

VENICE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
MOTION TO CENSURE L. REDMOND

*Three Counts — Re-allegation of Previously Sustained Censure Conduct, Persistent Disruptive Conduct,
and Persistent Interruption of the Presiding Officer*

July 23, 2026

To: The Board Officers of the Venice Neighborhood Council

We, the undersigned Board Members, move pursuant to Article V, Section 8 of the VNC Bylaws that Board Member L. Redmond be censured for the following conduct:

Count One — Re-allegation of the Two Counts Previously Alleged

1. That On May 20, 2025, during the VNC full board meeting, Ms. Redmond, while seated at the dais, extended her middle finger toward a member of the public who had just spoken in opposition to a policy position she held. (Exhibit 1.) And that October 20, 2025 Community Officer Christopher Lee resigned from the Venice Neighborhood Council, citing abuse by Ms. Redmond and the failure of this board, its officers and the City of Los Angeles to protect him from her harassment. (Appendix Item 2). This conduct violates Standing Rule 7 (Code of Civility), paragraph 6, which provides that each Board Member “will not use language that is abusive, threatening, obscene, or slanderous, including using profanities, insults, or other disparaging remarks or gestures.” It also constitutes a “violation of the Code of Conduct” within the meaning of Article V, Section 8 of the Bylaws.

Count Two — Persistent Disruptive Conduct at the July 16, 2026 Administrative Committee Meeting

2. On July 16, 2026, during the VNC Administrative Committee meeting, Ms. Redmond continued to press procedural motions on four separate occasions after the Chair had ruled her out of order in violation of Article V, Section 8 of the Bylaws which prohibits persistent disruptive conduct at a meeting as well as Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised §39 which prohibits a member from repeatedly using parliamentary forms for dilatory purposes. In particular:

- a. After being asked directly whether she had a point of order, Ms. Redmond stated, “No, it's not a point of order. I'd like to make a motion for a special—.” After the Chair ruled the motion out of order, Ms. Redmond continued to press it. The Chair stated on the record that this was the third, fourth, and fifth time she had spoken out of turn during the meeting, and that she was “impeding the orderly business of the board.”
- b. Later in the meeting, after the Chair advised there was no pending ruling to challenge, Ms. Redmond continued to press the same question after being directed to stop.
- c. Ms. Redmond moved to remove certain LUPC items from the consent calendar. The Chair ruled the motion out of order. Ms. Redmond appealed the Chair's ruling. The appeal failed on a 3–3 tie vote, with one abstention. Under Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised, a tie vote on an appeal does not overturn the chair's ruling; the ruling stood.
- d. Approximately forty minutes later, after being told her time to speak had expired, Ms. Redmond returned to the same consent-calendar ruling described in paragraph (c). (Exhibit 2, AdCom meeting recording/transcript, July 16, 2026.)

Count Three — Persistent Interruption of the Presiding Officer at the July 16, 2026 Administrative Committee Meeting

3. On July 16, 2026, during the same Administrative Committee meeting described in Count Two, Ms. Redmond engaged in conduct that constitutes persistent disruptive conduct at a meeting in violation of Article V section 8 of the bylaws, The conduct also violates Standing Rule 7 (Code of Civility), paragraph 5, which

provides that each Board Member will “communicate [their] ideas and points of view clearly, and allow others to do the **same without interruption**.” Finally this behavior violates Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised (Obtaining and Assigning the Floor; §61, Discipline of Members and Guests), since once a member — including the Chair stating a ruling or directive — has been assigned the floor, it is out of order for another member to rise or begin speaking except through the limited motions that may properly interrupt. The violations occurred because L. Redmond began speaking before the Chair had finished a ruling, directive, or sentence — without pause and without having been recognized — **on well over 30 separate, occasions across six non-contiguous portions of the meeting. Specifically:**

- a. Between 01:27:47 and 01:29:20, during the renewed special-meeting motion described in paragraph 2(a), **Ms. Redmond interrupted the Chair approximately 12 times.**
- b. Between 02:13:42 and 02:14:34, during the exchange described in paragraph 2(b), **Ms. Redmond interrupted the Chair 4 times.**
- c. Between 02:26:11 and 02:31:17, during the LUPC consent-calendar motion and appeal described in paragraph 2(c), **Ms. Redmond interrupted the Chair approximately 8 times.**
- d. Between 02:57:00 and 02:59:00, during discussion of a motion to reconsider a prior vote, **Ms. Redmond interrupted the Chair 6 times.**
- e. Between 01:43:15 and 01:44:20, following two on-the-record admonitions to be respectful, **Ms. Redmond interrupted the Chair 4 times.**
- f. Between 03:09:35 and 03:11:13, during the exchange described in paragraph 2(d), **Ms. Redmond interrupted the Chair 3 times.**

Appendix 1—the Interruption Log lays out in granular detail the factual record supporting this. Even a cursory look makes clear that irrespective of substance, the constant interruption of the chair substantially interfered with the orderly conduct of business and suffices in and of itself as a ground for censure.

Consistent with the purpose of Article V, Section 8 — to place a Board Member on notice of misconduct and provide an opportunity to correct it — the undersigned respectfully move that Ms. Redmond be censured on all three counts. The following three (3) members of the Board, do not together constitute a majority of the quorum of any Neighborhood Council body:

RICHARD STANGER

Movant 1 — Printed Name, Signature, and Date

7/24/2026

Yolanda A. Gonzalez

e, and Date

7/24/2026

JIM FITZGERALD

Movant 3 — Printed Name, Si

7/24/2026

Appendix

Item 1: Interruption Log

July 16, 2026 Administrative Committee Meeting — Supporting Evidentiary Record

Purpose: This log documents a sustained pattern, spanning the entire July 16, 2026 Administrative Committee meeting, in which L. Redmond began speaking before the presiding officer had finished a ruling, a directive, or a sentence — with no pause, and without waiting to be recognized. The pattern recurs across six separate, non-contiguous stretches of the meeting, on six different agenda items, over a span of nearly two hours. It is not confined to any one exchange or motion, and it is not a function of the merits of any particular motion L. Redmond was making. The conduct documented here is the act of interrupting itself, independent of who was procedurally correct.

Methodology: The below is a chronicle of the persistent interruptions of and talking over the chair. In other words she began speaking before the Chair's ruling concluded, however is undisputed and unaffected by the transcription problem.

Instance 1 — Renewed motion after being ruled out of order

Chair repeatedly unable to complete a ruling on a special-meeting motion already found out of order.

01:27:47.00 – 01:29:20.00 | 12 interruptions identified

Time	Chair (David Feige) — cut off before finishing	L. Redmond — begins with no pause (interruption)
01:28:35.54	"I don't think that's, I don't believe that's correct. So I'm gonna rule that out of order."	#1 "I made a motion..."
01:28:36.80	"What I am gonna do, what I am gonna do is now move on, is move on to the next item on the agenda."	#2 "To have a special meeting that."
01:28:40.23	"There's no, we'."	#3 "It was cut off by Gary. I was like, that."
01:28:45.43	"And I'm ruling that, and I'm ruling that at this."	#4 "I wasn't able to finish."
01:28:47.41	"I'll."	#5 "How can you rule it when I didn't even finish?"
01:28:56.49	"Lisa, it's not a, Lisa, it's not a point. That is not a point of order. You are not recognized. You're out of order."	#6 "It was a motion."
01:29:01.76	"This is the 3rd, Lisa, it's the 3rd time you've interrupted me this meeting."	#7 "Please don't."
01:29:03.12	"Please don."	#8 "Well because you don't called on me, you called on me."
01:29:05.52	"That's the fourth." Lisa...	#9 "Recognized me."

Time	Chair (David Feige) — cut off before finishing	L. Redmond — begins with no pause (interruption)
01:29:07.03	"I'm directing you."	#10 "Making a motion."
01:29:11.82	"Lisa, and the motion is out of order, and I'm directing you."	#11 "When David I'm..when will."
01:29:15.05	"That's the fif."	#12 "Motion be in order."

Instance 2 — "Grounds for a censure" exchange

Chair unable to close discussion and move the agenda to LUPC after an out-of-order ruling.

02:13:42.00 – 02:14:34.00 | 4 interruptions identified

Time	Chair (David Feige) — cut off before finishing	L. Redmond — begins with no pause (interruption)
02:13:53.74	"It's not a ruling, Lisa. It's not. There is no, there is."	#1 "There is a rule, you just said it's not up there."
02:14:03.27	"The record will reflect that you are impeding the orderly business of this."	#2 "Not, I made a challenge. No."
02:14:21.86	"The question?"	#3 "But we're."
02:14:24.41	"Lisa, Lisa."	#4 "Can you explain why it's not up for discussion?"

Instance 3 — LUPC consent-calendar motion / appeal

Chair unable to complete rulings on the consent-calendar motion and the subsequent appeal.

02:26:11.00 – 02:31:17.00 | 8 interruptions identified

Time	Chair (David Feige) — cut off before finishing	L. Redmond — begins with no pause (interruption)
02:26:37.60	"That motion's out of order, Lisa."	#1 "The motion's out of order."
02:26:41.98	"The motion's out."	#2 "that order."
02:26:44.82	"We've done this multiple times."	#3 "No, we have not."
02:26:54.29	"The motion is out of"	#4 "No, we have not. David."
02:26:59.30	"Lisa"	#5 "And a bylaw that says."
02:27:02.52	"This one."	#6 "There's what goes on consent."
02:27:06.95	"Lisa, I'm once again, it's out."	#7 "You're interrupting that you didn't get your way last month."
02:27:11.47	"Old."	#8 "This is how it."

Instance 4 — "Your time is up" / end-of-meeting exchange

Chair unable to close out L. Redmond's allotted speaking time or transition to the next speaker (Helen Fallon).

03:09:35.00 – 03:11:13.00 | 3 interruptions identified

Time	Chair (David Feige) — cut off before finishing	L. Redmond — begins with no pause (interruption)
03:11:01.90	"Thank you, Lisa."	#1 "out of order. I don't understand."
03:11:05.32	"Lisa."	#2 "Obviously."
03:11:09.87	"Lisa, Lisa, your time is up. Please, Helen, go ahead."	#3 "That's the problem."

Instance 5 — Reconsideration / "discussion" exchange

Chair unable to complete a ruling on the status of the prior vote or transition to the reconsideration motion.

02:57:00.00 – 02:59:00.00 | 6 interruptions identified

Time	Chair (David Feige) — cut off before finishing	L. Redmond — begins with no pause (interruption)
02:57:57.03	"No..."	#1 "And discuss."
02:58:00.18	"No, she's right."	#2 "It involves an open discussion, and it involves, like, what Dr. Nightingale said about... Stakeholders and..."
02:58:10.30	"Lisa, we, we had a discuss, we had a discussion about this. Everybody voted."	#3 "We did not have a discussion."
02:58:11.88	"Everybody."	#4 "being shut down, David."
02:58:14.28	"Lisa."	#5 "I've been told we were."
02:58:28.47	"You voted the way, you voted the way you voted. I'm entirely, before we adjourn, if there's a motion to reconsider, we can absolutely entertain it. Everybody already voted."	#6 "It can fail again, but I'll make the motion to reconsider so we can talk."

Instance 6 — "Dupe me twice" exchange

Chair's repeated, on-the-record admonitions to be respectful were themselves talked over in real time.

01:43:15.00 – 01:44:20.00 | 4 interruptions identified

Time	Chair (David Feige) — cut off before finishing	L. Redmond — begins with no pause (interruption)
01:43:51.49	"Lisa."	#1 "I'm still talking, do not."

Time	Chair (David Feige) — cut off before finishing	L. Redmond — begins with no pause (interruption)
01:43:58.93	<i>"I'm, I'm, I am admonishing you again. Please be"</i>	#2 "I'm, I'm saying"
01:43:59.95	<i>"Please be respectful.."</i>	#3 "You're using up all my time, David, by interrupting me."
01:44:07.08	<i>"Lisa, please be respectful toward other board members."</i>	#4 "Shame on you, dupe me twice, shame on me. This is no, we don't reconsider something until somebody from the prevailing side shows up."

Summary

Instance	Time Range	Interruptions
Instance 1 — Renewed motion after being ruled out of order	01:27:47.00–01:29:20.00	12
Instance 2 — "Grounds for a censure" exchange	02:13:42.00–02:14:34.00	4
Instance 3 — LUPC consent-calendar motion / appeal	02:26:11.00–02:31:17.00	8
Instance 4 — "Your time is up" / end-of-meeting exchange	03:09:35.00–03:11:13.00	3
Instance 5 — Reconsideration / "discussion" exchange	02:57:00.00–02:59:00.00	6
Instance 6 — "Dupe me twice" exchange	01:43:15.00–01:44:20.00	4
TOTAL		37

Thus, across six separate stretches of a single meeting, spanning agenda items as varied as a special-meeting motion, LUPC consent-calendar dispute, a reconsideration vote, and the meeting's closing minutes, L. Redmond spoke over and/or interrupted the Chair on about 37 separate, timestamped occasions. This is materially more than the Chair's own contemporaneous count in the room ("third...fourth...fifth time," given during Instance 1 alone, which itself contained 12 of the 37). The pattern is not concentrated in one dispute or tied to the outcome of any one motion — it recurs whether the Chair's ruling was later sustained or overturned. What is constant across all six instances is the refusal to allow the presiding officer to complete a sentence, a ruling, or a directive without being talked over. Even a cursory review of the record or a brief listen to the proceedings make manifest that her repeated conduct impeded the orderly conduct of council business and clearly meets the standard set for Censure set forth in Article V Section 8 of the VNC bylaws.

Item 2: Letter of Christopher Lee

February 9, 2026

To the VNC Board -

In addition to the health issues that I was/am dealing with, there was a significant pattern of harassment from several Board Members, most notably Helen Fallon and Lisa Redmond, directed to myself that bled into their behavior towards our stakeholders towards the end of my term that led to my resignation.

There were several email correspondences between us that were, in my opinion, clearly bullying constantly insinuating incompetence and failure, despite the fact that many of the occasions that they have pointed to were from the chairs prior to me. These emails *may* still be in my VNC email, and I'd be glad to release those to you for review if they still exist.

In addition, their behavior towards our community was something that I could not stand for (notable example Lisa flicking off a member of the public) and the lack of correction from DONE and the President left me concerned that I had little to no protection against their behavior.

Lastly, as you can see, they often weaponize the ignorance around proceedings to their advantage, when convenient, or disregard decorum completely when they have a point they want to make. This double standard in behavior was also never addressed, leading to a culture of disdain, abuse, and intimidation that occurred both in the Committee and Board levels.

In my opinion, DONE needs to have stepped in months ago to correct the behaviors and to restore a working NC in Venice. I hope this helps illuminate some more of the reasons for my resignation, and I'll keep you posted on the physical health side as I do want to return to serving the community when my body is not out to betray me.

—

Christopher Lee