

## Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting June 6, 2018

### Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Michèle Hansen, Ben Baldwin, Bill Cavellini, Erik Neu, Ann Camara, Tori Antonino, Erik Neu, Ben Bradlow, Pennie Taylor

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: Van Hardy, Tom, Jessica Eshleman, Simon Hill, Gary Trujillo, Matt Taylor, Nia Lambert

Co-Facilitators: Bill Cavellini

### Agenda

1. Welcome
  - a. Bill welcomed the group and led off introductions
2. Approve minutes from 5/30
  - a. No quorum at start so vote postponed
  - b. Vote: 7 yes, 1 abstention
3. Public Comment
  - a. Gary- Tim Talun had a question concerning the make-up of the negotiating committee
    - i. Tom- Can we restate the question
    - ii. Erik Neu- Recites question
    - iii. Ben Bradlow- Can we discuss this under agenda item 6?
    - iv. Simon- Within the rules the USNC elected a negotiating committee
      1. Bill- Yes the bylaws are explicit on this
    - v. Michèle- I think we can say exactly what happened. Nothing about the way the committee members were chosen makes me uneasy.
  - b. Simon- I'd like to speak against the public comment period as it is. I think the group is small enough to allow free comments.
    - i. Tori- Any 10 members of the USNC can bring an agenda item that must be addressed within something like ten days
4. Further discussion of "Good Food for All" program
  - a. Jessica- June 23-30th, the Union Square community is raising awareness and funds for the SNAP match at the farmers market. SNAP is formerly known as food stamps.
  - b. Erik- What is the request for support from the neighborhood council?
    - i. Jessica- Request is to consider coming to participating businesses and encourage network to do the same. Contributions are also accepted- we are a 501(c)(3)
  - c. Ben Bradlow- We have a general mandate to support our community. Including a notice about this is included in this.
  - d. Ann- Is there a flyer?
    - i. Jessica- Yes. We will also have social media but we are trying to reach those who we are not yet reaching.
    - ii. Jessica- I can share what I'm working on with the O&C Committee
  - e. Vote in favor of publicizing Good Food for All: 6 yes, 0 abstain 0 opposed
5. Discussion & decision on USNC hosting a meeting with the Board of Alderman June 18th on US2's Phase 1 plan and delay in transferring additional land to US2

- a. Simon- Let's do the meeting.
  - b. Ben Baldwin- Can we informally agree here and email the rest of the board to get the 1 vote we need to make it happen
    - i. Michèle- Can we skype someone in?
  - c. Ben Bradlow- I've expressed to the alderman already that I'm concerned that there could be meetings about this issue, and then the mayor will come to the BOA with a demand to transfer the land asap. There hasn't been the sense of urgency in taking up our issues, while another party can get that sense of urgency. I think we should have the meeting, but I want to emphasize the need to put pressure on our allies on the BOA to move our process along. Mark Neidergang's response to our letter suggests that it may not be possible to get our recognition until after summer recess. Delaying our recognition until August.
    - i. Erik Neu- This time of year, budget and financial topics take precedence at the BOA. The idea is to convince the BOA and US2 that their land transfer has to wait.
  - d. Tori- Do we need to wait for the BOA to recognize to start negotiations? As long as US2 recognizes us.
    - i. Michèle- I think so
    - ii. Bill- What is the status of Erik Mike and Rachel's attempt to make contact with US2?
      - 1. Erik- Received response today. We haven't discussed or responded. Proposed the 14th at 9am.
    - iii. Simon- US2 seems to have already kind of recognized USNC. We can bring up our issues and priorities at the meeting.
  - e. Van Hardy- What is the purpose of the meeting?
    - i. Discuss letter, our problems with D2 and why we're asking for a delay. BOA don't have meetings Mondays.
  - f. Tori- I reject Mark Neidergang's claim that our request needs to wait. We should schedule the meeting and push for our priorities.
  - g. Vote in favor of hosting a meeting with the BOA Monday June 18 place and time TBA:
    - i. yes- 5
    - ii. no 0
    - iii. abstain 0
6. Discussion of timetable for start & duration of training program, start of negotiations, and USNC Board meetings as training proceeds
- a. Bill hands out proposed training schedule. First session proposed for Monday, 6/11 7-9 at the Public Safety Building. All USNC Board Members encouraged to attend. Content of training sessions have not been distributed publicly.
  - b. Erik- I don't see a strategic value in hiding the topics of the negotiating training sessions. There are no curve balls, although I did find one item that was missing.
  - c. Bill- Should details of training be discussed in open session?
    - i. Ben Bradlow- If I had not attended exec sessions I would be confused right now. People should be assured that there is a clear mechanism for reporting back issues discussed in executive session.
    - ii. Bill- So we should discuss item 7 first?
    - iii. Ben- yes

1. Michèle- Seconded
  - d. Return to topic:
  - e. Bill- What does the group think for approximate start of negotiations with US2?
    - i. Michèle- I can't make the 16th, will there be written information?
      1. Bill- unclear
    - ii. Bill- General outline of training sessions
    - iii. Bill- Some flexibility on 6/16. Given responses from resource people, could be 16th or 17th. Any preference?
      1. None stated
  - f. Pennie- Motion to approve the timetable
    - i. Michèle- seconded
      1. 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention
  - g. Bill- We can determine start of negotiations when trainings are done. Soon after
    - i. General agreement
  - h. Bill- Absence of architects who have agreed to participate. There is still time until session for in July.
  - i. Tori- I can help flesh out the training sessions.
    - i. Pennie, Ann can also help
  - j. Erik- Omission in trainings- finance and business of real estate. Understanding the flip side of our negotiating position.
    - i. Bill- Would it be ok to be part of session 2?
    - ii. Erik- Don't care
  - k. Bill- Should we schedule USNC meetings during training period (June 11- July 16)
    - i. Ann- I suggest we have meetings in the gap between training sessions
    - ii. Erik- We voted on a motion to require report back so there have to be meetings.
    - iii. Simon- Oversight in timeline- summer session in July and August, people are going to be away. Better to aim for September for negotiations. Also need to have board meetings to prepare for other things
    - iv. Bill- Should we have a board meeting next week?
  - l. Erik- Motion to skip the week of 13th, meet on week of 20th. Unless people submit urgent agenda items by the 9th
    - i. Seconded
    - ii. Vote: 7, opposed: 1
7. Discussion & decision on mechanism for oversight of the Board over Negotiating Team
- a. Ben Bradlow- In union negotiations there is periodic reporting about priorities, progress, etc.
    - i. Bill- When a union is sharing updates with members, they card at the door. Not exactly analogous.
    - ii. Ben- If we conduct all discussion in total darkness, when an agreement is proposed to the public it may be hard to get a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote.
    - iii. Michèle- The question is what is appropriate to put out to the whole council rather than just the board.

- b. Pennie- Our membership is close to 1000. We can make an effort to remind people what we're doing.
  - i. Ann- We're not going to have real answers every day.
- c. Erik- There are two pools of people to concern ourselves with; Those who have lost faith and those who never had it. In an effort to bridge trust, we can have someone report back.
- d. Tori- My concern with canvassing further is that issues may be skewed a certain way, angling for a certain benefit over another.
- e. Ben Bradlow- Mobilizing for support is not the primary issue on the table
- f. Ann- I want people to know what the process is but we won't know what to give them until negotiations begin.
- g. Michèle- Can we publicize some of the top things that we are fighting for?
- h. Bill- Strategy and tactics shared with board, but not with general membership. Report on progress made in negotiations, subject matter. It's important to keep people informed.
- i. Ben Bradlow- Michèle's idea sounds right. The CBA report outlines a lot of this.
- j. Erik- One early thing that will come out of this is that the negotiating committee come up with a list of specific priorities. Maybe this is voted on by the board with a role call vote and published to the membership. Motion to make this part of report-backs: Negotiating committee comes up with a list of SMART priorities, voted on by board in role call vote with the results of the role call vote published to the membership.
  - i. Bill- Seconded
  - ii. Discussion of how to deal with new things as they come up, that may not be in line with priorities
  - iii. Ben Bradlow- We can come out with a maximalist position with trade offs happening in the process of negotiating. Have to make it clear by publishing a public summary of our asks.
  - iv. Pennie- As a board we have already given approval of our CBA document as a maximalist position.
  - v. Erik- Amend the motion to SMART priorities
  - vi. Tori- It will not be the content published or the role call? If it is the content, I don't want it published.
  - vii. Ben Bradlow- Description of Negot. team members was technical. Prioritization, in my sense, was dealt with in the election. Delegation got a technical body brings us to questionable territory. One way to avoid this is to have the board participate in the training sessions.
  - viii. Pennie- I see two layers of decisions- priorities and smart goals within those priorities
    - 1. Bill- I suggest we cross that bridge when we come to it
  - ix. Tori- Is the motion that the negotiating team come up with the smart goals?
  - x. Ben Baldwin- Motion to close discussion
    - 1. Pennie- Seconded
    - 2. Vote: 8 in favor
  - xi. Vote- 4 in favor, 4 opposed. Does not pass
- k. Erik- I agree that it is the job of the board to decide on priorities. I am not able to attend the schedule as proposed. I made the motion to ensure that someone was working toward smart goals

- l. Ben Bradlow- We need substantive deliberation on smart goals/priorities. Substantive decisions rest with the board not the negotiating team.
  - m. Tori- Smart goals could come out of those who participate in negotiating training as described in the calendar.
  - n. Pennie- Remind everyone that this has been a democratic process. We have collected the asks for the community, so the democratically elected board can make decisions.
  - o. Erik- Motion + those of negotiating committee and present members of IUSNC Board at session discussing priorities present a list of Smart priorities with a role call vote distributed to the membership
    - i. Michèle- second
    - ii. Vote: 5, 0 opposed, 1 abstention
  - p. Bill- Discussion on Tim Talun's request
    - i. Ben Bradlow- Criteria were clear, list of applicants were publicized, USNC deliberated in executive session, and the results were publicized.
    - ii. Michèle- I move that the chair write a simple email with what Ben Bradlow just said and send it.
      - 1. Erik- I would add that the selection was a direct result of the pool of applicants
    - iii. Ben Bradlow- We can send a clarifying email. The process was transparent.
    - iv. Erik- We can provide a higher level explanation to alleviate concerns
8. Public Comment
- a. Gary- There is a lot of focus on procedure at these meetings, which can be used to obscure the substance of issues being discussed. I want to call attention to the fact that Tim's question was declared when I raised it at this meeting during the first comment period to be such that it could not be considered because Tim is not present at the meeting. I replied at that time that the question is my own as well as being Tim's, at which point several members of the board agreed that that fact makes the matter worthy of consideration. However, when the item came up for discussion by the board, no reference was made to that fact, and it was again being thought of as Tim Talun's question only, and I was not permitted to comment on what I felt to be statements about the matter during that discussion, in which only board members were allowed to participate, that were entirely beside the point. There was an assertion made by the chairman that amounted to a claim that since a clear procedure was followed and the composition of the negotiating committee was decided by the board (during executive session, which cannot be witnessed by non-board members, and the proceedings of which are not reported to the membership), no further accounting is necessary. No amount of citing history or procedure, however, is relevant to the question asked by Tim and myself as to a request concerning disclosure of the specific qualifications of members of the appointed negotiating committee relative to representation of the several matters for which it will be required to advocate during CBA negotiations, especially as regards obtaining concessions on "indoor civic space" (community center).

- b. Simon- USNC is the elected body to keep oversight over the negotiating committee.

9. Next Meeting

- a. Wednesday June 20 unless urgent agenda items come up by June 9

10. Executive Session

- a. Tori: Motion to go into executive session because of personnel and strategy matters of negotiating team, as long as there's a brief recess
  - i. Pennie- seconded
  - ii. Vote: 8 in favor