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1. Call to Order. Roll Call.

Present: Kornberg, Ostrow, Demmers, Price, Ferris, Masi, Desai, Khanjian, Menz, Iaderosa, Ghazarian, Bae

Late: De Ocampo, McCarthy, O'Grady, Campbell, Khanjian

Excused: Malhi

Absent: Robbins

2. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items.

None.

3. Reports from Government Officials.

a. DWP representative Greg Bartz: Reporting on rate increases and ratepayer’s advocate

b. Assemblymember Mike Gatto: Explaining district line changes that will go into effect in the next election that will keep all Griffith Park adjacent neighborhoods in one district. Sharing his goal of working closely with local offices on neighborhood and stakeholder issues. Noting Assembly office’s role in encouraging DMV raids on Los Feliz Blvd to resolve used car sales issue. Explaining his support for a Rainy Day Fund and a reduced reliance on capital gains revenue to help curb impact of tax revenue cycles on state budget.

Bae: Asking if the office will again offer tax preparation assistance.

Gatto: Confirming this will again be offered in March.

Ferris: Asking about views on High Speed Rail

Gatto: Explaining that this is a political issue and he has not yet seen enough to know how key committee members will vote, but he thinks it is possible it will not be supported by the legislature.

Ostrow: Expressing his dismay at cuts to education and social support systems.

Gatto: Sharing his agreement that education cuts have been horrific. Explaining that the initiative process has strangled the budget process and left higher education and the judicial system vulnerable.

De Ocampo arrives.

Public Comment: Asking about proposed constitutional amendment LA City Council has recently supported limiting definition of person to humans and denying corporations equal speech rights.
Gatto: Agreeing with the basic sentiment of the proposal that corporations should not enjoy the same free speech protections as humans.

Bae: Asking about initiative process and voter education.

Gatto: Noting groups like Think Long and others are calling for this kind of education process, including a constitutional convention, but suggesting that reform is more likely to come in a piecemeal fashion through the legislature.

c. Nicole Carcel, Assemblyman Mike Feuer’s Office: Noting this is the Assemblymember’s last term. Sharing legislation on AEG stadium in the last term and on proposed legislation for similar future projects. Still looking for other legislative ideas from local groups and stakeholders.

Bae: Asking if the Assemblymember has announced his plans after he leaves this office.

Carcel: Feuer is running unopposed for City Attorney

d. MetroExpressLanes Program Presentation, Kathy McCune: Congestion reduction project. $274 million budget. Converts HOV lanes to Metro Express Lane. MetroExpress lanes serve busses and “dynamic pricing users.” Effort to change travel behavior to carpool and bus use. Carpoolers and bus users will use the lanes for free. Goal is to keep Metro Express Lanes moving at 45 mph. Enforcement by CHP monitoring through FastTrak technology. For those not using the program the most noticeable change will be in signage. Adding 59 new buses, other partnering transit agencies will also be adding additional buses. Revenues will be reinvested in the corridor for improvements. Express Lanes will open in October 2012 and February 2013. Transponders will be available in April. More information available at www.metro.net/expresslanes

Ghazarian: Asking about enforcement mechanisms.

McCune: Explaining that ticketing will be issued both by CHP and automated camera system.

Desai: Voicing opposition to this proposal. Concerned about unintended consequence of creating congestion in an uncontested lane designed to encourage carpooling.

McCune: Noting that this program has been implemented throughout the country and has been proven effective. Also noting that this is a one-year demonstration program.

Kornberg: Asking about minimum speeds.

McCune: Currently more than 45 mph. Under new system, if average trip falls below that speed trip cost is refunded to single drivers who paid.

Menz: Clarifying that current 110 lanes and one 10 lane will be converted, while additional 10 lane is added.

Ostrow: Asking about use of red-light cameras.

McCune: Explaining that cameras are only used to catch cars that don’t have transponders.

Ostrow: Asking about out-of-state drivers.

McCune: Explaining they will be required to follow the same rules as local drivers.

Ostrow: Asking about how drivers will know what costs are if they don’t know how their distance.

McCune: Explaining signs will show price per quarter mile, price to major mid-way hub, and to end of corridor.

Ostrow: Asking fees charged to “inactive” users.

McCune: Explaining that free rides by carpoolers count as activity.

Desai: Asking about signage.
McCune: Explaining the signs will be similar to current traffic signs.

O’Grady arrives.
Campbell arrives.

Public Comment:
Norma Zager from Los Feliz Ledger: Asking how budget and revenue.
McCune: $274 in public funds. Projecting $10 million dollars per year once it’s operational. Explaining performance measured in terms of average vehicle speeds for all lanes and other measures.
Ostrow: Tabling Executive Reports until after other items.

4. GPAC Spring Fling Presentation & MOTION to send GGPNC Representatives to the April 7th Event

McCarthy: Introducing Michael Pickering, representative of Griffith Park Community Center and Club
Pickering: Sharing event details, including games, vendors, and live entertainment. Explaining table and two chairs available for GGPNC representatives.

MOTION:
McCarthy moves to accept this invitation and send representatives to staff this event. Ghazarian seconds. No Objection. Passed by consensus.

5. Committee Reports

a. Education Committee: MOTION: Submit a letter and Community Impact Statement (CIS) to the L.A. City Council supporting its previously adopted Council Resolution 11-0002-S123: "Corporate Activities in Electoral Processes" also asking they urge our State and Federal Representatives follow suit in advocating for a U.S. Constitutional amendment, specifying corporations and individuals are differentiated, and monetary contributions to political entities does not constitute free speech. (submitted by Price, Mauceri, O’Grady; presentation by Julia Russell)

MOTION:
Prices moves. Campbell seconds.

Public Comment:
Julia Russell: Representing Move to Amend. Explaining history of Amendment and approval in city council and other neighborhood councils. Sharing large number of petition signatures. And explaining that this language can be amended however the board wishes.
Dave Bass: Supporting this motion and recommending the book “Unequal Protection.”
Barry Levine: Supporting this motion. Encouraging public outreach on this issue.
Nathan Green: Supporting the motion and encouraging public outreach.

Questions:
Ferris: Asking about McCain Feingold and Citizens United decision, and impact on unions, because unlike that legislation and decision, this amendment seems to attempt to unlink those two types of entities.

Russell: Explaining she doesn't know if this would cover unions or not, or why the word union is not included here as it is in other documents.

Public Commenter explains that unions are treated identically to corporations.

Bae: Confirming LA City Council has already approved this.

Discussion:

McCarthy: Supporting this motion and urging public outreach on this topic.

Ferris objects.

VOTE:

In Favor: McCarthy, Price, Masi, Desai, Campbell, Khanjian, De Ocampo, Bae, Ostrow, Demmers, Iaderosa, O’Grady

Opposed: Menz, Ghazarian

Abstaining: Ferris, Kornberg

Motion passes by majority vote.

b. Public Safety Committee: Report, Discussion and Action as Appropriate regarding the proliferation of medical marijuana dispensaries in the Los Feliz area.

Iaderosa: Sharing that two marijuana dispensaries have opened in a one block area in Los Feliz. These businesses are supposed to report to the city and neighborhood council. A third has opened two blocks away. Asking that the council join other neighborhood councils in supporting a ban on dispensaries until regulation by the city is possible. Introducing Captain Murphy.

Public Comment:

Captain Gillian Murphy: Explaining that he does not take a position on this issue and is only here to share concerns and statistics. There are 47 dispensaries in the Northeast division’s jurisdiction. There are concerns in the neighborhood, including concerns about a secondary market.

Eric Moore, Vice President EHNC: This is an issue the EHNC has been working on for some time. This is not about the legality of marijuana, but about the regulation of local businesses.

Craig Cox, Public Safety Chair, EHNC: sharing experience with these businesses, including one building which remains vacant as landlord looks to find a paying tenant besides a local known-gang affiliate who wishes to open a dispensary there.

Doug Hanes, EHNC: Neighborhood has a high vacancy rate and new dispensaries opening. Noting that pending lawsuits would be mooted by this measure and would save funds. Any other business is subject to greater regulation than this.

Mauceri arrives.

MOTION:

Iaderosa moves to support pending City Council proposal to ban marijuana dispensaries. Ghazarian seconds.
Questions:
Menz: Asking if a dispensary license is required.
Murphy: It’s a business license.
Bae: Asking about crackdown in the city last year.
Murphy: Explaining that narcotics division has to enforce that and it has been difficult to do so. Violators continue unabated.
Bae: Asking how the ban will work.
Iaderosa: Confirming all existing businesses would be shutdown, but individuals would be permitted to grow their own supply.
Ferris: Asking about state involvement.
Murphy: District Attorney and City Attorney could not agree on interpretation and so law enforcement was prevented from acting.
Iaderosa: State appellate court ruled that Federal law preempted state and local measures regulating these businesses.
McCarthy: Asking about enforcement against doctors.
Cox: City of Long Beach tried to regulate doctors, but state licensing board prevented this.
Desai: Asking where users who used to frequent dispensary will buy product once it’s banned.
Iaderosa: Previous, illegal sources.
Campbell: Clarifying ban would make all existing business banned, but individuals with prescriptions who frequent a banned dispensary won’t be committing a violation.
De Ocampo: Asking about budget impacts.
Iaderosa: These are collectives and are not paying city taxes.
De Ocampo: Asking about realities for legitimate users.
Murphy: Explaining users can grow up to eight plants, but also noting that it will be many years before they are all closed and hopefully in that time regulation will be possible.
Demmers: Clarifying this is a city ordinance and other nearby towns won’t be impacted.
Ostrow: Confirming this was caused by conflict in state decision and City Attorney opinion. Asking if any effort was made to reach out to local dispensaries. Confirming there are three dispensaries in our area.
Iaderosa: Explaining she did not ask why local businesses did not approach the neighborhood council because she learned that the court decision struck down that requirement.
Campbell: Asking how the ban helps law enforcement.
Murphy: Additional regulation is required. But this is a stop gap measure until regulation can be enacted.

Discussion:
McCarthy: Root cause seems to be doctors over prescribing. One suggestion might be tying prescription pickup to location of doctor’s office.
Mauceri: There is an exploited loophole here. This measure a first step in controlling this issue.
Masi: Supporting this. It is the only way to move towards regulations. Not concerned about what those regulations will be yet.
Bae: Opposed to this ban because there is a fundamental supply and demand issue and this ban won’t change that. It’s not fair to businesses to enforce a ban because government can’t figure out what else to do.

Desai: Opposing motion because these businesses will just seek black market venues to continue their operations.

Menz: Clarifying that these should be taxed beginning this year.

Ghazarian: Supporting the ban and arguing that legitimate avenues will remain intact despite the ban.

O’Grady: Reflecting on original intent of legislation was to help those who had a medical need, and this will help return to that intent.

Ferris: Supporting motion. Noting this has all happened rapidly and the ban allows additional time for the city to adjust to the new paradigm.

Ostrow: Does not see this as a supply and demand issue or as a physician abuse issue. This is about the ability to regulate a business in the city. Growing marijuana at home is not a practical solution. Regulations we had weren’t bad, but they were preempted by federal law. If the city council passes this it will be subject to the same conflict. Predicts this will be an empty gesture.

Masi: Explaining the goal isn’t to get rid of anything, but to properly regulate to communal satisfaction. Police discretion will target abusive violators first and hopefully regulation will be in place in time.

De Ocampo calls the question. Bae seconds.

Bae objects.

**VOTE:**

In Favor: Khanjian, Menz, Iaderosa, O’Grady, Kornberg, Demmers, Mauceri, McCarthy, Price, Ferris, Masi, Campbell, Ghazarian

Opposed: Ostrow, Bae

Abstains: De Ocampo, Desai

Motion passes by majority vote.

c. Green Committee: MOTION: GGPNC supports efforts to legalize urban beekeeping in Los Angeles and encourages the City Planning Department to initiate an ordinance that would allow residents to raise their own honeybees, a practice that helps boost struggling honeybee populations and ensures local food security.

**MOTION:**

Campbell moves. Ferris seconds.

Chelsea McFarland: Sharing her experience in her garden with a bee swarm and her support for this measure. 80% of plants are bee-pollinated. Bee colony collapse is a serious issue and threatens food supply. Individual beekeepers are a simple solution to this issue. County inspector reports there are 9 existing colonies per square mile in the city already. So these bees will exist regardless, but under this policy they can exist safely and healthily.

Public Comment:

Joe Andrews: Supporting motion and sharing experience as a bee-mover.

Ashley Fontenot, Ceebs Bailey, Roberta Kato: Supporting motion.
Summer Spanton: Sharing experience as beekeeper and supporting motion.
Maritza Prezkop: Co-chair of outreach committee in Mar Vista. Supporting this effort and sharing benefits her community has enjoyed through their involvement.
Kirk Anderson: Supporting the motion and sharing experience as a bee-removal specialist.

Questions:
Bae: Asking about current legal status?
Campbell: Explaining it is illegal by default, but requires a permit. This measure would encourage legal regulation of beekeeping.

Discussion:
Ferris: Supporting this and thanking the Green Committee for bringing this.
O'Grady: Sharing his experience in bee removal and supporting this motion.
Menz: Supporting the motion, and clarifying this would put our name on a list of supporting councils.
Ostrow: Supporting the motion.
No Objection. Passed by consensus.

d. Sports & Recreation Committee:

i. **MOTION:** Adopt a resolution supporting the youth ball field project in Griffith Park.

**MOTION:**
Mauceri moves. Menz seconds.
Mauceri: Explaining Proposition K makes money available for recreation in areas lacking facilities. CD4 received funds to restore funds in Griffith Park. The proposal is to reinstate ball fields that were removed when the I-5 freeway was built. There is an expiration date on the funds and so timely action is important.

Public Comment:
Erica Chapman: Mom of two young children and past president of Los Feliz Mom's Club and supporting this resolution. Suggesting there is huge community support for this proposal.
Joe Young: Chair of GGPNC PROS committee. Explaining that this resolution is premature. The local committee has only met once and has been encouraged to explore all options. Those options have not yet been explored. The LVNOC should get a chance to weigh in on this. The GGPNC PROS Committee should also be given an opportunity to weigh in on this.

Questions
Ferris: Asking if the LVNOC will consider our proposal.
Mauceri: Explaining that the LVNOC is tasked with gathering community support.
Kornberg: Asking about timeline?
Mauceri: Explaining ball field proposal has already been through vetting by larger regional group and it is now the LVNOC's role to vet local support.
Masi: Asking is this proposal has large chain link fences?
Mauceri: LVNOC has already told engineers this needs to fit in with the character of Griffith Park. Certain materials will be preferable. But that has been the recommendation of the LVNOC thus far. Explaining existing ball field in this location is an adult field and proposed additional fields will be smaller and designed for children's leagues.
Campbell: Clarifying funds that have been granted are granted for the purpose of building a ball field in Griffith Park. Asking why PROS support has not been sought?

Mauceri: Explaining that he represents the Sports & Recreation Committee only and can’t speak for PROS.

Joe Young: Explaining his view that it is not yet appropriate for the committees or the council to weigh in on this. That should wait until after the LVNOC has finished its work.

Khanjian: Clarifying that this proposal has been approved at regional level and must be finalized by LVNOC by spring.

Mauceri: Explaining that Bureau of Engineering has developed this plan and it will probably change before it is finished. Final decision holder is the Department of Recreation and Parks.

Demmers: Asking about timeline. Asking if there is competition for the funding.

Mauceri: Prop K passed 10 years ago and there is rolling funding. This plan about to expire. If the LVNOC decides there is not support for this then we would forgo funding.

Ostrow: Clarifying that the resolution supports basic concept but not plan specifics. Clarifying that LVNOC is supposed to seek this kind of support but also public input on plan specifics. Asking since additional input will be needed in the future how this is pressing.

Mauceri: Explaining that the plan specifics will come back before this body as well as historic monument commission and other groups. Pressing today because the first question the LVNOC is supposed to answer is whether there is community support.

Ghazarian: Questioning urgency.

Mauceri: Explaining that if the council waits the LVNOC may lose its chance to support this.

Menz: Clarifying that GGPNC is just voting on this basic idea, not on a final plan.

Kornberg: Asking is there is a CEQA review.

Mauceri: Has heard conflicting information on this question and does not know the answer.

Ferris: Confirming PROS Committee members were made aware of LVNOC meeting.

Masi: Confirming proposed fields are adjustable for different ages/games.

Discussion:

Demmers: Two committee chairs interpreted this process differently. But failing to vote now will look like a lack of support, which is not preferable.

Menz: Supporting this motion and sharing positive experiences playing team ball as a young child and softball as an adult.

Campbell: Supporting project but urging collaboration with PROS Committee.

Ostrow: Supporting motion. Ultimately engineers will have to meet certain requirements and their plans will be subject to public review.

Ferris: Noting that there are limited options for LVNOC to explore – this is a proposal for a ball field. There was an opportunity for a PROS Committee meeting on this. And if the PROS Committee wants to meet in the future they can bring additional comments at that time.

Mauceri: Clarifying that the resolution does not include the attached maps. Noting that comparable city parks in other locations have many ball fields and this is an area where our community is lagging. This is an active committee. The inactivity of one committee should not be a reason to stymie the activity of another.

Masi: Noting that representative from PROS did not voice any opposition, just that there is another more appropriate time to address this.
Ghazarian: Sharing his concern that both sides have not been heard on this.

O'Grady: Urgency comes from wanting to get things done. To wait another month just puts off the work another month. And there will be other opportunities to oppose this.

Ostrow: Noting that the PROS committee didn’t meet because it was their position that a meeting at a later time would be appropriate. The PROS Committee had 72 hours notice on this, just like the public.

Kornberg: Supporting the motion.

Menz calls the question. Bae seconds. No objection. Passed by consensus.

Khanjian leaves.

ii. **MOTION** (Mauceri, Bae, Menz): Appropriate up to $75 for field sign installation hardware at T.S. King Athletic Field.

**MOTION:**
Mauceri moves. Bae seconds.
Mauceri: explains double-sided signs need to be bolted together. This motion allocates funds for that process.
Masi calls the question. Bae seconds. No Objection. Passed by consensus.

iii. **MOTION** (Mauceri, Bae, Menz): Appropriate up to $300 for informational print materials for Griffith Park Youth Ball fields Proposition K Project.

**MOTION:**
Mauceri moves. Menz seconds.
Mauceri: Explaining there is a ban on lobbying.
McCarthy calls the question. Bae seconds. No objection. Passed by consensus.

De Ocampo leaves.

c. **Rules & Elections Committee:**

Demmers: Delivering VP Administration’s Report: Explaining DONE is working on bylaws and will approve after this month’s final change. City Elections survey received 26 NC responses and 39 stakeholder responses. City Council acted before the survey deadline, asking City Attorney to transfer authority of elections to DONE. Motion was approved and DONE sent out an email saying they were taking over the election. For now it appears the Elections are back on and will occur in spring or summer. There is a minimum of 10 seats up in the next election and we need to do significant outreach to fill them. Tips from LaBonge’s leadership meeting: host a table at the farmer’s market, use the public library as a venue, post the agenda in more locations, more meaningful programs, list of registered voters is available to us. Finally, reporting on budget hearings and Jack Humphreyville is the budget advocate. Survey will be distributed and the council should distribute the link.

i. **MOTION:** The Rules and Elections Committee moves that the GGPNC By Laws be amended to change the eligibility requirements for candidates for the ten (10) District representative positions scheduled for the 2012 NC election. (Note: This amendment does not affect the remaining five (5) District Representative positions, scheduled for the 2014 NC election or the four (4) Community Interest candidates. If
approved, this amendment will be forwarded to DONE for incorporation into the GGPNC By Laws.)

**MOTION:**
Demmers moves. Bae seconds.

**MOTION TO AMEND:**
Kornberg moves to amend to eliminate reference to “Legal.” Price.

**Discussion:**
Ferris: Supporting the amendment.
Mauceri: Explaining term is lifted from election guidelines.
Demmers: Concerned about taking the word legal out, because of county supervisor race issue.
Iaderosa: Suggesting the council define “legal.”
Ostrow: Expressing opinion that these limitations require complicated enforcement issues.
Menz: Asking if this then means “illegal” residents can serve?
Kornberg: Clarifying her position that this was an undefined term and should either be defined or not included.
Ghazarian: Opposed to removing this word.
Masi: Support of removing the time limit and the word legal.
O’Grady: All our elections are done by self-affirmation. There is no verification process.
Campbell: Asking if there’s a stakeholder proof requirement.
Ferris: Understanding sensitivity to the language. But noting that if DONE doesn’t flag this language then it’s fine.
Kornberg: Explaining self-affirmation was ignored by previous city clerk administrator. The goal in this process should be to produce language that reflects the council’s best efforts and best intentions and the word legal doesn’t reflect that.
Ghazarian: This is standard language. And not using it may create additional problems.
Demmers objects.

**VOTE on AMENDMENT:**
In Favor: Bae, Ostrow, McCarthy, Price, Campbell, Kornberg
Opposed: Demmers, Mauceri, Ferris, Masi, Desai, Menz, Iaderosa, Ghazarian, O’Grady
Amendment fails by majority vote.

**VOTE ON MAIN MOTION:**
In Favor: Ferris, Masi, Desai, Campbell, Menz, Iaderosa, Ghazarian, O’Grady, Kornberg, Bae, Ostrow, Demmers, Mauceri, McCarthy, Price
Bylaw amendment passes by supermajority vote.

Desai leaves.

ii. **MOTION:** The Rules and Elections Committee moves that the GGPNC By Laws be amended to reflect the boundary change adopted by the GGPNC
Board on December 20, 2011. (Note: This By Law amendment was approved at the last meeting. We will be submitting this to DONE along with the amendment to the candidate eligibility requirements (if passed) as changes to the GGPNC By Laws.)

Demmers: Withdrawn.

iii. **MOTION:** The Rules and Elections Committee moves that the GGPNC adopt the document, GGPNC Committee Protocols into “Standing Rules, Policies and Procedures.” (Note: This is a document that Rules and Elections has been working on since late summer to codify Committee chair and committee members’ responsibilities. It is more detailed than the Committee “cheat sheet” which the Rules and Elections Committee Chair distributed earlier this fall. We feel that it is an important addition to the Standing Rules Handbook, particularly with the number of new chairs currently in place.

Note: We are asking approval for the content of this document. Once reviewed, revised, and approved, it will be reformatted to be consistent with the SRPP manual that each Board member has.)

Demmers: Tabled.

6. **Executive Committee Reports.**

   **a. President**

Ostrow: Sharing meeting with LaBonge. Culture and Events and Neighborhood Improvement chairs are vacant. Copying at CopyCat must be signed for.

Masi: Asking if there has been a discussion about functionality of the PROS Committee.

Ostrow: Explaining that VP Admin conducted a survey of the committees and determined which committees were and were not in compliance with the various activity requirements. PROS was in compliance.

   **b. Treasurer**


**MOTION:**

Kornberg moves to adopt the budget. Bae seconds. No objection. Passed by consensus.

7. **MOTION** (Bae): to spend up to $40 for coffee and donuts (from Outreach budget) for a GGPNC-sponsored Outreach effort/intro meeting on Sat., Feb. 18th, at 11am in library conference room where community volunteers are asked to devote time each week to help reshel book. (Note: Due to budget crunch, our local L.A. Public Library has had to reduce staffing. As a result, I've recently counted eight entire carts and two walls of unshelved books. There's not enough manpower to reshel all the returned books. The library serves our community not only as a venue to check out books/dvds, but also provides internet, word processing, lectures, community gatherings, books sales among other services. For some, it is a quiet sanctuary to read - for others, it is a vital lifeline to information and help.)

**MOTION:**

Bae moves. Ferris seconds.

Bae: Providing background on budget cuts, volunteer needs, and collaboration with Outreach.

No Objection. Passed by consensus.
8. **MOTION** (Bae): The GGPNC believes that the boundaries of our neighborhood council should remain intact and reside within a single City Council district. The president will immediately communicate this position to the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission via the commission's web site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bae moves. Ferris seconds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrow: Providing background on the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menz: Noting lack of clarity in language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MOTION TO AMEND:**

Ferris moves to delete “remain intact and” from motion language. Ghazarian seconds.

No objections. Amendment passed by consensus.

**Discussion on Motion as Amended:**

Iaderosa: Clarifying there is no danger of Griffith Park being split among council districts.

Demmers: Noting no one filled out the survey that was dropped off last week.

Ferris: Noting the e-blast newsletter included links to this.

No objection to Amended motion. Passed as amended by consensus.

9. **Approval of Past Meeting Minutes**

Ostrow: noting corrections in two areas in November minutes.

Kornberg: Noting changes to 7c.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bae moves to adopt November draft minutes. O'Grady seconds. No objection. Passed by consensus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kornberg: noting change to December minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bae moves to adopt December minutes. Mauceri seconds. No objection. Passed by consensus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Comments on Non-Agenda Items**

Campbell: Clarifying Transportation Committee meeting schedule.

11. **Adjourn.**

Bae moves to adjourn. Kornberg seconds. Meeting adjourned 11:35pm.