable representation.
- d. Motion to distribute the following to Neighborhood Councils to review and submit as a CIS on CF 21-0407: the _____ Neighborhood Council strongly objects to the report on CF 21-0407 submitted by Raquel Beltrán on behalf of DONE and the Neighborhood Councils and call for it to be redone with input from experienced Neighborhood Council board members with factual and analytical errors corrected, with more focus on the specifics requested by the Arts, Parks, Health, Education and Neighborhoods Committee.

https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2021/21-0407_misc_10-14-22.pdf

Everyone in attendance at the Working Group meeting was troubled by the tenor of this report. As a group we are extremely concerned that it appears to be a disorganized data dump with few conclusions that are supported by the data.

Example: the statement that At-Large board seats are the preferred seat type for 90 percent of NCs, apparently because 90 percent have at least one At-Large seat. Almost all of those NCs preferred OTHER types of seats. Only X-number of NCs have ONLY At-Large seats.

The lack of focused conclusions and the example of the misleading conclusion about At-Large seats raises a question of why the basic DATA collected has not been made available to decision makers and the public, so others can draw their own conclusions or inferences.

An example of the criticism that the report is a "disorganized data dump" is the scatter graph that contains three variables in a single chart (a crazy data practice). The scatter graph appears to suggest that there is some correlation between the return of ballots and both average neighborhood income and average education level. However, the scatter graph is never even mentioned in the text of the report and the correlation coefficients, which appear to differ between the two neighborhood factors, are not given to the reader.

Failure to include more than a single year of election data when comparing mail ballot returns with the all-mail-ballot year. The department itself managed elections that included mail-in ballots. What were THOSE return rates? Absent more comparisons, the unstated inference of the report is that mail-in ballots are a wasted effort and should be prohibited in the future. That seems a very 'Republican' attack on mail-in ballots which could be more aligned with the City Clerk's dislike of them and perhaps late delivery of many of them.

This attack on mail-in ballots runs counter to the voter EMPOWERMENT based adoption of ALL mail-in ballots by the state of California for general elections.

Other minor concerns raised during discussion include the following which are not significant if taken individually but, taken as a whole, are indicative of the disorganization and lack of attention to detail by the writer:

* multiple numerical/arithmetical errors i.e. 91 NCs are *less* than 94, if only 65 of the 91 held elections in 2019, how can the total in 2019 be 94?

* information presented is at times diametrically opposed to the conclusions drawn

* when so many VBM ballots were not returned, the City Clerk and DONE should have immediately sent out a survey to those who requested them to determine the issues - there have been a number of reports that at least some ballots were not received, some were submitted to the City Clerk but returned to sender as undeliverable

* issues of certification, voting structure, board takeovers and more need to be addressed

* lack of people running is a separate issue but MUST be addressed if NCs are to be truly representative of their communities

* there is a hodge-podge of info but limited accuracy in conclusion

* it's irrelevant but unprofessional that this was submitted with an outdated list of BONC commissioners

5. Update on motions for De Leon and Cedillo to resign.

6. Update from the Ad hoc committee and motion:

a. Survey report back on new survey about training.

7. Update from Budget Advocates – Co-Chairs Jennifer Goodie/Kay Hartman 5 minutes

8. Update from Congress of Neighborhoods 2022 Congress. 5 minutes

9. Update from DONE. Raquel Beltran. 15 minutes

a. Zoom payment update

- b. Update on CIS and ENS
- c. Update of DONE Improvements

10. Update from BONC Len Shaffer 5 minutes
11. Update from any other NC regional alliance 5 minutes
12. Announcements 5 minutes
13. Adjournment-Meeting ends at 1:00PM