

Agenda Item 5.A: Analysis of the Administrative Committee's Decision to Send the PTIC's Motion on the Windward Avenue Pedestrian Enhancement Project by to the PTIC

On May 14th, AdCom voted to send back the PTIC's subject motion because enough members felt the item did not have enough outreach. This decision was wrong on two counts. First it violated the clear language of both the VNC By-Laws and Standing Rules. Second the accusation is without merit.

A. The Decision Violated VNC Rules

Relevant VNC rules included the following:

VNC By-Laws

Section 1: Standing Committees

- A. Administrative Committee:** Consists of eight (8) Officers, including the four (4) Executive Officers and four (4) Community Officers who shall be selected by the fourteen (14) Community Officers at the first Board meeting. All Administrative Committee meetings shall be agenzized as joint meetings of the Board. Chaired by the President. Sets agenda for Board meetings. Administrative Committee meetings shall require a minimum of four (4) present to establish a quorum. The Administrative Committee shall meet at least every two (2) months. The Community Officer members may be removed by a majority vote of the Community Officers.

Section 3: Committee Creation and Authorization

- A. Committee Authority - All committee recommendations shall be brought to the full Board in the form a motion for discussion and action.**

VNC Standing Rules

5. Administrative Committee

Amended 091020

The Administrative Committee does not address or consider the merits of proposed agenda items. Its function is to determine whether a proposed agenda item will be placed on the next Board meeting agenda. Any disputes with a decision of the Ad Comm can be resolved using the procedure in VNC Bylaws VII. D. (Bold font in Standing Rules. Reference to By-Laws VII.D. is not accurate.)

The PTIC is standing committee of the VNC. Nowhere does the Administrative Committee have the permission to short-circuit the PTIC's right to have its motions and recommendations heard by the full VNC. For this reason only, the PTIC should return its motion to AdCom for it solely to schedule the item on the VNC's next agenda.

B. The Basis for Sending Back the Item Is False.

The four members of AdCom, who feel that the PTIC did not adequately provide enough outreach, gave no factual basis for their position. The Agenda Request was properly prepared and included as supporting documents a clear and detailed report on the project and a detailed analysis of the 515 survey responses. Those responses were solicited through these multiple VNC channels over a 30-day period: the VNC's Newsletter, the VNC's social media accounts, a VNC email blast to its thousands of addresses, and posting the survey's availability on the VNC's homepage. The project and proposed reconfiguration of Windward was discussed with the Venice Beach BID and with a group of business owners on Windward Avenue who would be directly affected. The Ocean Front Walk Committee was given a presentation of the results and had a very favorable response. (No vote was asked for nor taken.)

As the survey responses were returned, the 90% support rate for the reconfiguration of Windward Avenue west of Pacific Avenue and the 68% support rate for the reconfiguration of Windward east of Pacific Avenue remained almost constant. There is no indication of a surge of responses that changed the basic fact that from the outset both proposals had strong community support.

Moreover, it is unclear what further outreach could be done that would change this support level. Any public meetings would not have as many attendees as the 515 responders of the survey and may well have survey responders in the audience clouding the outcome. It would take a huge surge of opposition to meaningfully lower the strong support for the project; nothing indicates that might happen.

In short, the survey was properly advertised, a large number of valid responses were obtained, and they were properly analyzed and presented.