

# Westside Coalition

## Minutes of February 25th, 2024 Westside Coalition Board of Directors Meeting

**Minutes Taken By:** Jake Erickson – Board Member

**Location:** NeighborWorks Community Mtg Room 622 W 500 N SLC   **Online:** Zoom Meeting

**Time:** Started 5:45 pm Ended 8:15pm      Wi-Fi Password: Nswfl\$1234

Board Members Present (#)	Jake Erickson, Kevin Parke, David Osokow, Jason Wessel, Sam Higgenson, Dorothy Owen, Izumi Okamura, Charlotte Fife-Jepperson, Chilton Hawk, Billy Palmer, C.J. Hellige
Board Members Excused or Absent (#)	Daniel Strong, Turner Bitton, Dan Potts, Chaise Warr, Bill Watts
Others Present:	Lizz Merrill, Nigel Swaby, Dan Meder, Maria Garcia, Margaret Owen
<b>Item 1</b>	<b>January WSC Minutes Approval</b>
Motion to Approve January 29th, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Motions to adopt the January 29th, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes.</li> <li>b. Kevin Parke                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Seconds the motion.</li> <li>ii. The motion passes unanimously 11-0.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>
<b>Item 2</b>	<b>Annual Meeting</b>
Planning Logistics of the Upcoming WSC Annual Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Timeline of the Annual Meeting             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Food from Red Iguana will be provided. Our meet and greet goes from 5:30pm to 6:30pm, with the annual report and elections taking place from 6:30pm to 7:00pm. Should the election be given a 30 minute window, or is that too short of a timeframe?</li> <li>ii. There won't be nominations from the floor. Everyone in attendance who is a Westside resident or a business owner on the Westside may vote.</li> </ol> </li> <li>b. Daniel Tuutau                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. There'll be electronic announcements delivered multiple times</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>

	<p>throughout the voting process, and voting will take place electronically.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. I second the notion of making the election 45 minutes instead of 30 to give people more time.</li> </ul> <p>c. Kevin Parke</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. In the past, we had people request a ballot so that we could have their email and street address to make sure they were eligible. I'm not sure that type of system is feasible here. We also used surveymonkey one year.</li> </ul> <p>d. Jason Wessel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Daniel Strong, Daniel Tuutau, Charlotte Fife-Jepperson, and myself will be on the election committee. Let's do a 45 minute election.</li> </ul> <p>e. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. So we'll do our election from 6:30pm to 7:15pm, and then entertainment will follow until 8:00pm.</li> </ul> <p>f. Dorothy Owen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Terry Thomas is a sound engineer who can help. The Fairgrounds have their system in place but we should consider using our own sound.</li> </ul> <p>g. Billy Palmer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The space has such a strong echo that it's very difficult to hear people. We shouldn't use the Fairpark's system. Billy will help on this topic.</li> </ul> <p>h. Izumi Okamura</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Izumi will help with translating any Annual Meeting-related documents.</li> </ul>
<b>Item 3</b>	<b>Proposal 1 of the Bylaw Review</b>
<p>Whether to Change the Phrasing of the WSC's Board Director Composition to Reflect 'Active' Community Councils</p>	<p>1. Proposal 1 Discussion: Whether to change the phrasing of the WSC's bylaws to reflect 'active' community council districts as opposed to 'inactive' community council districts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Are the community councils listed in our bylaws? Those boundaries will still exist even if the community council doesn't. At any time there might be the Poplar Grove Community Council which falls into inactivity, but it's important that our bylaws ensure</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

that all of the geographical areas should have representation whether they have an active community council or not. Could we change the language to say representatives from these communities in the event a community council becomes inactive?

**b.** Jason Wessel

**i.** The bylaws do state which community councils we draw our directors from. If we don't have an existing community council defined somehow, how do we determine what delineates the area? When this issue came up as a point of contention, we agreed that 2/3s of the WSC come from the community councils. To me it feels like we're having the same argument that we resolved 6 months ago.

**c.** Kevin Parke

**i.** We don't have a joint community council. If a community council merges, then those council areas are still represented by the community council.

**d.** Charlotte Fife-Jepperson

**i.** Does Westpointe still exist even though they consolidated?

**e.** Dorothy Owen:

**i.** It's the city's decision.

**f.** Jason Wessel

**i.** The chair is one board member, and then the community council appoints a second board member. Where do those board members come from if the councils no longer exist?

**g.** Charlotte Fife-Jepperson

**i.** You can add a clause, that if a community council for whatever reason becomes inactive or dissolves, then we have a few options to choose two people - to nominate people - from that geographical area.

**h.** Kevin Parke

**i.** If we can get two members from the geographical area, can't they also serve on the community council? Put them in as vice chair.

**i.** Sam Higgenson

**i.** We've been having recruitment issues but Jordan Meadows still does exist.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>j. Jason Wessel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. We still have five more proposals so let's circle back to proposal one.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Item 4</b>	<b>Proposal 2 of the Bylaw Review</b>
<p>Whether to expand the number of At-Large Directors on the WSC</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposal 2: Expand the number of representatives on the WSC by Growing the Number of At-Large Seats "up to 8." <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Maintaining equitable representation from geographical areas should be our goal here. If we did that, could we say that we need equal representation from missing community council districts?</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Kevin Parke <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. It seemed convoluted to make sure that two seats would be allocated to certain people since the criteria seemed subjective. Would this be a short term fix with long term consequences?</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. David Osokow <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Aren't we tying our hands by designating at-large seats to one area or the other? I think we need to keep ourselves flexible.</li> </ul> </li> <li>d. Billy Palmer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What do we want and what do we actually need? One thing we do know is that other than poplar grove, there have been ebbs and flows of people attending our active meetings. We've seen all of the community councils struggle. To stop and think about it, we're going to see this all the time.</li> <li>ii. What we're really after is to find the people who will advocate for the neighborhood in an extensive way across the Westside. The solution to me seems to be that we should aim for a culture of including as many people as possible who want to collaborate.</li> <li>iii. Keep the board full is another objective with appointed folks. If some folks can't come to these meetings.</li> </ul> </li> <li>e. Jason Wessel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How do we put that into rules? The goal of this proposal is to make the WSC more flexible.</li> </ul> </li> <li>f. Billy Palmer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Just give language that we make decisions on if and when things come up.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ol>

**g. CJ Hellige**

- i.** An increase in the at-large gives the WSC the abilities of people who wish to join even if they aren't on the councils, so I support the proposal.

**h. Billy Palmer**

- i.** Even though both have combined, we still need different rules for when a neighborhood has a dissolved community council.

**i. Dorothy Owen**

- i.** If we could get rid of the community council and help with civic engagement that'd be one thing. But I have a hard time with the notion that if these neighborhoods have been struggling, we then have to shrink their representation.

**j. Jason Wessel**

- i.** We would then have to come to what constitutes a geographic representation. How small can you subdivide?

**k. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson**

- i.** Charlotte moves to support proposal 2.

**l. Dorothy Owen**

- i.** Dorothy is against proposal 2. You can say that the number of at-large members can be changed by the board depending on the changing composition of the board.

**m. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson**

- i.** I'd like to amend my motion as follows: that the Westside Coalition can add additional at-large members not to exceed 18 board members.

**n. Dorothy Owen**

- i.** There's some language used several times in the bylaws that the board is able to implement policies and procedures. Let's set up a policy and procedure about how to go about this process.

**o. Jason Wessel**

- i.** There are many complicated issues here, and we can't adopt an amendment with this many issues on the table.

**p. Billy Palmer**

- i.** If we have the basic understanding of what proposal 2 does, and we've heard the concerns of our board here, then I trust that we

	<p>can figure the policy and procedures out. It doesn't have to be perfect. In my opinion it's good enough.</p> <p><b>q. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i.</b> Charlotte moves to close debate on the amendment.</li> <li><b>ii.</b> All in favor to close debate on the amendment 11-0.</li> <li><b>iii.</b> Charlotte motions to adopt as follows: that the westside coalition can increase the number of at-large directors up to 18.</li> <li><b>iv.</b> The motion to adopt proposal 2 passes 10-1.</li> </ul>
<b>Item 5</b>	<b>Proposal 3 of the Bylaw Review</b>
<p>Whether to Shorten the Timeframe For Candidacy Submissions to the At-Large Director Role to 5 Business Days</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Extending the Meeting</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. Jason Wessel</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i.</b> Can I request that we extend the meeting to 8:15pm? These deliberations are taking longer than expected.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>b. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i.</b> Charlotte motions to extend the meeting to 8:15pm.</li> <li><b>ii.</b> Chilton Hawke seconds the motion.</li> <li><b>iii.</b> The motion passes with all in favor 11-0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li><b>2. Proposal 3: Shortening the time limit for candidate submissions to the at-large director positions at the Annual Meeting elections to 5 Business Days.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. kevin Parke</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i.</b> This is just 5 business days, and we've spoken about it in the fall without much issue. It just gives people more flexibility.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>b. Izumi Okamura</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i.</b> Izumi motions to adopt proposal 3 as written.</li> <li><b>ii.</b> Charlotte Fife-Jepperson seconds the motion.</li> <li><b>iii.</b> The motion passes with all in favor 11-0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<b>Proposal 4 of the Bylaw Review</b>

Whether to Eliminate  
Nominations From the  
Floor During the Annual  
Meeting

**1. Proposal 4: Eliminating nominations from the floor during the Annual Meeting.**

**a. Jake Erickson**

- i.** The proposal argues to remove taking nominations from the floor during the Annual Meeting for the At-Large director positions. A nomination from the floor will make it hard to have an electronic election because we would then have to vet people from the floor.

**b. Dorothy Owen**

- i.** We could always have a write in option.

**c. Billy Palmer**

- i.** I can think of a few other reasons why nominations from the floor are a bad idea. Anyone can come in with a large group of people and get elected.

**d. Jason Wessel**

- i.** if you have an annual meeting with a time frame, all you need to do is send people to disrupt the clock.

**e. Kevin Parke**

- i.** It would be a logistical nightmare to take nominations from the floor.

**f. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson**

- i.** Would you allow write-in votes?

**g. Billy Palmer**

- i.** This isn't unusual for almost any non-profit or community organization. It's also not unusual to have a process that concentrates on getting the right people to the board.

**h. Kevin Parke**

- i.** We had another election that brought on a bunch of single issue golf course people who didn't actually care about Rose Park.

**i. Dorothy Owen**

- i.** I withdraw my objection if we insert language that states we develop policies and procedures on how the nominating committee will act, because then that really solves the problem.

	<p><b>j. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. We will create a policies and procedures document for that process in good faith.</li> <li>ii. I propose as an amendment that we strike the last sentence from the proposal.</li> <li>iii. Dorothy seconds the proposal.</li> <li>iv. All present vote in favor of striking the last sentence of proposal 4, 11-0.</li> </ul> <p><b>k. Billy Palmer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Motion to adopt proposal 4 as amended.</li> <li>ii. All vote in favor of proposal 4 as amended, 11-0.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Item 6</b>	<b>Proposal 5 of the Bylaw Review</b>
---------------	---------------------------------------

<p>Considering the Submitted Description for the Board Officer Role of Communications Director</p>	<p><b>1. Proposal 5: Whether the submitted description for the position of Communications Director as a board officer suffices.</b></p> <p><b>a. Billy Palmer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. It sounds like a good idea to me. I support as written.</li> </ul> <p><b>b. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Charlotte supports the description, but motions that we amend proposal 5 by omitting the second sentence (with the words ‘in this capacity’).</li> <li>ii. Jake Erickson seconds the motion.</li> <li>iii. All present vote in favor (sans Izumi Okamura who left). The motion passes 10-0.</li> </ul> <p><b>c. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Motions to adopt the motion as amended.</li> <li>ii. Chilton Hawk seconds.</li> <li>iii. All present vote in favor of adopting proposal 5 as amended 10-0.</li> </ul>
--	---

Item 7	Proposal 6 of the Bylaw Review
<p>Whether the board officers can make decisions on behalf of the WSC unanimously, or by a majority vote of the board officers.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposal 6: Whether the Executive Board (board officers) is empowered to act on behalf of the WSC by majority vote, or unanimous vote.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Jake Erickson                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Supports the majority vote option.</li> </ol> </li> <li>b. Billy Palmer                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Favors unanimous vote.</li> </ol> </li> <li>c. David Osokow                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Favors a majority vote.</li> </ol> </li> <li>d. Kevin Parke                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Leans to a unanimous vote.</li> </ol> </li> <li>e. Billy Palmer                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Motions to adopt the amendment with the majority vote phrasing attached.</li> <li>ii. The motion passes 10-0.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>
Item 8	Motion to Adjourn
<p>Adjourning the January 25th, 2025 WSC Meeting</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Motion to Adjourn               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Kevin Parke                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Kevin motions to adjourn.</li> <li>ii. Charlotte Fife-Jepperson seconds.</li> <li>iii. All board members present vote in favor of the motion 10-0. The meeting adjourns.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>
	<p><b>Next Meeting:</b> March 25th, 2025 5:30pm – 7:30pm</p>