

DRAFT Minutes of the Uptown Planners Special Meeting
On Requirements for (Re-)Applying for Recognition as the Official Community
Planning Group

Called to order at 6:17. Quorum present to conduct business.

I. Parliamentary Items

- a. In attendance: Lu Rehling, Susan White, Juli Hyde, Mat Wahlstrom, Stu McGraw, Patty Ducey-Brooks, Mary Brown, Don Liddle.
- b. Approval of the agenda: Approved without comment.

II. Action Item: CPG Recognition

a. Collection of Required Demographic Information

Description of demographic information survey collection process, distribution of blank copies to those who did not pre-fill or submit electronically. Individual collection of each of the four completed parts in separate envelopes.

b. Consideration for Approval of Draft Operating Procedures

Lu read the minutes of the last O&O meeting, and explained that the draft contained mandatory language in bold black lettering, and that if failure to approve would automatically disqualify. However, board members can voice objections. Further, the yellow highlighted text of our additions can be discussed and changed if needed for consideration. She also noted that the yellow language followed the legacy admin guidelines unless it was contradicted by the new policy. This was preliminarily approved by Marlon.

Tom Mullaney: regarding 1: need clarification of the borders of Uptown, specifically between the Midway-Pacific Hwy and Old Town community planning areas. It was noted that the maps are not clear, and Mat Wahlstrom mentioned that, sometime before the last plan update, the border between Mission Hills and Hillcrest was moved without notice from Dove St to First Ave. Mat Wahlstrom made a motion for UP to request the Planning Dept provide clear maps. No objections.

Juli Hyde mentioned the reference in 2.6 to a “City Manager.” Lu Rehling made a motion to request this be changed to “City.” No objections.

Lu Rehling noted that 2.5 overlaps 7.2, and so changes to either one must be made to the other. She also summarized the yellow changes in 3.

After discussing how to conduct the volume of material to consider at this meeting, Don Liddell suggested and it was decided to go through section-by-section, discuss any suggested amendments, and to make the amendments the quorum of the board present agreed to without objection. This was unanimously approved.

Tom Mullaney: problem with the underlying black lettering with contradictions baked in, and that the city needs to revise.

Mat Wahlstrom: change 3.1 to change “representatives” in yellow to “members.” No objections.

Lu Rehling described yellow changes in 4, specifically 4.4.2. She emphasized that the intent was to increase the maximum of twenty and change the length terms to two years to accommodate those that can’t fulfill a four-year commitment. She notes that possible objections to this may be addressed in the section regarding the transition period.

Stu McGraw agreed that two-year terms may attract more candidates, but that there could be conflicts with how other CPGs will be operating as well as impacts to election committees. Lu clarified there are no more remainder-of-term appointments, and that the other changes were suggested to avoid needing to maintain more board members.

I asked for clarification as whether appointed members being forbidden.

Lu clarified that appointments were only allowed based on diversity, and so it could be amended to say appointments by neighborhood.

Sol Shumer addressed Stu McGraw’s comments and mentioned how other groups do things differently. Should make the number of members an open range of

minimum to maximum.

Tom Mullaney said we should settle on fifteen members. Also related that there needs to be a definite usage of "member" means. Lu stated that the various uses are necessary. Sol said he says he understands both positions and that we need to stick with what's there. And Juli pointed out that we need to move on or else we'll get nothing done.

Susan objected to two-year terms as not allowing people to get the experience needed.

Don Liddell motioned that we decide on fifteen members; after discussion, others agreed. But the length of term was debated at length to decide on two-, three-, or four-year terms.

Mat Wahlstrom: change 4.3.1 to say "appointed by the UP board" to clarify that all youth appointments must be made by the members of the UP board, and keep the ages to 18 to 15 for them. The board agreed.

Susan read Clifford Weiler asking for clarification on the second bullet under 5.1. After discussion, we approved language to include "by a non-resident."

Tom Mullaney had questions about the definition of "proxy." After discussion, it was agreed that the definition was sufficiently both in general understanding and as delineated elsewhere in the draft bylaws.

Lu mentioned that the language about resolving disputes "by a member of the Election Committee" to 5.1.4. She further clarified that the reason for all the yellow in 5 is because the black letter said these need to be covered but had no other direction.

Agreed to amend 5.2.2, the deadline for candidate applications, the time to verify candidate eligibility from "two" to "seven" days

Under 5.2.4, agreed to change to "February meeting" from January to correct us going dark that month.

Amend language to 5.2.6 to remove plurality to allow election to determine

method of election.

Amend 5.2.7 to “within 24 hours.”

In regard to 6.2 regarding Rules of Procedure, Lu Rehling drew attention to the decision reached by O&O to adopt "Rosenberg's Rules of Order" in place of "Roberts Rules of Order," and that many organizations under the Brown Act have already legally done so. This was much appreciated.

Amend 6.3 to remove “and other government regulations” from first sentence.

Amend 6.5.1 to “at the discretion of that committee’s chair,” and “encouraged” instead of “expected” to serve on two committees. We also agreed to changes to clarify the language regarding quorums and voting at meetins and joint meetings, so as to prevent possible conflicts with the Brown Act.

Under 6.7, changed the nonstandard "24-7" to the standard 24/7 abbreviation.

Under 6.8, we changed "anyone" to "Board members" to forestall cross-talk and debate not on the agenda during non-agenda public comment, to clarify agenda structure, and procedures for approving modifications to the agenda.

Under 6.10, we want to recommend deleting the bulleted element that minutes must include the names of speakers (unless they specifically decline to state their name) as well as provide a summary of their comment as burdensome -- and certainly not anything the City Council or other government agencies have to do in their minutes -- as well as prone to abuse by people wishing to force us to memorialize and disseminate hate speech. This change would need to be cleared under whatever the final Administrative Guidelines are issued by the city.

Under 7.2, no changes were made, but particular attention was drawn to the fact that the records retention requirements being implemented, that is, shifting the burden to permanently maintain them from the city to CPGs, is burdensome and unreasonable. And that it is a matter of particular concern, as we had the experience of a previous board failing to maintain control of our domain name and the subsequent loss of our website and all records. And the remaining sections under 7.0, it was noted that the city allows itself more leniency in

following many of the requirements that it is intending to impose on us.

After review of the remaining sections, no discussion was considered necessary, as there was nothing objectionable or to which we could object.

In conclusion, we agreed to recommend the original draft drawn up by O&O, as agreed at this meeting should be amended as here described, to the full board at our next regular meeting on November 7, 2023. We also expressed our gratitude to especially Lu Rehling for all her time and attention to presenting O&O's findings on this subject.

c. Consideration for Approval of Additional Application Documents

Due to the fact that the city is still in the process of finalizing these documents, and given the deadline imposed by the city of December 31, 2023, any further considerations of these and other items need to be approved by the full board before or at our December 5 meeting, or else need to schedule special meetings before that deadline.

d. Recommended additional steps required before application.

Due to the fact that the city is still in the process of finalizing these documents, and given the deadline imposed by the city of December 31, 2023, any further considerations of these and other items need to be monitored and other meetings of the full board to discuss them.

III. Adjourned at _____.