

From: Vince Bičiūnas <vince@biciunas.com>
Date: September 6, 2007 9:14:50 AM PDT (CA)

Dear Moonwater, Rob Kelly, Kathryn Hanowell, Ann McCartney, Tim Stewart and Phyllis McKee,

Three unexpected yet democratically arrived-at motions passed at our Fairhaven Neighbors general meeting last night after discussion of our facilitated meeting series on the structure for an inclusive neighborhood organization. The motions are as follows:

--Motion that, in order to support a more inclusive and democratic process regarding the disputed recognition of the current neighborhood association, the general membership

1) withdraws permission of the five members of Fairhaven Neighbors participating in the facilitated discussions to represent the entire association, and

2) desires that the facilitated process be continued with broader, democratic participation, open to the full membership and to all stakeholders in Fairhaven, to take place in an open public meeting on, before or at the next general meeting of Fairhaven Neighbors, which is scheduled for October 5, 2007.

--Motion to postpone the neighborhood plan update meeting scheduled for September 11, 2007, pending resolution of concerns about the facilitated discussion process.

--Motion to instruct the president of Fairhaven Neighbors association to write a letter to planning director Tim Stewart requesting that the City hasten its activity to move forward with the process to revise the Fairhaven design review regulations.

These motions effectively preclude continuation of our meetings as planned and previously agreed and instead request that a future facilitated meeting be scheduled where all interested parties are allowed to speak. We agreed that our next scheduled meeting space and time already reserved on October 5, 7-9 PM could be used for this purpose, if you so decide.

During the discussion of the first motion on the table, I did explain and repeat that we (board members Sue Kaun, Michael Lilliquist and I) agreed on June 13th to have representatives at a mediation table. The general opinion in the room last night, however, was that the issue of who exactly was being represented by the ten delegates was

not clear or fair. It seemed to most a lopsided arrangement. (We still know very little about Fairhaven Village Association, for example.)

There was strong opinion by some at the meeting last night who also have training or experience in facilitated discussions, that there was no valid reason to not allow all interested parties a chance to speak. This neighborhood organization is one that follows parliamentary procedure and a democratic one-person, one-vote process. Therefore, all meetings should be open and public, not limiting some to observer-only status. It was felt our newly defined and broadened membership rules afford everyone, including commercial property owners and business owners, opportunity to voice their concerns and become participating members in this community. If some members still feel the need for a facilitated discussion of our bylaws, then this is welcomed in an open and public process, and we look forward to it.

I realize this complicates matters for facilitators under a contract, and await word from you, Rob, on how we should proceed.

Respectfully,
Vince Biciunas, President
Fairhaven Neighbors

PS: I'm cc'ing FN Board Members and those 'at the table' since I know time is of the essence and I would like all to be informed asap.