What Could Change if Corporate Personhood Were Abolished?

If *We the People* are sovereign, we must control the government. Corporations are created and chartered by the government which, acting on behalf of *We the People*, gives corporations privileges, not rights. Neither the government, without the consent of the governed, nor corporations have the right to rule over the people. Since corporations have gained the legal status of persons, corporations have accumulated rights and become rulers — in other words, they can tell the government what to do.

Corporate legal personhood was wrongly given — not by *We the People*, but by nine Supreme Court judges in 1886. Corporate Personhood is bad for democracy, people, and the planet because it has allowed an artificial entity to legally relegate people to subhuman status. *We the People* have the sovereign right — indeed, duty — to abolish Corporate Personhood.

When Corporate Personhood is abolished, here are some actions *We the People* can take that are currently “beyond our authority”:

1. Prohibit all political activity by corporations — stop all corporate political donations and all corporate lobbying. These activities are currently legal because “corporate persons” are protected under the First Amendment.

2. Prevent corporate mergers and prohibit corporations from owning stock in other corporations. Regulation of these activities was overturned because “corporate persons” are protected under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

3. Inspect for environmental or health violations without a warrant or prior notice. The Fourth Amendment protects “corporate persons” from search without a warrant, protecting corporate polluters from concerned citizens and regulatory agencies.

4. Revoke corporate charters by popular referendum. This is now illegal because “corporate persons” are entitled to equal protection and due process under the Fourteenth Amendment.

5. Prohibit the erection of cell phone towers and chain stores from doing business in your town, county, and state. Civil rights legislation and the Fourteenth Amendment are used to ensure that “corporate persons” have an equal opportunity to be part of our communities.

6. Stop advertising for tobacco, guns, and other dangerous products. “Corporate persons” are entitled to free speech under the First Amendment, with “commercial speech” increasingly protected by the federal courts.

7. Levy differential taxes for corporations and restrict their size. The Fourteenth Amendment protects “corporate persons” from unfair discrimination (although they don’t complain when they get big tax breaks).

8. Require labelling of genetically modified foods. This is currently prevented because the First Amendment protects the right of “corporate persons” NOT to speak.

If Corporate Personhood were abolished, none of these things would change automatically. New laws could be written and old laws could be challenged in court to eliminate the kinds of protections that have enabled “corporate persons” to amass so much wealth and power.

Remember: judge-made law is not democracy! *We the People* have the power to change this.

*This list was compiled by the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, a coalition partner with MoveToAmend.org.*
Move to Amend resolution

Agenda Item: GB072111-3
Date: July 21, 2011
Proposed By: Barry E. Levine

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council recommends a non-binding resolution to amend the United States Constitution denying personhood and its rights to corporations and stating money is not equal to free speech.

Full Proposal

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council requests that the City of Los Angeles join with other municipalities across the nation in passing the attached non-binding resolution which calls for amending the U.S. Constitution to firmly establish that money is not speech and that human beings, not corporations, are entitled to constitutional rights. On January 21, 2010, with its ruling in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, the Supreme Court ruled that corporations are persons, entitled by the U.S. Constitution to unduly influence elections.

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council members believe that the Supreme Court is misguided in principle, and wrong on the law. In a democracy, the authority of the government is derived from its citizens and as such, the citizens rule. If we wish to limit corporate campaign contributions, it is our right to do so.

We agree with Justice John Paul Stevens who stated in his dissenting opinion that the Court’s opinion is “a rejection of the common sense of the American people, who have recognized a need to prevent corporations from undermining self government since the founding, and who have fought against the distinctive corrupting potential of corporate electioneering since the days of Theodore Roosevelt. . . . While American democracy is imperfect, few outside the majority of this Court would have thought its flaws included a dearth of corporate money in politics.”

Proposed Motion

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council recommends a non-binding resolution to amend the United States Constitution denying personhood and its rights to corporations and stating money is not equal to free speech.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will make our government responsive to the voter more than the corporate contributor.</td>
<td>Not within our city jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council send the attached letter to Councilmember Koretz, Councilmember Wesson, Council president Garcetti, Mayor Villaraigosa, Assemblymember Holly Mitchell, Senate member Curran Price, Congressmember Karen Bass, US. Senators Boxer and Feinstein and President Obama

Full Proposal

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council requests that the City of Los Angeles join with other municipalities across the nation in passing the attached non-binding resolution which calls for amending the U.S. Constitution to firmly establish that money is not speech and that human beings, not corporations, are entitled to constitutional rights. On January 21, 2010, with its ruling in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, the Supreme Court ruled that corporations are persons, entitled by the U.S. Constitution to unduly influence elections.

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council members believe that the Supreme Court is misguided in principle, and wrong on the law. In a democracy, the authority of the government is derived from its citizens and as such, the citizens rule. If we wish to limit corporate campaign contributions, it is our right to do so.

We agree with Justice John Paul Stevens who stated in his dissenting opinion that the Court’s opinion is “a rejection of the common sense of the American people, who have recognized a need to prevent corporations from undermining self government since the founding, and who have fought against the distinctive corrupting potential of corporate electioneering since the days of Theodore Roosevelt. . .While American democracy is imperfect, few outside the majority of this Court would have thought its flaws included a dearth of corporate money in politics.”

Proposed Motion

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council will send the following letter to all our elected officials recommending a constitutional Amendment denying corporations personhood rights and declaring money is not equal to free speech.

“June 9, 2011

Honorable Eric Garcetti, Paul Koretz and Herb Wesson

Los Angeles City Hall

200 North Spring Street, Room 475

Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Council President Garcetti and Councilmembers Koretz and Wesson,
The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council requests that the City of Los Angeles join with other municipalities across the nation in passing the attached non-binding resolution which calls for amending the U.S. Constitution to firmly establish that money is not speech and that human beings, not corporations, are entitled to constitutional rights.

On January 21, 2010, with its ruling in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, the Supreme Court ruled that corporations are persons, entitled by the U.S. Constitution to unduly influence elections.

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council members believe that the Supreme Court is misguided in principle, and wrong on the law. In a democracy, the authority of the government is derived from its citizens and as such, the citizens rule. If we wish to limit corporate campaign contributions, it is our right to do so.

We agree with Justice John Paul Stevens who stated in his dissenting opinion that the Court’s opinion is “a rejection of the common sense of the American people, who have recognized a need to prevent corporations from undermining self government since the founding, and who have fought against the distinctive corrupting potential of corporate electioneering since the days of Theodore Roosevelt. …While American democracy is imperfect, few outside the majority of this Court would have thought its flaws included a dearth of corporate money in politics.”

Thank you.

Sincerely,

______________________________

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will make our government responsive to the voter more than the corporate contributor.</td>
<td>Not within our city jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motion to approve a $3000 Neighborhood Purpose Grant for the 2011 Peace Picnic

Agenda Item: GB072111-5
Date: 21 July 2011
Proposed By: Martin Epstein

Full Proposal

HarSimran Khalsa has approached SORO NC about funding the 2011 Peace Picnic, in what would be its fourth year. The Peace Picnic began as a public response to shootings that occurred within SORO, and was seen as an opportunity for SORO NC to work with our local faith-based organizations.

The total proposed budget for the event is $3600. The increase in budget is largely due to correcting past issues with food availability; this year, restaurants will be asked to provide food at discounted rates, rather than for free.

The event will take place at Robertson Recreation Center on 28 September 2011. In the past the event has drawn about 200-300 attendees.

Because of timing issues, this funding proposal did not have time to be considered in committee. In 2010, SORO NC funded $1140 towards the picnic.

Proposed Motion

That based on the attached application, SORO NC approve a Neighborhood Purpose Grant of $3000 to the Los Angeles Parks Foundation for the 2011 Peace Picnic.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a request from the community for an event that SORO NC has supported for the past three years.</td>
<td>This event draws comparatively few people for the amount of funding requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORO NC believes in promoting peace in our community.</td>
<td>The amount requested is larger than in past years. Given our reduced budget and tighter priorities, it is not clear which committee the money would come from.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Notes

Votes For: Against: Abstain:

Proposed Amendments:
City of Los Angeles, Department of Neighborhood Empowerment
Neighborhood Council Funding Program

APPLICATION for Neighborhood Purposes Grant (NPG)

This form is to be completed by the applicant seeking the Neighborhood Purposes Grant and submitted to the Neighborhood Council from whom the grant is being sought. All applications for grants must be reviewed and approved in a public meeting. The Neighborhood Council, upon approval of the application, shall submit the approved application along with all required documentation to the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment via the Project Coordinator.

Name of Neighborhood Council you are seeking the grant from: South Robertson NC

SECTION I - APPLICANT VERIFICATION INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1A) Organization Name</th>
<th>26-2358338</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>26-Feb-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Parks Foundation</td>
<td>Federal I.D. # (EIN#)</td>
<td>State of Incorporation</td>
<td>Date of 501(c)(3) Status (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11973 San Vicente Blvd. Suite 200</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1B) Organization Mailing Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1C) Business Address (If different)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1D) Address of Affiliated Organization (If applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name and address of person designated to receive official/legal notices: Amanda L.G Kelley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2) Name: Amanda L.G Kelley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11973 San Vicente Blvd. Suite 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) Type of Organization- Please select one: (Organizations must be located within the City of Los Angeles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Public School (not to include private schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attach Letterhead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION II - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

4) Please describe the Neighborhood Improvement Project for which the grant is intended.

Every year starting in 2006, local residents have organized a Peace Picnic at Robertson Recreation Center. The event celebrates the United Nations' International Day of Peace on or around September 21. SORO NC is the primary sponsor. Local businesses and restaurants donate some of the funds and most of the food. Live music is provided by various local faith and educational organizations. Recreation Center staff provide peace-themed games and activities for the children. Attendance each year is estimated at 300-600 people.

5) How will this grant be used to primarily support or serve a non-discriminatory, public purpose and benefit the public at-large.

The Peace Picnic offers the many diverse residents of the South Robertson neighborhood an afternoon of good food and homegrown music and entertainment, in the spirit of celebrating peace and building community. Local businesses and restaurants who contribute to the event get positive exposure. Residents who might never have stopped in at the Recreation Center may spend several happy hours there, mingling with neighbors they perhaps never met before. In the current slow economy, the Peace Picnic is an especially valuable opportunity to bring people together with an abundance of good food, good entertainment and good will.
### SECTION III - PROJECT BUDGET OUTLINE - Please outline the project budget below.

#### 6A) Personnel Related Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Requested of NC</th>
<th>Total Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6B) Non-Personnel Related Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Requested of NC</th>
<th>Total Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. food and supplies</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. advertising (print flyers, posters, lawn signs, related items)</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. sound system rental</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. co-payment subsidies to donor restaurants</td>
<td>$ 1,200</td>
<td>$ 1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7) Is the implementation of this specific program or purpose described in box 4 above contingent on any other factors or sources or funding?

- [x] Yes, please describe below
- [ ] No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Total Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>monetary donations from local businesses</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
<td>$ -300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8) What is the TOTAL amount of the grant funding requested with this application?

3,000

### 9) What is the expected completion date?

9/28/2011 (mm/dd/yyyy) [date required]

### SECTION IV - PROJECT PRIMARY AND SECONDARY CONTACT INFORMATION

Provide the name, telephone number, fax and e-mail address (if applicable) of the person(s) responsible for the funds and program(s) listed in Section II of this application.

#### 10A) First Name

HarSimran

Telephone Number: 310-553-7334

Fax Number: 310-277-1073

E-mail: harsimran@essentialfocus.net

#### 10B) First Name

Tamara

Telephone Number: 310-278-5383

Fax Number: 310-277-1073

E-mail: tamara.williams@lacity.org

### SECTION V - DECLARATION AND SIGNATURE

We hereby affirm that, to the best of my knowledge, the information provided herein and communicated otherwise is truly and accurately stated. We further affirm that we have read Appendix A, "What is a Public Benefit," and Appendix B "Conflicts of Interest" of this application and affirm that the proposed project(s) and/or program(s) fall within the criteria of a public benefit project/program and that no conflict of interest exist that would prevent the awarding of the Neighborhood Purposes Grant.

#### 11A) Executive Director of Non-Profit Corporation or School Principal

Judith Kieffer

Title

Signature

Date

#### 11B) Secretary of Non-profit Corporation or Assistant School Principal

Judith Kieffer

Secretary

Signature

Date
**SECTION VI - AFFILIATIONS**

Does anyone in your organization have a former or existing relationship with any of the NC board members?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: XYZ Non-profit Corporation</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION VII - FOR DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD EMPOWERMENT USE ONLY**

Date Received

Reviewer Name Date Reviewed

REVIEWER'S NOTES

DATE Submitted to Funding c/o Adriana Manzanero-Lopez

Method:  ☐ in-person  ☐ E-mail  ☐ Fax  ☐ inter-departmental mail

DATE RECEIVED BY FUNDING UNIT

Application ☐ Complete ☐ Incomplete

Funding Unit Notes:

DONE Date Stamp Receipt
## 2011 Peace Picnic Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food and supplies</td>
<td>Not to exceed $1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising (printing flyers, posters, lawn signs and other related expenses)</td>
<td>Not to exceed 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound system rental</td>
<td>Estimated 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-payment subsidies to donor restaurants</td>
<td>Not to exceed 1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>Not to exceed 3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash donations from local businesses</td>
<td>Estimated 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested from SORO NC</td>
<td>Not to exceed $3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Form W-9

Request for Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification

Name
The Los Angeles Parks Foundation

TIN: 197434163

Address
19743 San Vicente Blvd, Suite 200, Los Angeles, CA 90049

Part II Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN)

Enter your TIN in the appropriate box. For individuals, this is your social security number (SSN).

For a resident alien, sole proprietor, or disregarded entity, see the Part I instructions on page 2.

Enter other TINs in the appropriate box. For entities, it is your employer identification number (EIN). If you do not have a number, see How to Get a TIN on page 2.

Note: If the account is in more than one name, see the chart on page 2 for guidelines on whose number to enter.

Part II Certification

Under penalties of perjury, I certify that:
1. The number shown on this form is my correct taxpayer identification number (or I am waiting for a number to be issued to me), and
2. I am not subject to backup withholding because: (a) I am exempt from backup withholding, or (b) I have not been notified by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) that I am subject to backup withholding as a result of a failure to report all interest and dividends, or (c) the IRS has notified me that I am no longer subject to backup withholding, or (d) I am a U.S. person (including a U.S. resident alien), and the certification instructions. You must cross out item 2 above if you have not been notified by the IRS that you are subject to backup withholding because you have failed to report all interest and dividends on your tax return. For real estate transactions, item 2 does not apply.

For mortgage interest paid, acquisition or abandonment of secured property, cancellation of debt, contributions to an individual retirement arrangement (IRA), and generally, payments other than interest and dividends, you are not required to sign the certification, but you must provide your correct TIN. See the instructions on page 2.

Signature of U.S. person

Date 5/14/2011

Purpose of Form

A person who is required to file an information return with the IRS must get your correct taxpayer identification number (TIN) to report, for example, income paid to you, real estate transactions, mortgage interest you paid, acquisition or abandonment of secured property, cancellation of debt, or contributions made to an IRA.

Use Form W-9 only if you are a U.S. person (including a resident alien) to give your correct TIN to the person requesting it (the requester) and, when applicable to:

1. Certify the TIN you are giving is correct (or you are waiting for a number to be issued),
2. Certify you are not subject to backup withholding, or
3. Claim exemption from backup withholding if you are a U.S. exempt payee.

If you are a foreign person, use the appropriate Form W-8. See Pub. 616, Withholding of Tax on Nonresident Aliens and Foreign Entities.

Note: If a requester gives you another form other than Form W-9 to request your TIN, you must use the requester’s form if it is substantially similar to this Form W-9.

What is backup withholding? Persons making certain payments to you must under certain conditions withhold and pay to the IRS 30% of such payments after December 31, 2001 (29% after December 31, 2003). This is called “backup withholding.” Payments that may be subject to backup withholding include interest, dividends, broker and barter exchange transactions, rents, royalties, nonemployee pay, and certain payments from fishing boat operators. Real estate transactions are not subject to backup withholding.

You will not be subject to backup withholding on payments you receive if you give the requester your correct TIN, make the proper certifications, and report all your taxable interest and dividends on your tax return. Payments you receive will be subject to backup withholding if:
1. You do not furnish your TIN to the requester,
2. You do not certify your TIN when required (see the Part II instructions on page 2 for details), or
3. The IRS tells the requester that you furnished an incorrect TIN, or
4. The IRS tells you that you are subject to backup withholding because you did not report all your interest and dividends on your tax return (for reportable interest and dividends only), or
5. You do not certify to the requester that you are not subject to backup withholding under 4 above for reportable interest and dividend accounts opened after 1983 only.

Certain payments and payments are exempt from backup withholding. See the instructions on page 2 and the separate instructions for the Requester of Form W-9.

Penalties
Failure to furnish TIN. If you fail to furnish your correct TIN to a requester, you are subject to a penalty of $50 for each such failure unless your failure is due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect.

Civil penalty for false information with respect to withholding. If you make a false statement with no reasonable basis that results in no backup withholding, you are subject to a $500 penalty.

Criminal penalty for falsifying information. Willfully falsifying certifications or affirmations may subject you to criminal penalties including fines and/or imprisonment.

Misuse of TINs. If the requester discloses or uses TINs in violation of Federal law, the requester may be subject to civil and criminal penalties.

Cat. No. 10231X
Dear Applicant:

We are pleased to inform you that upon review of your application for tax exempt status we have determined that you are exempt from Federal income tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Contributions to you are deductible under section 170 of the Code. You are also qualified to receive tax deductible bequests, devises, transfers or gifts under section 2055, 2106 or 2522 of the Code. Because this letter could help resolve any questions regarding your exempt status, you should keep it in your permanent records.

Organizations exempt under section 501(c)(3) of the Code are further classified as either public charities or private foundations. During your advance ruling period, you will be treated as a public charity. Your advance ruling period begins with the effective date of your exemption and ends with advance ruling ending date shown in the heading of the letter.

Shortly before the end of your advance ruling period, we will send you Form 8734, Support Schedule for Advance Ruling Period. You will have 90 days after the end of your advance ruling period to return the completed form. We will then notify you, in writing, about your public charity status.

Please see enclosed Publication 4221-PC, Compliance Guide for 501(c)(3) Public Charities, for some helpful information about your responsibilities as an exempt organization.
LOS ANGELES PARKS FOUNDATION

We have sent a copy of this letter to your representative as indicated in your power of attorney.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert Choi
Director, Exempt Organizations
Rulings and Agreements

Enclosures: Publication 4221-PC
Statute Extension
Part X  Public Charity Status (Continued)

- e 509(a)(4)—an organization organized and operated exclusively for testing for public safety.  
- f 509(a)(1) and 170(b)(1)(A)(iv)—an organization operated for the benefit of a college or university that is owned or operated by a governmental unit.  
- g 509(a)(1) and 170(b)(1)(A)(iv)—an organization that receives a substantial part of its financial support in the form of contributions from publicly supported organizations, from a governmental unit, or from the general public.  
- h 509(a)(2)—an organization that normally receives not more than one-third of its financial support from gross investment income and receives more than one-third of its financial support from contributions, membership fees, and gross receipts from activities related to its exempt functions (subject to certain exceptions).  
- i A publicly supported organization, but unsure if it is described in 5g or 5h. The organization would like the IRS to decide the correct status.

6 If you checked box g, h, or i in question 5 above, you must request either an advance or a definitive ruling by selecting one of the boxes below. Refer to the instructions to determine which type of ruling you are eligible to receive.

- a Request for Advance Ruling: By checking this box and signing the consent, pursuant to section 511(c)(4) of the Code you request an advance ruling and agree to extend the statute of limitations on the assessment of excise tax under section 4940 of the Code. The tax will apply only if you do not establish public support status at the end of the 5-year advance ruling period. The assessment period will be extended for the advance ruling years to 8 years, 4 months, and 15 days beyond the end of the first year. You have the right to refuse or limit the extension to a mutually agreed-upon period of time or issue(s). Publication 1035, Extending the Tax Assessment Period, provides more detailed explanation of your rights and the consequences of the choices you make. You may obtain Publication 1035 free of charge from the IRS website at www.irs.gov or by calling toll-free 1-800-829-3676. Signing this consent will not deprive you of any appeal rights to which you would otherwise be entitled. If you decide not to extend the statute of limitations, you are not eligible for an advance ruling.

Consent Fixing Period of Limitations Upon Assessment of Tax Under Section 4940 of the Internal Revenue Code

For Organization

[Signature of Officer, Director, Trustee, or other authorized official]

Barry A. Sanders  
(Type or print name of signer)  
May 23, 2008  
(Date)

Chairman, President, Director

(Type or print title or authority of signer)

For IRS Use Only

Robert Clark  
(IRS Director, Exempt Organizations)  
August 1, 2008  
(Date)

b Request for Definitive Ruling: Check this box if you have completed one tax year of at least 8 full months and you are requesting a definitive ruling. To confirm your public support status, answer line 6b(i) if you checked box g in line 5 above. Answer line 6b(ii) if you checked box h in line 5 above. If you checked box i in line 5 above, answer both lines 6b(i) and (ii).

- (i) (a) Enter 2% of line 6, column (e) on Part IX-A. Statement of Revenues and Expenses.  
- (b) Attach a list showing the name and amount contributed by each person, company, or organization whose gifts totaled more than the 2% amount. If the answer is "None," check this box.

- (ii) (a) For each year amounts are included on lines 1, 2, and 9 of Part IX-A. Statement of Revenues and Expenses, attach a list showing the name of and amount received from each disqualified person. If the answer is "None," check this box.

(b) For each year amounts are included on line 9 of Part IX-A. Statement of Revenues and Expenses, attach a list showing the name of and amount received from each payer, other than a disqualified person, whose payments were more than the larger of (1) 1% of line 10, Part IX-A. Statement of Revenues and Expenses, or (2) $5,000. If the answer is "None," check this box.

7 Did you receive any unusual grants during any of the years shown on Part IX-A. Statement of Revenues and Expenses? If "Yes," attach a list including the name of the contributor, the date and amount of the grant, a brief description of the grant, and explain why it is unusual.  
- Yes  
- No
Motion to hire a monthly note-taker

Agenda Item: GB072111-6
Date: 21 July 2011
Proposed By: Gomes

---

Motion postponed to August 18 General Board meeting
Motion to approve Green Team committee strategic plan

Agenda Item: GB072111-8
Date: 21 July 2011
Proposed By: Paula Waxman

Seeks Board approval and endorsement of the Green Team’s strategic plan

Full Proposal

The Green Team Committee has drafted a strategic plan to guide its activities, priorities and budget allocations. As one of the NC’s core Standing Committees, it is important that the Board make certain that the actions of the Committee are in alignment with its own vision.

Proposed Motion

I. That the SORO NC Board approves and endorses the attached Green Team Committee strategic plan

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives direction to the Green Team’s activities and helps build consistency in our communications</td>
<td>May not be in line with individual Board member conceptions of the Committee’s function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Committee transparency and accountability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Notes

Votes For: | Against: | Abstain: |
---|---|---|

Proposed Amendments:
Green Team Committee Strategic Plan

2011

I. PURPOSE, MISSION & GUIDING PRINCIPLES
The purpose, mission and goals of the SOUTH ROBERTSON NEIGHBORHOODS COUNCIL as determined in the By-Laws are to:

• Act on the City Charter Mandate to identify and address community concerns in sustaining the environmental, economic and social well being of the COUNCIL AREA.
• To serve as an inclusive forum for public discussion of issues, needs, and concerns of the COUNCIL that will provide the BOARD with knowledge empowering it to make decisions that strengthen and maintain the purpose of the COUNCIL.
• Encourage STAKEHOLDER participation in addressing community concerns.

II. ACTION AREAS
The mission of the SORONC GREEN TEAM COMMITTEE is to support the above stated objectives of the COUNCIL through the following action areas:

1. COMMUNICATION WITH THE COMMUNITY: to learn the environmental concerns of the SORONC community, to form relationships with neighborhood faith-based green teams, and liaisons with other NC green teams, to develop a newsletter as a forum for neighborhood concerns and for disseminating current information.

2. EDUCATION: to provide environmental education through field trips, debates, lectures, workshops, classes, and to form close relationships with neighborhood schools in order to promote green campuses and environmental awareness.

3. ACTIVITIES RELATING TO THE ENVIRONMENT: to sponsor activities such as neighborhood clean-ups and beautification, water/energy/resource conservation related activities, to support the Hami Garden, and SOVA food bank assistance.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCACY

5. GRANT WRITING
Votes to support potential compromise boundary adjustment options

Agenda Item: GB072111-9
Date: 21 July 2011
Proposed By: Executive

As Mid-City NC is also interested in annexing the area to the southeast of SORO, DONE has proposed several options

Full Proposal
In the wake of the BONC hearing on July 5, 2011, DONE has proposed several proposed compromise arrangements for Area B, one of two areas SORO NC seeks to incorporate.

Some of these options are mutually exclusive. The NC will vote on each option individually.

Proposed Motion
That SORO NC vote to endorse any of following proposed boundary adjustment options:

a. That SORO NC reaffirms its petition and stated desire to represent the entirety of Area B itself;

b. That SORO NC withdraw its boundary adjustment petition for Area B and support Mid-City NC’s petition instead;

c. That SORO NC would consider sharing the west side of La Cienega (area currently within its boundaries) with Mid-City NC and withdraw its boundary petition for Area B;

d. That SORO NC would consider sharing both sides of La Cienega between Venice and the boundary of Culver City with Mid-City NC;

e. That SORO NC would consider sharing the east side of La Cienega with Mid-City NC, but not the west side.

Considerations

| Pro | Con |

Board Notes

Votes For: Against: Abstain:

Proposed Amendments:
Motion to send a letter to BONC regarding irregularities in SORO NC boundary adjustment process

Agenda Item: GB072111-10
Date: 21 July 2011
Proposed By: Executive

Seeks Board approval for letter detailing severe issues with how our application was handled

Full Proposal

According to Ordinance 176704, which establishes the basic process for NC boundary adjustment, a number of actions MUST take place when an NC submits a boundary petition:

- Within 15 days of the submission, DONE must make a formal recommendation to BONC. If they fail to do so, the petition must be immediately forwarded to BONC without their recommendation;

- Within 10 days of DONE’s recommendation (or failure to do so), BONC must hold a public hearing (preferably within the NC) to decide whether the petition meets the criteria of the Ordinance and the Plan. If BONC doesn’t have a meeting already scheduled within that 10 day window, it can be pushed to their next regular meeting;

- DONE must publicly post notice of the hearing within the affected area (translated, if appropriate) 15 days before it happens. They also need to mail notice of the hearing to the NC.

None of that happened when it was legally required to, and several items didn't happen at all.

If it had, the SORO NC petition (submitted April 5, 2011) would have been considered on its individual merits no later than May 3. That’s a full 24 days before Mid City NC (MINC) even submitted their petition. Remember that the criteria for approving a petition is very straightforward: is the petition complete? do the stakeholders and the NC agree to the change? In SORO NC’s case, the answer to both would have been yes.

MINC certainly has its own complaints with the process, and we are sympathetic. But delays by DONE and BONC unfairly pitted two capable and committed NCs against each other. Worse, when the hearing did happen on July 5th, the chaotic confusion over BONC’s own rules of order further undermined the confidence of the NCs and the stakeholders in the process.

There is no question that the progressively severe cuts in DONE’s budget over the past several years (which SORO NC vocally opposed) led to this impasse. Indeed, SORO NC applauds the work that General Manger Kim and his staff regularly do above and beyond the call of duty. The Department is doing a herculean job managing basic support functions for 94 Neighborhood Councils, but in this case, important steps were overlooked.
SORO NC entered into this honestly believing that we have a compelling argument for representing Area B. In addition to wide-spread support from residents in the area, we are in the midst of executing a plan to expand the Arts District west along Venice Blvd. The area is geographically and economically contiguous, and most importantly, we already actively represent the many families who send their kids to Shenandoah Elementary and Hamilton High School.

We were also determined to play fairly—strictly by the rules—and we’re proud that at no point did we cut corners in compiling our petition or in our extensive outreach to the community. We therefore object that corners were cut by DONE and BONC, and ask that our petition be considered by BONC on its own merits and without regard to other petitions submitted long after ours.

**Proposed Motion**

I. That the SORO NC Board approves a letter to BONC (cc:ing DONE, the City Attorney, and Councilmembers Krekorian, Koretz, Wesson, and Garcetti) outlining our objections to the critical irregularities in the boundary adjustment process, making the points outlined above.

**Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important to identify a severe breakdown in legally-established processes.</td>
<td>It may be better to simply restate our case at the August 2 BONC hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifies that our conflict is not with MINC nor with BONC or DONE overall, but with process failures in this particular case.</td>
<td>May still upset our partners in DONE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes the basis for a potential appeal to the City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Board Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Votes For:</th>
<th>Against:</th>
<th>Abstain:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Amendments:**
Motion to authorize an ad hoc committee to speak for SORO NC on boundary issues and take such action as it deems appropriate

Agenda Item: GB072111-11
Date: 21 July 2011
Proposed By: Executive

Establishes a small group to co-ordinate boundary adjustment petition decisions

Full Proposal

Our petition for boundary adjustment continues. As we’ve gone through the various steps, it has become clear that the NC will have to move quickly in response to changing situations. The motion creates an ad hoc committee of no more than 6 SORO NC Board members authorized to make decisions about the petition on behalf of the NC. At the conclusion of the petition process, the committee will disband.

Proposed Motion

I. That the SORO NC create an ad hoc committee expressly authorized to collectively take such action as it deems appropriate on behalf of the NC. Actions may include (but are not limited to) writing letters to City officials, coordinating outreach efforts to stakeholders, speaking on behalf of the NC, representing the NC in any proposed boundary negotiations, and initiating an appeal to City Council if the committee feels it warranted.

II. That the members of the committee will be appointed by the SORO NC President

III. That the committee will report regularly on its actions to the NC Board

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives us flexibility and speed in negotiations</td>
<td>Since the committee isn't comprised of volunteers, it may be out of sync with the wishes of the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces the need for special meetings of the Board</td>
<td>The committee arguably should have been established at the beginning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Notes

Votes For:  
Against:  
Abstain:  

Proposed Amendments: