

# OPNC Special Board Meeting Minutes

**Date** 12 Aug 2024 19:00

**Location:** Zoom Meeting Online or By Telephone  
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/8386991801>

**Type** Special Board Meeting

**Status** Pending Board Approval ▾

**Submitted By** Guy Toley

## 1. Call to order and roll call

## 2. PRESENTATION FROM GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

- None Present

## 3. SELECTION OF OFFICERS (PURSUANT TO BYLAWS ARTICLE VI SEC. 3

Robust discussion and comments from board and stakeholders.

- Discussion and possible action to appoint a President of O.P.N.C.
  - Guy Toley Nominates Clem Wright Seconds

Ramsay Goyal Appointed (Yes Unanimous)

Discussion and possible action to appoint a Vice President of O.P.N.C.

- Ramsay Goyal Nominates, Guy Toley Second

Michael Haggerty Self Nominated (Yes Unanimous)

Discussion and possible action to appoint a Secretary of O.P.N.C.

Ramsay Goyal Moves, Clem Wright Seconds

Max Hawkins Self Nominates (Yes Unanimous)

- Discussion and possible action to appoint a Treasurer of O.P.N.C.

Guy Toley Nominates Max Hawkins Seconds,

Geoff Birchfield (Yes Unanimous)

## 4. Finances

- Treasurer Report (Not Much Spent this much on Public Storage and Moore Business Invoices that need to be paid)
- Discussion and possible approval of June 2024 MER

Michael Haggerty Moves – Geoff Birchfield Seconds (10 Yes, 1 Ineligible)

- Discussion and possible approval of July 2024 MER

Ramsay Goyal Motions – Sam Bark Seconds (10 Yes, 1 Ineligible)

- Discussion and possible approval of payment for Public Storage \$194.00
- Discussion and possible approval of Moore Business Invoices from March 2024 – August 2025 amended to August of 2024

Ramsay Goyal Motion – Guy Toley Seconds (Yes 10, 1 Ineligible)

#### **5. BOARD AND SPECIAL MEETING MINUTE REVIEW**

- July 2024 Board Meeting Minutes **Tabled**

#### **6. COMMITTEE REPORTS PLANNING AND LAND USE (General Report Ramsay Goyal**

In the meeting, the board discussed sending a letter of support for the Venice for the Streets for All project, which is on tonight's agenda. Charles proposed traffic control measures to stop illegal right and left turns, particularly at Midtown Crossing Shopping Center, but more investigation is needed before bringing them to the board. There was also a discussion about adding speed bumps on Gramercy Place between Olympic and Country Club, which could be included in the letter of support. The committee is still researching the possibility of a crosswalk across Western, with a letter of support approved but more investigation required. Additional transportation committee items can be submitted for future discussion.)

#### **7. COMMITTEE REPORTS PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC SAFETY (No Report)**

#### **8. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Sue McCulloch**

Recommending a white paper to be written about the proposed K Line options. It's critical to inform the community, as the postcards distributed provide little detail. The two options are: a \$15 billion rail line that would take at least 25 years and involve extensive construction along San Vicente, La Brea, Fairfax, and Pico, or a high-frequency bus route that would be far cheaper, involving minimal changes like painting lanes and removing parking meters. The rail option could cost taxpayers significantly more than expected, with Metro imposing a surcharge. Public hearings are limited, with one happening tomorrow at Pan Pacific Park and a webinar on Thursday. An LA Times article and Metro's executive summary suggest these projects may not reduce traffic. Many people in the community are unaware of these issues, and time to submit comments is running out, so it's crucial to write the white paper or get the topic on the agenda.

#### **9. Duplicated Agenda Item 5**

#### **10. NEW BUSINESS**

- **NPG for OBA Foundation (No board action – date had passed)**
- **NPG LA Korean Festival (Motion Passed 10 Yes, 1 Ineligible)**
- **NPG – Heal One World (Tabled)**
- **Venice Blvd For All Proposal**

Presentation by on proposed Venice for All by Michael Schneider from Sidewalks for All. After this presentation there was approximately 35 minutes of discussion and questions from various board members and stakeholders where the tone of the community stakeholders was against this measure.

A motion was made by Michael Hagerty to send a letter of support for Venice for All, Clem Wright Second the motion

Yes: CW, GB, MH, NF, PR, MH (6)

No: FL, GT, JC, SB (4)

Abstain: BR, RG (2)

**Max Hawkins** reading the results – 6 yes, 4 no, 2 Abstain – Motion Passes

**Najmah Brown** stakeholder interjected after the vote:

“Should Max not have recused himself from voting, since there's a conflict, especially with his opposition to Country Club Park just putting that out there. Thank you.”

**Max Hawkins:** “I don't think that there's any conflict”

**Frank Larrazaletta:** “can you elaborate on that? Please.”

**Najmah Brown** went on to explain that Max Hawkins' being behind Opensidewalks.la and his efforts “attacking the gates” in Country Club Park. She went on to suggest that there is a connection between Micheal Schneider Sidewalks for All and Opensideewalks and other biking advocates that on the OPNC board and that was a conflict.

A discussion followed and Max Hawkins confirmed that he is involved with Opensidewalks, but he didn't believe that this was related to this vote.

Stakeholders saw this a conflict of interest.

**Jessica Celious** stated: “You have a personal event. You have a personal goal.”

More discussion between the board and stakeholders took place. **Najmah Brown** gave further background and history of people and organizations that have attempted to get the gates removed.

**Najmah Brown** “And he worked. Hold on, back up. He's also being supported by Michael Schneider streets Fall, because it's Adrian Hoff, Michael Schneider and Max Hawkins working together. It's a conflict of interest, and I am going to report this to the city.”

**Michael Schnieder:** “For the record. That's not factually true.

Max and I have never spoken about that. We have no nothing to do with that, and Adrian Hoff is no longer on the steering committee of streets, for all.”

**During the final comments and board business:**

**Guy Toley** Shared information about what he is aware of with the Opensidewalks.la and the efforts to have the gates removed in Country Club Park. It was discovered and confirmed by an LA Times reporter that Max Hawkins was behind Opensidewalks.la. He shared that the neighborhood south of Pico (south of Country Club Park and OPNC boundaries) was being used to create pressure to have the gates removed.

**Max Hawkins:** Suggested that this be agendaized so that we can take this up as a discussion.

**Michael Hagerty:** Referred to the item passing with a 6 to 4 vote

**Jessica Celious:** “Right, right. But we but we feel like there's a conflict of interest.”

Further discussion between board members and stakeholders took place:

**Michael Hagerty:** Made comments to point out that even if Max is conflicted, it does not change the outcome of the vote.

**Jessica Celious:** Stated “Not just, Max. You as well.”

**Najmah Brown:** Asserted that Michael Hagerty is a strong advocate for mobility and referred to past dialogue between the two of them.

During some cross talk between stakeholders

**Beverly Rowe:** Commented “I would have voted no”

**Stakeholder Ina-CCP Resident** Commented: “So I'm sorry this was a failure to disclose. This is dishonest.”

Several board members called for a re-vote.

**Ramsay Goyal:** “So I'm honest. Well, so I'm honestly not sure about whether or not like I think this is up to Guy. Whether or not we can revote here.”

**Guy Toley:** Yeah, I'm not sure about the rules on this as well in terms of.

More comments from stakeholders about how this vote was held and the impact it has on the communities. Comments were made about the lack of communication from the NC.

Ramsay Goyal: “So I looked into Robert's rules of order. You can. This is from a completely unbiased perspective.

- I. There's a motion to reconsider. It has to be called, and can only be called by someone who voted yes, on the the original motion. It can't be called by someone who voted no, or someone who abstained, or someone not part of it,

someone who voted. Yes, if they've gained new information since the vote within 30 days of the original vote can call for a motion to reconsider an agenda item, and then it needs a second. And then at that point the item is re voted on, but that motion has to be called by someone who voted yes, on the original item.”

**Paul Rogoff:** “I'll move to reconsider.”

**Jessica Celious:** Second the motion to reconsider

Discussion between the board members about the procedure.

**Max Hawkins: Commented:** “I just wanted to say that. The contents of this vote are completely unrelated to my involvement in open sidewalks.”

More discussion took place between stakeholders and board members:

**Ramsay Goyal:** So we have to vote on the motion to reconsider before we can get back into discussion of the actual thing. I just found out, so just moving the motion, and then passing the motion or moving the motion, seconding the motion is not enough to bring it back up. We have to have a simple majority on the motion, to reconsider itself.

**Vote to reconsider this agenda item:**

Yes: BR, GT, JC, PR, SB, FL (6)

No: CW, MH, NF, (3)

Abstain: RG, MH (2)

Uncertain: GB (1)

Motion to reconsider the agenda item passes.

**Vote to table the agenda item:**

Yes: Unanimous