

FAQ – Proposed Amendments to Appendix A / single-organization categories

1. What is PPCC’s organizational membership structure and why are these amendments proposed?

It is critical at this unprecedented time to increase opportunities for organizations to participate and have a voice on the PPCC Board, which in turn will benefit the community. Currently, there are 29 organizational members listed on Appendix A to the bylaws, divided into *nine categories which are necessary to balance the nine elected Area and At-large representative positions on the Board* (see FAQ 12). One organization from each category every year serves as the primary member. Seven of the categories contain multiple rotating organizations; in those cases, another organization serves as the alternate and then rotates to become the primary in the next year in that category. Organizations must wait their “turns” to be seated, often for several years – thus restricting their ability to participate. Two of the categories each contain one organization (often referred to as “standing” organizations: Pacific Palisades Residents Association (PPRA) and Pacific Palisades Historical Society (PPHS). Unlike other organizations, these two organizations do not rotate and may appoint both primary and alternate reps. Three new organizations (PRC, Pali LTRG and Team Palisades) have now applied to become members and are supported by the Executive and Bylaws Committees; if approved, they must be added to one or more of the nine organizational categories. To further its goal of increasing participation, the Bylaws Committee proposes changes to Appendix A which will result in no more than three nor less than two organizations in eight of the nine categories (realistically, the Education category cannot be changed due to the many schools in that category).

The proposed changes maintain the important balance with the nine elected representative positions; allow for greater participation; and are consistent with PPCC’s long history of changes in organizational numbers and status (see the “Organizational Composition/Timeline” document distributed with the proposed amendments: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/04/PPCC-Org.-Composition.pdf>).

2. Do PPRA and PPHS have “permanent” seats on the Board?

No. The Bylaws contain no provision for “permanent” organizational members. There are provisions for categories containing only one organization, but those categories have changed many times during the last five decades, with organizations being moved from single-organization categories to rotating categories with two or more organizations, or leaving the Board altogether, or being readmitted in rotating categories. Organizational members that have changed from rotating to standing status (or back again) include Temescal Canyon Association (TCA) and the Chamber of Commerce. In 1994, prominent PPCC leaders (including the current PPHS Vice-President) *expressly and publicly recognized the regular fluidity in PPCC organizational membership status* (major structural changes to the Board were then adopted, including eliminating all HOA members and adding then-new elected representative seats).

3. Have PPRA and PPHS been members of PPCC since its founding?

No. Neither PPRA nor PPHS was listed in the Bylaws as a member when PPCC was first formed in the early 1970s. Years later, when they were eventually added as organizational members, they appeared in *rotating* categories (PPHS was first listed as part of a *nine-member rotating category* in 1983, and PPRA as part of a two-member category in 1994) – only later did they become members in “single-organization” categories (it appears from the available documents that PPHS was granted single-organization / standing status in 1994, and PPRA was provided that status in 2006).

4. Do the proposed amendments “remove” PPRA and PPHS as PPCC Board members?

No. The amendments would simply place PPRA and PPHS in new “two-organization” categories, sharing respectively with Team Palisades (PPRA) and the Friends of the Palisades Library (PPHS). Under this arrangement, the organizations would 1) **remain members**, and 2) **be seated on the Board at every meeting**, although rotating each year between the primary and alternate positions. The Redline amendments make this status clear.

5. Will PPRA or PPHS be diminished, downgraded or rendered less powerful by placing them into two-organization categories? Will their representatives be prevented from participating or voicing their opinions at PPCC meetings?

No. Again, although rotating from primary to alternate positions and vice-versa every year, PPRA and PPHS in “two-organization” categories would *always be on the Board* and could participate as they have in the past – being seated at meetings when they are attending; commenting on agenda topics or issues; and announcing any events or initiatives they may be sponsoring. Although they would rotate each year in the same manner as other organizations (between the primary and alternate positions), in years when they are alternate members, they would also vote on motions if the primary organizational rep is absent at a meeting. Moreover, per agreement of their prospective counterparts in the categories (Team Palisades; Friends of the Library), PPRA and PPHS would *remain primary members until September 30, 2027* (for a full *additional* term beyond expiration of the current 2025-26 term). Most importantly, **nothing about the changes would in any way affect their ability to continue to serve the community** (see FAQ 8).

6. Would placing PPRA and PPHS in two-organization categories somehow be unfair or undemocratic?

No. PPCC is an all-volunteer, non-profit organization with Bylaws that govern its composition and membership. Organizations can choose whether to become members. There are numerous alternate PPCC representatives, both for the elected representatives and the organizational members. It is a common practice in similar councils, and clearly not unfair or undemocratic, to provide for alternate representatives who may vote when the primary is absent. *Alternate members can fully participate in discussions at Board meetings and can advocate for positions, even if not voting.* At a time when our community has changed forever and is engaging in extensive discussion about the rebuild of the entire town, preserving special standing status and privileges for two organizations among 29+ other organizational members is arguably *unfair to the other PPCC organizations*; is *not warranted* by current conditions; and in the end may be *detrimental to PPCC and the community* if maintaining that status results in reducing other organizational voices on the Board.

7. Are PPRA and PPHS more important than other organizations?

No. **All PPCC organizational members are important and do good work on behalf of the community.** The Bylaws Committee did not discuss the relative worth or value of any organizational members’ contributions in addressing the proposed Bylaws amendments. *Such judgments are inherently subjective in any event:* Which PPCC member organization is more worthy or important to the community than other organizations? PAPA? Pali High? Friends of the Library? The American Legion? The Palisades Forestry Committee? PPHS? PPRA? All organizations understandably believe they are important, and Individuals may differ in their opinions as to which organizations are more valuable than others. But such comparisons are not productive and detract from the important goal of increasing participation opportunities, including for the three new organizations.

8. Will PPRA and PPHS be prevented from doing good work in the community because of the change in their membership status on the PPCC Board?

No. Of course not. Their status as organizations on Appendix A (regardless of their placement in a single or two-organization category) effectively has no bearing on their ability to continue conducting their core functions and to undertake actions or initiatives independently for the benefit of the community.

9. Should PPRA and PPHS realistically be concerned that their respective partners in the two-organization categories may not vote the same way that PPRA and PPHS would vote?

No. It appears that underlying any opposition to or concern with the changes is a belief that the proposed counterparts to PPRA and PPHS would not share the same outlook or desire to protect the community, *i.e.*, would not vote in the same way that PPRA or PPHS would vote, thus causing a supposed “loss” of a vote when PPRA and PPHS are the alternate members. We see no evidence that would be the case. Team Palisades, like PPRA, expressly represents residents and publicly states that one of its purposes is to “strengthen community connection, resilience and recovery” (compatible with PPRA’s purposes). The Friends of the Library and PPHS share an obvious interest in preserving the Palisades’ historical record (at least one respected community member is a member of both boards), and there is a symbiosis between PPHS’s work and the work of libraries (the Santa Monica Library as well as the University of California contain extensive archives of historic images donated by PPHS). In any event, both PPRA and PPHS can always advocate their positions and work with their counterparts to ensure that they are on the same page in terms of voting on important issues. (Note: for the last several years, votes on motions have for the most part been *unanimous*; there is little reason to think that will change with the proposed amendments to Appendix A.)

10. Have PPRA and PPHS always exercised their right to vote on motions before the Board?

No. PPCC’s minutes show that both organizations have been absent at several meetings over the years, at times missing opportunities to vote on important motions. Although the Bylaws include attendance requirements, it is understandable if an organization cannot attend a meeting, and the President can excuse non-attendance in appropriate circumstances. (Note: a new Standing Rule is now proposed that would allow for appointment of a temporary representative at a given meeting when neither organization in a category is able to attend.) But it is arguably disingenuous for any organization to insist on *the singular importance* of its vote when historically, its representatives have unexcused absences and do not always attend to cast a vote

11. Does the vote of one member organization have a meaningful impact, in most instances, on the outcome of a motion before the Board?

No. The PPCC Board consists of 23 voting members, *i.e.*, each vote is 1/23 of the total possible votes on a motion. While votes are of course important in that they reflect positions of individual member organizations, in almost all cases one vote will not make a difference to the outcome of a motion, particularly because PPCC requires a 2/3 majority vote for policy motions. (An example: PPHS cast the sole No vote in 2024 on a motion involving the proposed Zone 0 regulations, which passed with Yes votes by all other members; PPHS of course was entitled to express its opinion by voting No, but its vote had no impact on the outcome). As noted, in recent years, the votes on most motions have been unanimous.

12. Can another (10th) organizational category be added easily to Appendix A, containing the three new organizations and allowing PPRA and PPHS to remain in single-organization categories?

No. *It would not be easy, nor would it be a sensible or good idea, for a 10th category to be added to Appendix A.* The Bylaws Committee considered and rejected this possibility, for several reasons:

- As explained, PPCC has for many years maintained the important balance between the nine elected representative positions and the nine appointed organizational positions.
- Adding a 10th organizational category for the so-called “recovery” organizations would create an imbalance in voting, in that appointed organizational representatives (who are *not required to be residents* or Pacific Palisades stakeholders) would have *a larger voting bloc on the Board than residents* who are represented by the elected reps.
- Adding a 10th organizational category would result in an even number of voting members (24); several years ago, the Board recognized problems with having an even number of members (*i.e.*, possible *tie votes* on motions), and accordingly amended the Bylaws to provide for 23 voting members; it would not be responsible to recommend a change now resulting in an even number.
- The Palisades’ recovery is expected to last for 5-10 years; there is no reason to create an entirely new category solely for “recovery” organizations, whose tenure could be at least that long or longer.
- Even if we were to place the new organizations in a 10th category and retained the single-organization categories, we would still be left with categories in Appendix A with four or more rotating organizations (*i.e.*, other PPCC members would still have to wait years for their turns to be seated and thus their opportunities to participate would continue to be constrained – the opposite of the Committee’s goal.
- Another suggestion -- creating a possible 10th *elected representative* position – was also discussed and rejected by the Committee as infeasible at this time, for a variety of reasons:
 - the Board would be increased to 25 voting members (larger numbers can become unwieldy).
 - time would have to be allowed for careful deliberation as to the nature of the new elected position;
 - extensive new Bylaws amendments would have to be drafted to accommodate new 10th positions or categories, likely requiring weeks of work (based on the Committee’s past experience);
 - after drafting is completed, two additional distributions of the new amendments would have to take place at consecutive PPCC meetings, with a vote at the time of the 2nd distribution;
 - the election of PPCC Area and At-large representatives is upcoming this summer; the Bylaws amendment process likely could not be completed until mid-July at the earliest, when the process for announcing candidacy in the Election had *already been noticed and initiated*;
 - there would be inadequate advance notice to the public of a possible new elected rep position, since the initial Election notice about the positions must be distributed by 7/2/26 (per the current Bylaws, before the Bylaws amendment process could be concluded);
 - if no one came forward as a candidate for a brand-new position on the Board (because of inadequate advance notice), and if a 10th organizational category were nonetheless approved, we would then be left with an imbalance between the elected and organizational reps, *and* we would still have organizational categories of four or more rotating members and constrained opportunities to participate.