

Discussion & Motion with CIS Submission RE: David Ryu’s Proposed Neighborhood Council Reforms submitted by him as Chair of the Health, Education & Neighborhood Councils Committee to the City Council, based on survey results from NCs. Council File #18-0467

<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=18-0467>

http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2018/18-0467_mot_05-25-2018.pdf (Attachment N)

Motion: To approve, deny, approve if amended or disapprove unless amended, Councilmember David Ryu’s proposed reforms for the NC system, to reflect the BABCNC’s positions, and to submit a CIS to that effect.

- Larry noted that we are being asked to provide input on David Ryu’s recommendations and identified some issues that impact this NC from the list, the main three being:

- Second Bullet Point: That CM Ryu wants to do away with the definition of Community Impact (sic) [Interest] Stakeholder, which he feels has merit, as the definition is so general, we don’t know what it means; how someone qualifies.

- Third Bullet Point: That CM Ryu has been proposing that all NC councilmembers be elected; no selections and no privately appointed. There may be more NCs that have a few selected seats and we need to express our position on this as it will impact our private residential stakeholder groups.

- Fourth Bullet Point: That they want to have some kind of review of bylaws to make sure that the governmental structure is equitably allocated by representation. Larry noted that we are mostly residential and we have certain selected seats that are more or less institutional representatives; this needs to be communicated to CM Ryu’s committee and CM Ryu himself, as there is an assumption that the selection of an institutional representative is not democratic, but if an individual is representing that institution, who should have the say? This is the issue.

- Other: Larry mentioned other items noted in CM Ryu’s motion which he doesn’t have issue with.

He opened this to the floor. Nickie recommended having a committee to address this. Bob related that one issue does not fit all; Stephanie noted that we are not politicians and that being elected is not practical for everyone. Several board members reiterated that we are a purely residential neighborhood.

Motion 1. BABCNC opposes to the removal of “selections” for board members as it would undermine the ability of the existing organizations working in different communities within BABCNC to have a voice in governance on the NC. The result would be a fracturing of the community where a duly elected board of a residential association could end up being represented on the NC by someone with opposing interests. Moved Travis; seconded Robert R. 24 yes; 0 no; 1 abstention: Dan P.; 7 absences. Passed.

Motion 2. BABCNC opposes any effort to define “equity” in representation of different stakeholder groups by the City. This is a local decision that should be addressed by the NC, which knows and understands the proportions of different interests within its territory. BABCNC is skeptical that such efforts would not be used to force over-representation of certain interests (e.g., commercial) out of proportion with their predominance within the NC territory. Moved Travis; seconded Larry; 25/0/0

Larry related that beyond filing this motion alone, we need to do some lobbying with other NCs that feel the same way we do; meet with Ryu’s staff, and put pressure from all areas of the city that this is not a good proposal. Travis confirmed that we now have two positions to take to the CM’s office.

Those interested in meeting with CD4: Cathy W., Jamie, Don, Maureen, Andre, Larry, Stephanie, Robert S., Kathy C., Nickie, Pamela & Travis.