

On Oct 23, 2013, at 1:46 PM, Kevin McKeown <kevin@mckeown.net> wrote:

Last night, one of the Councilmembers who two weeks ago voted for an ordinance allowing commercial group trainers in Palisades Park did not show up for the vote to adopt on second reading. However, there were still six of us on the dais, because this time Pam O'Connor was present.

We once again deadlocked in a three-three tie. Pam, Gleam, and Ted voted for the ordinance allowing trainers in Palisades Park on second reading. Tony, Bob, and I held fast, voting no.

That meant the ordinance failed. There would be no law at all controlling commercial group training in Palisades Park. We would continue as is, which residents have told me is unacceptable.

I let the matter sit a while. We now knew where Pam stood, and we were still expecting Terry O'Day to come late. His vote would have put the ordinance over the top. Then I got word he wasn't going to show up at all. I had to do something I really didn't want to. I called for reconsideration.

At that point, it was clear the best I could do last night was vote to put in the partial protections in the proposed ordinance. Otherwise, we went back to their being NO law about trainers in parks. At least the current law limits the numbers and locations in Palisades Park, and charges a fee that some of the Palisades Park trainers claim will put them out of business there. Some of us would be OK with that.

I could have left my heartfelt no vote stand, and the result would have been ever more trainers overrunning Palisades Park. I didn't think that's what residents wanted.

What next?

The balance here is only one vote. If you or others can convince Pam, Terry, Gleam, or Ted to change their positions and vote to ban commercial trainers in Palisades Park, I'd bring this matter back again in an instant. One advantage of my casting my unenthusiastic vote last night is that I'm now on the prevailing side, and have the right to bring the ordinance back for reconsideration, with a clause protecting Palisades Park.

I don't see any point in my doing that until the community works on that

fourth vote. I've argued the case as best I could, and failed to sway my colleagues.

The current ordinance runs for one year. We can revisit sooner than that. As an ordinance, it is also subject to a referendum, but that is an expensive and difficult process.

Thanks,

Kevin

K e v i n M c K e o w n
kevin@mckeown.net
<http://www.mckeown.net>

Santa Monica, CA (USA)
Tel: (310) 393-3639
"Choose to be conscious"