

Nina Sorkin, Chair of the Election Committee of the SLNC, reportedly recommended – "endorsed" – certain candidates. Any such overt bias, along with the untethered and sustained authority given by EmpowerLA, makes the fairness of the recent election dubious, and a challenge necessary.

It has been reported that she was removed from the polling place for telling people how to vote. A month earlier, a board member evidently reported, to EmpowerLA, similar partisan actions by Ms. Sorkin. There was also the extraordinary occurrence of her calling publicly for a candidate to be censured, showing her overt and undeniable willingness to harm a particular candidacy (which currently is listed as being down by four votes). That candidate contacted EmpowerLA and said Ms. Sorkin being allowed to continue to "exercise her partiality in many ways, including the identifying of lists of voters... may be decisive and {will} certainly have an impact on how this election, and EmpowerLA's involvement in it, will be assessed."

Even her more innocuous actions could create an unequal playing field – for example, her motion calling for selection of Micheltorena school, and it alone, said Micheltorena would be "convenient" to certain regions -- making it inconvenient to others!

She may have swayed many people but she evidently didn't do what she'd promised – reach out to churches, organizations and schools all over Silver Lake to encourage voting and candidacies, and to identify "community impact" voters. In the end, she claimed she had only outreached to 2-3 groups, all within a block of Micheltorena, favoring Micheltorena-centric candidates. She may have had a major impact concerning which groups were contacted regarding community interest status and which non-resident stakeholders might be allowed to vote. Did she only concentrate on groups that might help her choices?

Did she have a major impact, lobbying for her choice as to polling place selection, while w/posing board-approved policy?

Re the choice of Micheltorena over Citibank, she questioned the parking – of Citibank! – but stated that Micheltorena's big lot was available, drastically affecting the preferences of some board members, But Citibank's parking was fine and Micheltorena's wasn't available, thus essentially robbing many voters of any any chance to vote, and once again helping candidates with their main base quite close to Micheltorena.

It can certainly be said that her choices, advocacy, actions and decisions had a massive impact in creating an imbalance in the election. Of course, the SLNC board chose her for the board, but was walled off from any oversight role, when EmpowerLA chose to place the committee's authority over the board's: for example, when EmpowerLA's Terrence Gomes said, on 3/7, "let the election committee

communicate and conduct all election business for the SLNC.” So the role and impact of Ms. Sorkin must be challenged, but EmpowerLA’s willingness to create a down-is-up, Alice in Wonderland, tail-wagging-dog dynamic needs searching review and accountability. That said, Ms. Sorkin’s capacity to endorse candidates, influence voters and disparage others likewise requires massive attention because of her impact on this election.