

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting June 20, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Michèle Hansen, Ben Baldwin, Bill Cavellini, Ann Camara, Rachel Weil, Joanne Berry

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: Van Hardy, Gary Trujillo, Father Richard Curran, Joe Beckman, René Mardones, Wig Zamore, Ann

Co-Facilitators: Bill Cavellini

Agenda

1. Welcome
 - a. Quorum not achieved. Bill led off introductions
2. Approve minutes from 6/6
3. Public Comment
 - a. Joe Beckman- Has there been any followup from the YMCA?
 - i. Ann- I am going to ask the library, arts council, and YMCA to come to a meeting next week
 - ii. Father Richard – I met with YMCA director Bill Murphy recently
4. Recap on Monday meeting
 - a. Bill reviewed the discussion between USNC members and Board of Aldermen from Monday 6/18 on USNC recognition as CBA negotiators with US2
 - b. There is a meeting prior to the Legislative Matters Committee, proposed by Mark Niedergang, to jumpstart the CBO ordinance process to get it in shape for a vote
 - c. Joe Beckman- Is there any discussion of rental vs. condos? This could be important for the real estate transfer fee.
5. MEPA Updates
 - a. Joanne- Imperative that we stop bringing MEPA up in discussions since we have leverage on it. These are regulations that are required and shouldn't be discussed by the negotiating committee or CBA. We know a waiver request is coming and they cannot be allowed to get that waiver. In order to ensure they are not granted a waiver, we need to get the community involved. The project has many components that trigger environmental reviews
 - i. Bill- I have said that MEPA is a leverage point, but I have never meant to imply that it could be sacrificed for something else.
 - ii. Joanne- Good, then it should not be discussed in a way that
 - iii. ___ - I want to get as much attention focused on the BOA passing the CBO as possible at the pre-meeting and Legislative Matters meeting. USNC needs support at each of these meetings. Need to bring attention to importance of a formal agreement. What is the ideal scenario for tomorrow?
 1. Joanne- Summary of what we have asked for in the May letter to the BOA with our asks sent to membership
 2. Rachel- Pre-meeting is at 5pm. Not sure of the extent to which the Legislative Matters meeting will be relevant to

our purposes.

3. ____ - Who will be in attendance tomorrow? The point is to show our investment.
 - a. Ann will be there at 5. Michèle may be able to go in the beginning.
 - iv. Joanne- I propose that I send out an email guiding people on how to comment on submissions from US2
 1. Michèle- I think you are already empowered to do this
 - v. René- I suggest USNC see if they can get some legal assistance during hte MEPA process
 - b. Ann Camara- We need to send an email. Show up tomorrow, write letters
 - c. Wig- second largest project at assembly sq sent CDs today. There's 30 days. There needs to be a brainstorm within 7 days. There is only 1 site visit. Need a broad number of citizens to participate. Helps to show that you understand the MEPA process, understand what is in and out of jurisdiction. If they want a MEPA waiver on D2, once its done its done for 50 years. Typically >1000 pages.
 - i. USNC will send instructions on how to sign up for MEPA notifications
6. Design Review Committee meeting - updates
 - a. Rachel- There aren't any updates. DRC doesn't have a quorum, so there is no meeting planned.
7. Oversight discussion
 - a. Ben Baldwin gave a brief review of what was talked about in the last meeting. There were no firm decisions made on oversight.
 - b. Bill- I would make a suggestion that the board be fully informed on everything discussed in negotiations with developer.
 - i. Also- the board should share as much as possible with membership at regular meetings. That would include what topics were discussed within negotiations in a given week. However, I would exclude almost all strategic and tactical decisions that the negotiating team went through in coming up with priorities
 - c. Ben Baldwin- Issue is that we don't have a mechanism of reporting back. Who is the point person?
 - i. Bill- Can we do that at USNC open meetings?
 - ii. Ann- Can we have a secretary at negotiations?
 1. Bill- that idea was recommended by the expert from NJ
 2. Rachel- That subject should come up at the next training session
8. Public Comment
 - a. Joe Beckman- What partner agencies are going to be involved in negotiations?
 - i. Bill- They won't be present in negotiation sessions. They are present in training sessions. Many organizations are represented
 - b. Wig- Board membership will have to approve any agreement
 - i. Bill- Bylaws call for a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority to approve agreements
 - ii. Wig- Based on form of Assembly Square, they had many experts on different topics. We did not reveal much from negotiations. We only brought lawyers in at the last second to check language. \$50mil was on the balance.

- c. René- Thanks to the USNC board for the time spent on this process. SCC spent a long time negotiating with Clarendon Hill. They might be a good resource on negotiations.
- d. Gary Trujillo- I appreciate the need to withhold certain information from the general membership concerning negotiations, for the reasons stated by Bill. However, I feel it is important that the negotiations represent the needs and priorities of the full membership, and that there should be some mechanism devised to ensure that members can provide information about those needs and any recommendations they may have for obtaining them in CBA as they may care to express. I am particularly concerned about advocacy for specific citizen desires regarding the community center, and do not feel confident that the planned "training sessions" for negotiators will be adequate for that purpose..
 - i. Bill- I'd encourage you to speak with the people representing the community center at the training session, and invite you to write your thoughts on the subject, expressing whatever you may be able to collect from others who have strong feelings on that subject.
 - ii. Gary- I will do so on condition that what I write be read out during the community center portion of the CBA training session.
 - iii. Bill- agreed
 - iv. Gary- Tim Talun had been invited to participate in the training session. It seems not accidental that you haven't heard from him.
 - v. Bill- We wrote to Tim but never heard from him. (Bill went into some detail concerning the way the invitation to Tim was made and what was done subsequently to cover the topics that Tim would have covered had he accepted the invitation, and said that Tim's thoughts would likely be incorporated anyway into what would be said by those who will be handling that portion of the training session.)
 - vi. Gary- It seems reasonable to assume that Tim's non-reply is related to the fact that questions he has raised, such as the one concerning the composition of the CBA negotiating committee qualifications, have also been ignored. I feel it would be good to have people such as Tim and Rob.... (At this point Bill, cut off Gary with a re-statement of what he had said previously about how Tim had not responded to the invitation. Gary objected that he was not permitted to finish his sentence, which he said was intended to express the importance of having people people such as these participate in USNC activities, not only the training session, especially those who would be representing the Union Square Neighbors, which would enable the USNC to be more credible and effective and to be more likely to gain support from the segment of the neighborhood represented by that entity).

9. Next Meeting

- a. No meeting scheduled.

10. Executive Session

- a. Bill: Motion to go into executive session because of personnel and strategy matters of negotiating team, as long as there's a brief recess
 - i. Ben seconded
 - ii. No quorum- could not vote