

Governance committee meeting

Mae opening the meeting

Mae presented the agenda for the meeting

Mission statement, ratified by CWG, was presented by Mae.

Mae presented Jim's draft of the co-chair's duties.

Mae asked for comments about the mission or duties.

Mae presented the three options before the steering committee.

- 1) question of leadership roles and structure
- 2) participation
- 3) accessibility of CWG

Victor: referring to the proposal by the coalition, the principals called into question:

1) two chairs?

2) one of those chairs should be hooked into the community Board? Victor refers to a discussion between Danny and Victor previously. "All of this has it" .

Victor says "we need committees"

Victor: things that are unresolved : two chairs? ,

and we should not put a value on the "burden" of the chairs. That's not a question.

Danny: Jim established such a "high bar" for participation, that really it wasn't practical for anybody to step up. It's not just the burden, it's the concentration of "risk". We have to "ball park " what is reasonable for somebody to do.

Victor: Would you agree that we discuss the tasks certain committees take on, that much reduces the duties of the chairs.

Danny: I agree. What has evolved is different than the document that Jim presented about the duties of the Chair. What evolved was not sustainable. What my personal feeling is that the role of the co-chairs should be that of facilitating the meetings. Moderators are not 100% impartial either. To the extent that someone has the podium for a year, that's where I think even then some idea of at least some method to moderate the meetings could be addressed. The general meeting should not be a rubber stamp. We can use that for discussion.

Mae: before we move forward, can someone take minutes?

Victor : can we take minutes of our conclusions?

Mae: ok

Doug: I agree with Danny and also with Victor. If you read the document, the chairs are facilitators, Not as sort of directors with a particular agenda, and Jim , highly committed, tended not to go this way. More of a security council arrangement. This I why they switch people out on security council - to get exposure to dif. View points. It's a little fairer. One thing I wanna add, I don't understand the proportional representation.

Victor: I don't think that that's an issue that we should discuss tonite. Because it's a nightmare to discuss it. The more fundamental issue is the structural issue.

Doug: I don't agree. We need a better understanding. Is it a functional majority, is it a weighted vote? What is it exactly. It would help me get some clarity on what that means.

K: how can we have that discussion, if we don't have a proposal?

Danny: we can talk about it, we don't have to come to a conclusion

Victor: Doesn't this come into play when we talk about the structure?

K: I don't think that the co chairs are just facilitators. Anyone can facilitate, and that you can rotate if that is the worry of the group. I have never seen any group function well, of any kind over any length of time, and not have at least two people committed to that. Too much in this group falls through the cracks, if there is no one in the role, it should be a tightly defined role. Someone needs to take that role. The steering committee has to be composed of committees that are making the thing move, the work.

Jan: I think the committee should serve the function to be the more permanent . While the co chairs should remain defined, just making sure meetings run. I cant think of a board that has chairs that are as involved as what you are talking about. The decision making should be in the committees.

Victor: Where are the chairs making decisions?

K: I would define it as : it's a coordination role, the decisions would come from the general membership,
Jan: I think it's a matter of semantics, I don't understand your distinction between coordinating and facilitating.

K: Yeah, I think the podium was mentioned, if there is an unfairness to that, someone needs to coordinate. Then rotate amongst the steering committee.

Bethany: You , Rob mentioned a group that functioned w/o a chair.

Rob: this is a method that is used for community groups, it was used for some very effective groups, LES Alliance was one,

Danny: Our's as well, we have resisted this structure in CCRC

Rob: There are no chairs, in its purest form, there is no agenda, people meet, and then and there they choose the facilitator. He/she is chosen among people who don't want to speak, and if you look at Robert's Rules Of Order, the Chair doesn't speak EVER. If the Chair wants to speak , the Chair has to abdicate his position of Chair, and he/she has to give it to somebody else, and think this is an important part of the meeting.

The issue of accountability never arises for such a group because no one person is making a decision, decisions are made by a vote. There's all the accountability you need.

You decide your facilitator, then the group decides on the agenda.

The agenda is the committee reports. It's as simple as that. You can delegate responsibilities.

You have spokespersons, usually more than one, accessible to the media,

Someone to crack the whip on the committee chairs.

What ever is needed as issues arise, people decide.

Danny: Whip cracking comes from "peer pressure" . it's the desire to achieve a goal, becomes the whip cracker. The CWG is a planning exercise. It's not a market driven thing. It seems to me ideal - in my emails I urge a contest of ideas. The structure you describe best suits that.

Victor: I don't feel it does, a neighborhood assoc. is very diff. All kinds of org's, (as in CWG)

Rob: we use this method for the CUNY coalition

Victor: But that's a coalition, this is not a coalition, I understand what you're saying, however the CWG has a specific task. There are time lines that we should be reminded of. It's vastly different.

It's a membership org (CWG) with a task to fulfill, and a time line.

Danny: I do have a question about the time line. When the planning person came and told us to "take our

time” where did the time line come from? Does it come from one person, does it come from a committee?

Victor: I agree with you. Arent’ we allowed to ask that question? Several time I asked “where did this time line come from?”

Jan: It came from Jim. Because several times we asked Jim , and it was he who set the time line.

Victor: It certainly did come from Jim. It’s better than not having one. And if everyone has agreed with the time he has given us, then lets do it.

Danny: Except for when people have presented valid reasons for not meeting the time line, yet we’re still tasked with meeting that time line, then it becomes arbitrary.

Victor: So what, we didn’t make it, CAPZ didn’t make it. (deadline)

Danny: The thing is that corporations have to have a “head” because they have to react to things. This group thing is not a fast reaction time thing. What is bad about the corporate model, it becomes one person’s vision. I don’t think that CWG wants to become that, even for one year.

Victor: Wouldn’t you put a time line on it if its agreed upon. If that’s the only problem.....

Doug: the problem with the time is that we have two and half years that we can’t cut out. In addition to that there seems to be a sense (here) that there is as much time as we want to do this. While that technically is true, the outside world is not going to wait for the CWG.

And so the chance to guide development, we lose that if we spend too much time...

Mae: The other thing about Time lines, community members seem to want to spend time to talk about this. Other’s criticize that it is not moving fast enough. We have to be considerate of.

Michael: I would agree with that, and I think that’s why maybe we should turn this discussion to voting. There has been a general recognition of increasing participation at the CWG. Decision making needs to be democratized. If we can improve decision making , what EVER leadership structure we have, that will be resolved. If the community felt that THEY have more influence, then the leadership question can be resolved.

Victor: as a community activist, the burden of CWG fell on our groups to bring this matter to the people - in what ever form. I never did in the two years failed to do that. I met with churches, pastors, in other words the CWG for all its defects, in its stages of evolution did bona fide good faith efforts and those town hall meetings, and those meetings surprised many. I think the CWG itself has to present these forums to the community.

Michael: There’s a number of diff. types of orgs in the community, tenant associations, share holder assoc. , service org’s, small businesses, for-profits, non-profits. - they have diff. accountability to the community.

Mae: What are you suggesting? That they are not equal to each other?

Michael: that is what is problematic

Rob: Several weeks ago, Josephine asked if can have a group (and there was some agreement to this) to decide to have a proposal on how voting can be done. I think that is clearly necessary. We can’t discuss all of these issues. We have an agreement that we will have a proposal. The other thing is that Zella brings up something we can’t discuss here, but it’s important for what we’re doing. :

The 197-a is something that is in some sense an *artifact* of the previous co-chair structure. It came down to us from the top. A lot of people feel that “It’s totally useless, will take a huge amount of time, YEARS. “ It’s a way-laying of your efforts.

There have to be other means to implement actions. This is an opportunity in the changing of the structure

to review what has been done.

Josephine: I actually have a ques. about why we're doing such a general discussion. We have proposals already in front of us, we can examine those now. I do have a proposal, a starting point. I will pass this out. We should start from those concrete proposals. I feel as though we'll get frustrated if we cont. in such a general way.

We should talk about what ever questions that arise from these concrete proposals. Even for the chairs, there has already been specific proposals , so why don't we take that out and go through the questions we have about that.

Mae: Quite honestly not everyone agrees with you. This is why we're starting in a general way. We realize, even people in this room came to the CWG at diff. times. Some looked at things that were ratified in the beginning and some came later, or have not looked at it in a while. Your proposal is not the only one. Quite frankly....

Josephine: I'm asking why we haven't taken those out,

Mae: We are focusing on three areas, and we're talking for now about the three areas, and how the proposals related to them is what we will be discussing.

Victor: Getting back to Michael, I think you said something that is very sensitive. I think you are feeling what I initially felt, which is that I think there is a lack of voice, of the people we in non-profits represent. I don't see how we can brnig them into this as much as we try. But I think we have been successful in bringing groups in , in those populations.

Michael: Both of us have had conv. With church leaders in our comm. And they have expressed reluctance because they want to make sure that their participation is not a waste of time for their respective parishes.

Victor: With all due respect to them, and I belong to that tradition, they have to invest something in this as well.

Michael: Of course, they have that concern, we have that concern.

Jan: we talked about responsibility of groups who come to the table, to do our own outreach, to bring more and more people - the feedback that I have been getting in the comm. Is that with the current voting structure, we have some significant old groups in C-town who have many many reasons for making valid decisions and putting forward opinions, but a the same time we have "the Chinatown pistol Club" nothing against them personally, but that will cause and has caused a lot of ppl. In Chinatown to very easily dismiss this entire process. So I think that there needs to be , as Doug mentioned, a weighted vote, to prioritize business, residents, certain things that we can all agree on - pistols being low on the priority, I would hope. Without that its easy to dismiss further outreach and further cooperation from significant groups. They wont come to the table, so long as they know that after they go through the process, that they have the same vote as someone who is very insignificant.

Doug: I think this is a pretty loaded question. And I appreciate this from Josephine and you could have taken a diff. part of the same article. One person one vote, which is how all City Planning is done - all the elected officials have one vote when they represent their constituencies at the City Council, at the City Planning commission, which ever. Scott Stringer got 180,000 votes Margaret Chin got 27000 votes but she's got one vote on the City Council,

Michael: But they have one vote because they represent an already demarcated a segment of the population, you can have one vote if you have clearly defined equally defined populations

Doug: Totally Michael, that is the point I was going to make. Proportional representation is a good idea where you have full, free, fair open elections. It should not be used as a vehicle for ceasing power for self appointment. You guys all, with all due respect, have not been elected by anyone to do anything, you're

claiming a proxy of a group of people

Danny: Actually I represent a co-op

Doug: right, but I am talking about this coalition, it's like you're saying "we represent the people of Chinatown we should be weighted differently", and I would like to have it explained better how exactly that weight would work.

Michael: this is a conv. We had yesterday

Danny: I'm of the mindset that when things are tough, approximate. And approximation is better than what we have right now. I agree that the reason we have the senate, and the house of representative is to address two issues. The state autonomy, and the representation. That's why we have two houses in congress. To me, I agree that no ones elected, and something like this is very prone to double count. Anything that exacting proportional will not be practical. My feeling is that we can probably categorize groups, broad categories, based on demographics, census, something like that. A weight very similar to how the matrix committee worked, a lot of weight to that category, you get one vote to that category. In that way the CWG represents a decision that is claimed to be representative of a demographic - something, and that is an approximation to getting CWG to make a statement - ie: CWG weights this decision in favor of this demographic or this area as opposed to his area.

Jan: It incentivizes participation from weighted groups and right now we don't have incentive.

Victor: This is the first time that we have a glimpse of what it could look like. With due respect that you wanting to have this answered quickly. It's so complex. It has some merit

Doug: They are both very helpful forms of the same idea.

Victor: you should examine this more, but not tonite. It's more than what I heard, we know the House of Representatives, and we know the the houses are split, but it's not comparable to what we're talking about.

K: You also know that they were made up by rich white guys.

Victor: You should be writing it

Danny: Writing what?

Doug: Just to get a little more clarity, I wasn't sure what the model was, does the Coalition want 30,000 votes? Is there an automatic majority 51% 50 49%? Or is it something like, there are diff. categories, those who represent a lot of different people, there are separate votes they get three votes. The Chinatown pistol Club they get one vote. That sort of thing is closer to what's fair in my mind.

Danny: I think that type of process is right for conflict. You're counting my person, I'm counting my person....

Doug: Yes, how would we validate this, give me the names of our people, etc.

Rob: I want to put forward a motion that you and some other people who are interested draw up a proposal.

Victor: I second it

Danny: I don't want to chair that.

Victor: You deserve it

Danny: I can put up the google doc.

Doug: We should take a look at the list, and cull it, somewhat. There were people who were at the beginning but we don't see them any more.

Jan: along those lines I have some serious concerns how the number 52 (members) is being thrown about, because it's really disingenuous in terms of the validity of the decision of this group. It's not the decisions of 52 neighborhood groups. It's a concentrated group of ppl. Who have a strong genuine decision making feeling toward what they want Chinatown to be. The way that it (52) was thrown around, by the previous chair, 52 this and 52 that, I really think it needs to be reexamined, if we had a weighted system it would be a clear message to pols. That this is what we are, forget about the number of our members look at where we've put the emphasis on what it is.

Victor: so you're actually supporting this

Jan: very much, I have serious concerns over the number 52 and the way it was thrown around last year.

Danny: so wanting to keep the numbers up , and we want a big number we don't cull. Right?

Mae: I don't think it's a matter of culling, I think it's a matter of , well why haven't groups come around. Sometimes it's a capacity problem. I have talked to groups who came in the beginning and then said well, you aren't talking about anything I'm interested anymore. We need to find out why

Doug: Look, culling is wrong, but I think at this point we need to reaffirm commitment to this process. And if they are not interested in reaffirming that , then they should not be a part of it.

Victor: Exactly, and this is the time to reaffirm commitment to this process.
So there is a motion on the floor, and I would like to deal with, get it out of the way, and talk about the issue of the two chairs.

Gigi: The motion to create a document / proposal, system for the next meeting.

Danny: It's about decision making.

Victor: it should be more specific.

Doug: I think it should be called representation first and we decide what it's going to be .

Gigi: so you're going to prepare some things - you and others

Gigi: Danny, Rob, Jan

Ed Chen: Sounds like you have a proportional representation, you have your group structure , then you have your individual, you would have your 52, then you would have your

Victor: you should be on the committee

Mae: so it seems like Danny, Ed, Rob, Jan have volunteered.

K: Danny would you also look at org's like MOCA, how do they fit in ?

Doug: I would also like to suggest to prepare a letter to ask the members to reaffirm their commitment to the CWG.

K: I disagree, until we work this out.

Victor: but there should be some kind of a hopeful positive report to our membership that these dialogues are taking place.

Danny: right. We can report on that.

Gigi: there will be a presentation on *representation* next time.

Michael: we can let ppl. Know who are not here, that this will be one of the things discussed.

Victor: Isn't the next issue the two chairs?

K: Can I ask "do we have agreement thought that at least for the moment , on the structure of the steering committee, need to be formed to get the work done." Is there is a straw pull agreement about that?

Gigi: we had a straw pull issue last nite at CB3 full board so let's not discuss straw pull.

Michael: I think that consensus on that, Is maybe a way to take a step forward together positively, and we'll address the co-chair.....

Victor: Could we actually have a motion that would recommend the formation of the committees that are so listed here ,

Doug: well let's talk about them first.

Victor: They're kind of standard: Outreach, fund raising, Gov't relations, meetings and events - I don't know what that is, meeting and events.....

Danny: I think these are details, I think the structure is what we should talk about. I mean, it's a governance thing, right? Specific committees, the steering committee should do that kind of stuff. I think that we should talk about governance.

K: Unless part of the issues of the steering committee is, cause I assumed the steering committee is the head of those committees.

Victor: you're saying that who ever head's it will....

K: would make up the steering committee, so you may be relevant on that point.

Victor: But is there a difference between these committees, standing committees and working teams? I think working teams is not necessary integral to the structure. They are like, what you're doing. So when you and I talked about this, you went even further, I thought that working teams should be eliminated. Danny said they should not be - that they should not cease, but they should be laid dormant. Fair enough.

Jan: Are you talking about working teams or committees?

Victor: we're talking about working *teams* vs. *committees*

Jan: She's talking about Committees

Doug: Can you propose a motion? Because I like what I am hearing from you. We should affirm steering committess with committeess under it if that's where you wanna go.

K: I don't do motions, but if someone else wants to that's fine. I just wanted to know if we agree if we agree on steering committees.

Victor: Would a steering committee compromise of the head's of the standing committees? Can we agree on that?

Mae: That's usually how its done.

Victor: But I am distinguishing that from working teams.

Mae: working teams are different.

Danny: We're talking about spreading all the work that Jim had described on that two pager into committees.

Doug: yes, making it horizontal rather than vertical.

Mae: I mean that makes sense.

Victor: so we agree on that?

K: Yeah, that's what I thought.

Doug: so the motion on the table is that we should affirm the idea that the steering committee is comprised of the leadership of the standing committees. Ok that's the motion.

Rob: But *not* exclusively the leadership of the committees.

Doug: OK well, that's up to question. I mean part of the issue is that steering committees are empowered by their committees and the general membership to make decisions. That's part of the problem that we have is that every committee is everybody in the entire group. And that has fostered a lot of discussion, which is great. BUT maybe we can do that with the leadership of the different committees and make them more representative. So it's not just from the particular group, so that we don't have to worry about having everybody at every committee, people can trust each other a little more to make decisions at the steering committee, that everybody can be offered up, at the cwg.

Danny: I would point to Zella's suggestion that the steering committee at least consist of one member of each community board. I think that in addition to the heads of the standing committees, that there be one person from each community board.

Doug: that makes sense, they are the sponsors.

Danny: Right, so that way, a CB representative doesn't have to be a member of a committee in order to be on the steering committee. So that would make whatever number of standing committees, plus three.

Doug: I mean some of these, like meetings and events committee may not have standing in the steering committee because they may not need their substantive input in major decisions.

Gigi: so if we're to go through the list of the proposed, so let's just say for example, I want to make sure I'm understanding this correctly. If we're to have say, and outreach committee, a fund raising, finance, and govt. & relations, and events - that makes four plus one CB1,2,3 plus the two co-chairs. Makes 9 members would constitute the steering committee.

Doug: well, that depends. If one of the co-chairs were a member of a CB, then we can cut that off. We don't want the steering committee to be that large.

Danny: it comes back to "do we need to have co-chairs if they're just facilitate meetings?" they may be on the steering, but do they need to be on the steering committee.

Victor: I think they do

Doug: they do if they are co-chairs

Danny: if we read the draft, they're just facilitating meetings, and have no authority other than any other member.

Doug: no, but in a practical sense, they will take on more importance than just that. It's a fact of life. Even Thomas who didn't talk as much as Jim.....

Rob: I think that's the issue . Should there be such an office?

Mae: I have been a member of many diff. types of orgs, you know neighborhood groups, volunteer groups, coalitions, the small ones, the staffed orgs, and now this CWG. The first of its type I have been part of. All of them have had co-chairs and for the most part have been very democratically functioning. So a lot depends on the leadership style of the co-chairs. Some sort of take, I'm not criticizing Jim and Thomas, I think they were great, so you have to be able to provide leadership and share it at the same time. It's like an art and you can't codify it or something.

Danny: I don't want to depend on the grace of who ever is a co-chair for the group to behave properly. I don't want to depend on it. So I want to bound it. If you need to have co-chairs, then have them, but I want it bound. Maybe it's the length of time, and rotating might be the wrong term, but for someone to have , once you have chair or chief, it automatically connotes, and you take on things that you are not mandated to do. That's the questions we have to ask ourselves, right? If you have a steering committee and that steering committee is strong, then why do you need to have to vest into a co-chair . Why not call them facilitators, or moderators, if That's the role?

Josephine: If the steering committee is strong as you were saying, then obviously the co-chair has to be accountable to the steering committee. If the steering committee is strong, if we form the steering committee, then one person from this steering committee could be the co-chair for a certain amount of time.

Victor: That's always to avoid having a chair or co-chair. You go through all that machinations just to avoid having co-chairs. Which I think they're important because one: sometimes you need a public face, out there. For elected officials, agency officials, even for org.s to know who they are talking to . There has to be some consistency in who is speaking for the org. actually I think the co-chair is more than just what you are suggesting. I think they are spokespersons for the whole org. and speaking only from what they learned from the steering committee.

Rob: then why not just designate a spokesperson?

Victor: Because , then again doing the thing we're trying not to do. We're trying not to have a co-chair. I think we need to have a consistent face to this community because of the nature of the process.

Rob: I think that's where people disagree.

Danny: Yeah the consistent face, we're not going to have more consistent than what's here. So what the problem with every six months or four months. So we don't have kings, we have presidents.... So the whole point is why go for a year? That's my ques.

K: I actually think that we need an overall coordinator. I think if you have a strong steering committee, with strong committees than that's they job of the steering committee to keep the co-chairs honest in that regard. And I think that every org. has a duty and an obligation and a right to both correct and protect their leaders. It's both, it's like we need to keep people from straying, everyone gets confused here. I agree that if you're suddenly a follower, then ok I'm a follower, I'm a leader, then ok I'm a leader. And I think that just functionally we need a leader.

Michael: Then what do you see , if we all want a stronger steering committee other than a face of the CWG, what do see the co-chairs doing?

K: Coordinating, mostly.

Michael: what's that mean?

K: It means that some of those, some of these committees will overlap, somebody has to be the person who everybody makes sure that they're talking to . It doesn't mean that everybody else doesn't talk to everybody else, but somebody has to be the person who says.....

Rob: Why don't you just have "the coordinator of the committees"?

K: I do think that victor is right on that, by any other means....

Rob: That's the point though.... You don't want to have the spokesperson, who is also the coordinator, who is also the facilitator , who is actually "the King" . we had a problem and we're all meeting because there was a problem.

K: I disagree.

Rob: well, otherwise we wouldn't be here.

Victor: I don't believe in kings.

Rob: The fact that we're here is evidence that there was a problem. That's an empirical fact. Otherwise if there was no problem there wouldn't be

K: May I respond?

Rob: You may disagree that there was a problem, but there was a problem. And you have to sort of open your eyes and say "there was a problem".

K: I may disagree with what the problem was. It's moot.

Rob: It's the problem that we're trying to avoid again. And what we're saying to you, and to Victor is that "yeah we can have that, we can have a spokesperson and we can have a committee coordinator - we have all those tasks, we don't have to have a chair. There are very effective groups that have had no chairs.

K: I just want to add "does anybody here rotate the chair of their org?" because....

Danny: well, we don't even have a chair (on CCRC). As Chatham Green yes. BUT I make a distinction between running a business and planning.

Victor: We don't run a business, we're a not for profit.

Danny: That's a business, that's a business. You pay ppl. , you have to make a decision.....

Victor: NMASS has a chair?

Michael: yeah but we do rotate. But it does come down to what the time period (is) . I don't think anyone is saying that we don't need someone to coordinate. I agree with you that there needs to be someone people can talk to , and that they can check back in with people. The idea of rotating co-chairs was to both make that coordination role distinct from the spokesperson - and the person in charge of facilitation of meetings, and outreach and all the diff. things

Victor: What would be a reasonable time to rotate?

Michael: That should be up for discussion, but the distinction of role, I would agree with K actually, it's important to have someone to coordinate, someone people can connect with so you don't have to talk to

Danny, then talk to Rob, then talk to Gigi to figure out what's going on. But two problems we saw - a year is a long time to effectively reflect the different interests of CWG, its important to have diff. people play that coordination role. But two, that co-chair or what ever you call that person shouldn't oversee and be responsible for every single area that Jim delineated in his duties for co-chairs. And what we're saying is that that should be led by different standing committee chairs.

Gigi: Right, I think that part of the reason that there's this pulling away from this co-chair structure is because there wasn't a full on strong steering committee structure in the past 18 months. If we believe that there is going to be four strong people that will step up in each of these positions, then Jim's list gets shrunk by two thirds. And that system automatically pulls away a lot of power from a co-chair structure , from what I hear is sort of the issue of too much power in one person or two people.

Danny: I would agree but I think the co-locating of the coordinator and spokesperson role , actually is very powerful. Basically as a spokesperson, I get to say first what CWG - I get to say what my interpretation of the CWG decision is. And it's up to everybody else to correct that. One of the benefit's a rotating moderating has, is that once you have moderated a meeting, you behave much better in a meeting after you tried to moderate a meeting. Because you know what it takes to moderate a meeting. If you have a whole year, and you know that after that you can "retire" from it, that's a whole diff. ball game.

Jan: I just wanna give an example of why I think we need to have a rotation of a chair. Even as a non-voting, but someone who attends a lot of meetings, I receive statements from the Chair that were very declarative statements that I know were not voted on by 52 ppl. In a meeting. This is a perfect example of how a chair in the wrong , misguided kind of duty will make statements , send it to a group whom I don't know who else was on a list where these declarative statements went, they were clearly *opinions* of a *person* not necessarily voted on before this went out. And I think it becomes very dangerous when a person in a chair position is able to publish a document, send it to the press , send it to an unknown unpublished group of people, and then with a title, sign it Chinatown Working Group. That becomes very dangerous and I think we need to have very clear definitive guidelines that will prevent that from happening and one of the things, that even if it does happen its here for a six month period of a three month period or an eight month period. So that there is a rotation where somebody clearly wont' continue that trend.

Victor: I would like to talk to Jan. Cause, Jan I think you say things that reflect a CWG that was in the stages of evolution and working defectively. To the point where we all recognize. So if you say, if you say the argument is over time then how long should a chair be rotated? If its six months then I would agree to that.

Jan: In a very succinct way, I think it's a *failsafe*. I think that we were led down for two years, a somebody who had control over an email list, the website, the min's the publishing of the min's the editing of the min's and no voting on min's , was controlled by one person. And another person was able to make published statements, send them to press, not vote on them, have them sent out. I think that if, on the very worst scenario, if a chair cont.'d on that trend a rotation of chairs is a failsafe.

I give you (as example) one of the biggest oldest orgs in Chinatown CCBA. CCBA has two year chair positions and they represent an enormous number of different groups, satellite groups that are under the same umbrella, I'm sure they would have done ONE year, but I think it's incredibly forward thinking of them 100 years ago to have a rotation of chairs every two years, very reasonable for a group THAT large. And so we've had great leadership through CCBA and we've had not-so-great leadership but at least it's a failsafe.

Mae: And so maybe we're not talking about rotation, but the length of time of the term. Like there are short terms and there are long terms. Because that's like its' just a two year term.

Danny: I would go back to what you said, it's the splitting of the role. So as spokesperson, and I sent out a notice MISTAKENLY, you know MY mistake - and I said "spokesperson" it's very easy for someone to question and retract it. If I sign (the notice) "co-chair" then it takes on a different weight. It absolutely does. If we want a spokesperson, then have a spokesperson, don't give them the title of "chair" . Or co-chair.

Rob: I just have a question, why indeed have rotating chairs, rather than just have no chairs, and just have all the tasks done by the committees.

Jan: I would be open to that. I think that we've been so much, as Victor pointed out. Clearly it was a "broken machine" and we were dragging this broken machine along. Since we're at the table talking about a new thing I think we need to work on whatever, I'm very open to having no chair.

Doug: without agreeing completely that it was a "broken machine" because I think that although there were real - I think that despite the fact that there were problems, and I agree that there were. That there was a license taken that shouldn't have been taken, there was also a level of commitment that nobody else stepped up to offer, so I think *that* we have to understand. So in all fairness I think we have to say that. The other thing is that in combination of what Gigi says, the steering committee is going to be much stronger, much more involved,

Jan: I agree.

Doug: ...the combination of that and a six month term for some variation of co-chair of spokesperson will together work to make sure that the kind of problem that you are citing never happens again.

Bethany: Just a response in terms of - in part there was no other "stepping up" for that particular role because we didn't have the type of structure that we're discussing now in order to make that type of a role for other people possible and I think that is what is important about what we're doing now. Is that we can make roles for which people can step up into. And one person doesn't have to feel like he or she doesn't have to take that entire responsibility on their shoulders.

Mae: ok So are there like three diff....

K: I guess, you know its tricky to keep characterizing a certain way, and I think that if we're going to move past and get to something else I would just, respectfully say that we - there are issues about the past that you're trying to address, I hear that, but it gets tricky for me to hear that. So it could be characterized another way, and I would prefer not to have either characterizations. But the one thing I would say to make note of, we couldn't even, in this meeting, get anyone to take the minutes. And to me that's not a small issue. And when we're talking about building a governance structure that is going to come into play in an all volunteer org. So I want us to be thinking about that, realistic about that. I mean we talk about stepping up into these roles, you know we can make these committees, if no one fills them we're screwed. I would almost like to table the "chairs" issue, because I think that committees are the meat and potatoes of our discussion.

Gigi: I want to just offer some reflection, and I don't want to speak for Mae. But in the three weeks that Mae and I have been doing this we talk at least once every two days. Possibly every day, multiple times, on the weekends, and sat.'s and Sundays, and yes - maybe some of the glitzy stuff and some of that, you know being able to take leaps and bounds that you don't think are appropriate, yes that's part of was situation and personality, but a lot of it is typing up the agenda, making sure the room is ready for today, and that the email went out. Really basic stuff that would not fall under any of this.

Michael: ... but it could

Gigi: Elise, we don't have an administrator any more, which was Elise, so its making photo copies, its when new members go to the website and they email you, and they wanna know ABC. And you don't want to ignore them, so there's lots of little things that don't fall under anything and so that's something to be mindful of to have one person or two people, and yes I agree for a certain period of time, to be able to have the big picture because I don't foresee enough structure like this even if you have spokesperson, and you add whatever things you wanna add, that you necessarily will be able to fill all the cracks with that.

Mae: I think that the basic issue is that there is always a need in every org. not just this one, and the ones we're into for a leadership to be more accountable to the larger body. So there sounds like there's three diff.

kind of ideas going on :

The steering committee having the co-chairs - making the steering committee a lot stronger than it is.
So the co-chairs kinda stay accountable.

The other thing rotating chairs - or perhaps it is shorter terms is what you are talking about because the previous co-chairs, they had terms, it's not they were like chairs for life, right?

The other proposal is "no chairs".

Three diff. things going on, it's 7:16. I don't know how much longer you want to stay here today. Do you want to have another sort of thing to have to put that together.....

Bethany: Just a quick clarification, I think that there are some things that Gigi was talking about can be, and are covered in some of the committees, for example the media and events coordinator, that person would be responsible for all administrative duties : photo copies, agenda, making sure the email is sent out.

Victor: What would reduce the burden on the chairs.

Bethany: right.

Victor: I think that we are very close, more than I ever thought we would be on many of these issues. So I think that we should - why not have a committee of this group -

Gigi: no, this is the committee. What ever you want fleshed out in a document, have people put it together.

Victor: We should meet again.

Mae: We need to select chairs for THIS group. Gigi and I cannot chair this group. So we need to find someone/s to chair this group.

Victor: What is this group charged with?

Mae: We need to have something for the January meeting, in these three areas. Including this meeting at most five additional meetings. You don't have to have five.

Danny: I can offer a meeting space in our building. Our community room is open for meetings.

Gigi: That's his way of not volunteering to chair the committee.

Danny: no. I'll chair to take my turn at chairing.

Michael: I'll take min's for the next meeting.

Doug: Why don't we practice something rotational and do chairs for each of these little separate things.

Danny: I'll chair the next one.

Victor: and by the way, ISS is avail. We have a nice room. What's the date that's being proposed?

Mae: Monday Nov. 8th at I.S.S.

End of recording.

