



Mar Vista Community Council



AGENDA & MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors

<http://www.marvista.org/minutes-and-agendas.php>

Tuesday, November 13th, 2018, at 7:00pm
Mar Vista Recreation Center Auditorium
11430 Woodbine Street, Mar Vista, CA 90066

1. Call to order

Meeting called to order at 7:05pm with approximately 12 non-board members in attendance.

2. Presentation of Flag and Pledge of Allegiance

Led by Chair Hanna.

3. Roll Call – Call of the roll and certification of a quorum

Quorum established with Robin Doyno, Aaron Elster, Stacy Shure, Mary Hruska, Rob Kadota, Elliot Hanna, Sara Roos, Nanxi Liu, Holly Tilson; Michelle Krupkin (7:12pm), Ken Alpern (7:14pm)

4. Community Memorial Observations

~ none

5. Announcements

Patrick Winters: Urges careful attention to the Planning application for a large health care facility (5 combined parcels) at 11405 Venice Boulevard. The Developers of Welbrook are from Utah. They are requesting numerous deviations including a tremendous setback, reduction [of what - alley?] in the rear, height increase, 60% density bonus increase from 40 units to 87, parking increase.

The R3 Zone application is "tremendously overreaching" and will have tremendous impact on the community in general and the adjacent residential community specifically. There is a public hearing on December 5 at the WLA Municipal Building, 1645 Corinth Ave, 90025, second floor. Please turn your attention to this important matter and attend the public hearing.

Shure: The Developer presented this project at MVCC's Planning and Land Use Committee (PLUM) meeting twice, most recently on September 11. The second meeting included their response to requested modifications. Because Mr. Winters became aware of the project only through the ZA public notification, it appears Welbrook did not reach all immediate neighbors.

Debbie Almo-Vazquez: Enjoys the neighborhood and in particular visits the Farmer's Market every Sunday but is troubled by ever more and increasingly regular requests for money, handouts. How can the market be made more comfortable for all Farmer's Market patrons?

Notes as well that Developers are heavily present and some have hundreds of projects going at once, resulting in project delays and little care for the community, encouraging attractive nuisance and safety hazards such as trashed job sites, graffiti and broken fences and sidewalks, with difficult project communications.

Online LA311 app and communications with DBS (LA Department of Building And Safety) and CD11's Ms. Levien were suggested.

Mary Hruska: extremely concerned about a proposed City ordinance [online hyperlinked text follows], Council File [CF 12-0460-S4](#); Case No. CPC-2016-3182-CA; ENV-2016-3183-CE. Known as the "[Processes And](#)

[Procedures Ordinance](#), a proposed amendment to the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) that would "systematically reorganize the administrative provisions of the Zoning Code". The matter will be heard soon before CoLA PLUM. Many citizens' letters appear in the Council File linked above; it will be hard to compose a MVCC position quickly enough with the holiday and complexity of the matter (Alpern). It could be that MVCC should meet in special session to consider the matter specifically; MVCC PLUM will consider it in December.

Concern is that City Council members will not attend sufficiently to the 900+ page document given its presentation as perfunctory and inconsequential, a simple stream-lining of zoning code processes; it is anything but. The ordinance would affect City law and fundamentally restructure power in favor of the Mayor and the unelected Director of City Planning, while dis-empowering community stakeholders. For example if passed as proposed we would have no community say in the redesigned Community Plan; MVCC's PLUM Committee would have no value.

WRAC is aware of the proposed ordinance but has no position on it.

An informative from this stakeholder is posted with the meeting supplemental information.

6. Public Comment for Items NOT on This Agenda

~ none

7. Ex-Parte Communications and Conflicts-of-Interest - Each board member shall declare any ex-parte communications or conflicts-of-interest pertaining to items on or related to this agenda.

Alpern – CityWatch articles, discussions concerning the board vacancy and committee leadership.		Doyno – HIC discussions with its CoChairs	
Elster – PLUM leadership vacancies, discussions with Bowlero regarding their chained parking lot.		Hanna – Discussions of committee vacancies and resignations.	Hruska -none
Kadota - none	Krupkin – discussions concerning the board vacancy and committee leadership; outreach to Zone 2 stakeholders		Liu – none
Roos – conversations with Zone 2 stakeholders about the board vacancy		Shure – none	Tilson – none

8. Adoption of the Agenda

- ~ New Business items were mis-titled and mis-labeled in the agenda; corrected in the Minutes (Krupkin).
- ~ The Traffic Study motion should be considered first, and as a companion to the Town Hall motion; WRAC motions later (Hruska).
- ~ Catch-and-Release motion from POSy was not agendized though passed through two committees and submitted for consideration (Roos).
- ~ A Special Meeting to consider the "Processes and Procedures Ordinance" may be necessary (Alpern).

Adopted as corrected without objection at 7:31pm

9. Reading and Approval of Minutes – Reading and approval of the minutes from the October 9, 2018 regular meeting of the Board of Directors.

Reading waived; Minutes **approved** (Alpern/Hruska) with corrections from Krupkin, Tilson, Shure at 7:35pm.

10. Reports

10.1 Elected Official and City Department Reports

[Hannah Levien](#) (CD11): Requests a moment of silence for those who died recently at the Borderline Grill in Thousand Oaks; and the Woolsey [Malibu] and Camp [Paradise] Fires.

~ Regarding the Street Vending motion, [SB946](#) passed at the state-level, so LA City Council wanted to take immediate action to pass a local program, which would be grandfathered, thus establishing some level of local control over the issue. Therefore BSS, Rec/Parks were asked for input prior to the 15th; more details are available on request: Hannah.levien@lacity.org

~ Responsibility for graffiti removal is slated to shift from LAPD to BSS, per a motion introduced by CD11.

- ~ Great Streets final report will be released 11/19/18 as promised.
- ~ Catch/Release motion can be pursued even though accidentally not agendized tonight.
- ~ Thanks for supporting the potential of incorporating short-term housing into the Disability Community Resource Center mandate; the recommendation is under investigation.

Vanessa Serrano (DONE): DONE is co-hosting a Town Hall for NCs on Thursday, November 29, 2018, with the Purposeful Aging Los Angeles (PALA) initiative of the County and City of Los Angeles. Presentations will be on age-friendly action plans, addressing questions such as: What are the pressing issues for our aging population?, What are you doing or would you like to see addressed? Please bring ideas about how to enhance and improve different regions and the neighborhoods specific to these; how to help make them age-friendly.

Krupkin: The Pilot Program along Venice Boulevard is not designed for aging seniors; it is not ADA-compliant. PALA should work closely with the LA Department on Disability.

- ~ ASL interpretation is available now on request via DONE.

10.2 Officer Reports

10.2.1 Chair – Elliot Hanna

Reminds committee CoChairs, that Minutes need timely posting; please get caught up.

10.2.2 1st Vice-Chair – Rob Kadota

Notes there was no MVCC booth on Sunday due to a problem accessing the storage locker, since corrected.

10.2.3 2nd Vice-Chair – Mary Hruska

Thanks for the CD11 Street Vending update from Ms. Levien. An update on the analyst's information from the 15th will be appreciated too.

10.2.4 Secretary – Sara Roos

Missed deliveries of the MVCC Fall Newsletter were investigated, solicited, replaced and conveyed to the distributor. Council letters, CIS and other business can be followed via the [website link](#); please do not hesitate to ask about business disposition or missing information.

10.2.5 Treasurer – Holly Tilson

~ none

10.3 Zone Director Reports

10.3.1 Zone 1 – Ken Alpern

Waiting and wondering when the Palms/Sepulveda parcel Developers will speak with the Zone 1 community (the silence is deafening). CD5 is actively communicating with stakeholders about the matter; Ms. Shure is on the case.

Commercial space in the zone presently is insufficient and shrinking as well. The matter has important, MVCC- (and City-)wide relevance that should be addressed through the Community Plan update.

10.3.2 Zone 2 – Vacant

10.3.3 Zone 3 – Mary Hruska

No specific news about Zone 3, but everyone is encouraged to pay attention to the Community Plan update process!

10.3.4 Zone 4 – Aaron Elster

~ none (see Zone 5 below).

10.3.5 Zone 5 – Michelle Krupkin

Time Warp music store – north side of VB in MVCC Zone 4 – is closing (not the record store). This marks the 21st business to close on Venice Boulevard since the road reconfiguration.

~ LAPD news includes the Officers Thanksgiving that will be held on Wednesday the 21st, sign up for food serving, cleanup. The LAPD Winter Wonderland and sleigh stops is fast approaching, with opportunity to volunteer at Pacific Station (Culver/Centinela) on the day before sorting toys. Pacific Division Cadets are collecting shoe box donations. Contact michelle.krupkin@marvista.org or rob.kadota@marvista.org for information or to consider saying "thank you" by donating your time.

10.3.6 Zone 6 – Holly Tilson

Zone 6 stakeholders are concerned with petty crime, that isn't so petty. Bike chop shops, homelessness. WMVRA is interested in hearing more from CD11 about proposed supportive housing in the DCRC at Beethoven/Venice.

10.4 Committee Reports

10.4.1 Elections And By-laws

Last meeting's small group dealt with expenditures, and a discussion of how to simplify the scheduling and posting of meetings.

10.4.2 Community Outreach

~ none

10.4.3 Transportation and Infrastructure

Safety issues with scooters continue to be reported; the matter is not going away. BIG Wow and Thank You to CD11's Alek Bartosouf and Hannah Levien for attending to issues of curb ramps and stop walks. Everyone looks forward to "Ken having nothing to complain about". Until then the parking study agendized under "New Business" below is important for CD11 to address and in conjunction with CD5. There is concern that the hopscotch mosaic project in front of the library is on hold because the "repair blitz" at Centinela/Venice may have displaced work at Inglewood/Venice?; Ms. Corinne's first installation has yet to be remunerated.

CD11's Ms. Levien clarifies that the "repair blitz" will be doubled, with a second episode scheduled near the fiscal year's end; it would have been too soon to accomplish a second tile installation now.

10.4.4 Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM)

PLUM discussion of a 70 unit project at Gateway/Barrington. Three motions were passed but the development team will return.

Community Plan – group is being shepherded and guided by a former MVCC Chair and long-time resident who encourages involvement from all stakeholders. December meeting will be rescheduled to avoid the holidays. Agendized motions from WRAC (below) do relate to the SubCommittee's work.

POSy – considered council member Englander's reconsideration of a Catch/Release program for coyotes. The program already has been tried and was found wanting; POSy opposes reinstating the already-failed initiative, but proposes a public education safety campaign that could be useful at mitigating public risk.

10.4.5 Public Health and Safety

86 kids registered for MVCC's Bike Safety Fair. It was a great success with much great support from Walk N Rollers and many local businesses [list them?]. Special thanks to Zone 1's Westside Village HOA for a cash contribution. Jump [Bikeshare] handed out helmets to all participants. There were First Aid kits and reflective vests for kids and adults at the Farmer's Market.

10.4.6 Education, Arts, and Culture

~ none

11. Special Orders –

11.1 Committee Resignations – Discussion and possible action regarding the resignations of Sherri Akers, Birgetta Kastenbaum, and Tatiana Leuthi as Co-Chairs of the Aging-in-Place Subcommittee and Martin Rubin as Co-Chair of the Elections and Bylaws Committee.

Aging In Place is a committee of long-standing, founded and run for many years by three ladies (above) who've done a spectacular job, and feel it's time now to step aside. They tried a quarterly cycle, but found the schedule didn't work, so have chosen simply to move on. The committee is integrally connected with its founders and would be hard to recreate without the original CoChairs. In the absence of a different workable suggestion, the committee's work will be archived and preserved for future reference.

Mr Rubin has chosen to step aside as Cochair of the Elections and By-laws Committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Selena Inouye: Regrets that Mr. Rubin has resigned. He was a big part of the committee, suggesting committee leadership issues could have been handled better. With lots of new people chairing committees the board should spend some money for training to prevent such problems.

BOARD COMMENT

Krupkin: AIP was an amazing asset to community. It is sad to see its Cochairs go, but hopes the committee can continue on; sorry Mr. Rubin is stepping down too.

*Resignations **accepted** at 8:05pm 10/0/1 (Hanna).*

11.2 Committee Appointment - Discussion and possible action regarding the appointment of Co-Chairs of the Planning and Land Use Committee to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Damien Newton.

The resignation of Mr. Newton leaves Mr. Elster a one-man army. Mr. Alpern and Ms. Shure are appointed to join Mr. Elster as Planning and Land Use Meeting (PLUM) CoChairs

*Seeing no opposition the **appointment** (Krupkin/Roos) is ratified 10/0/1 (Hanna).*

11.3 Second Announcement of Zone 2 Vacancy – In accordance with Article V, Section 6, Subsection C of the Bylaws of the Mar Vista Community Council - of a Zone 2 vacancy created by the resignation of Damien Newton.

The Zone 2 Director vacancy remains as no Letters of Interest from a Zone 2 stakeholder were submitted. The position remains yet to be filled; qualified stakeholder's Letter Of Interest are due by Saturday, December 8th, 2018 at 9pm.

11.4 Approval of Treasurer's Report – Discussion and possible action regarding the Treasurer's report for the prior month.

MER could not be generated because a few receipts need straightening out. In its stead is a "Treasurer's Report" in the packet. We have spent approximately \$11,860 and have approximately \$30K remaining; included in the budget already. Winter Wonderland has a \$1K NPG (Neighborhood Purpose Grant). Everything else is regular monthly costs – storage, printing, wifi, etc.

*Motion (Alpern/Krupkin) to **approve** the Treasurer's Report **passes** 10/0/1 (Hanna).*

11.5 Presentation from Skip Scooters – Brief presentation from Lauren Urhausen, Western Regional Director of External Affairs for Skip Scooters

*[Lauren Urhausen](mailto:lauren@skipscooters.com), lauren@skipscooters.com
[Rafi](mailto:rafi@skipscooters.com), General Manager for the LA area [rafi@skipscooters.com?]*

Skip Scooters distinguishes itself from competitors by working hard to have a good relationship with Community and the regulators. Never having been served a cease-and-desist order, they play by the rules, are in this together, and want to work with us. They maintain a relationship with responsible writers, use in-app tutorials. They have an internal locking device to prevent stranding and falling and are dedicated to Safety, employing a helmet program (one is earned by Ms. Petersen for correctly answering where scooters are permitted to be ridden).

Please do not hesitate to contact them so they may become part of the Community.

Krupkin: MVCC has articulated its concerns regarding scooters in a CIS filed with the City. We favor geofencing, funding for enforcement and other points enumerated there. We welcome collaborative solutions.

Hruska: Curious the motivation of scooter-users: does it substitute for walking, the bus, driving? Funds to study this formally would yield valuable data.

Skip: Data from Portland, OR DOT finds scooters used for first/last mile transit. That is, the modality competes with driving or Uber, or the bus if its stop changes. Approximately 50:50 eliminating walking and driving. Cautions that this is Portland, not LA where traffic is very different (fierce today).

Alpern: There's no shortage of accidents: Safety is important. State-level governance doesn't have to be undertaken the same way at the local level. We would like to know the degree scooters are a public health problem; will the cost of their risk be assumed by everyone??

Selena Inouye: Notes the product is "able-ist"; it does not accommodate disabilities. Two-wheel scooters are not stable, a third wheel is necessary.

Skip: Recumbent bicycles are available already in some markets.

Kadota: Signaling is sketchy on a scooter but it is just as important for a scooter operator as a cyclist or motorist to signal intention. How can this be addressed in future products?

Roos: Beyond mobility and utility studies, an on-going, funded study of current safety metrics such as ER visits, accidents and injuries would be important. These reports should be mandated in-app.

Skip: We're lacking infrastructure in LA to studies these issues yet.

12. Consent Calendar – The Consent Calendar is reserved for items deemed to be routine and non-controversial. Any board member may pull an item or items for further discussion.

12.1 Appointment of Primary Cardholder – The Mar Vista Community Council appoints Elliot Hanna as the Primary Cardholder for the Mar Vista Community Council's credit card.

12.3 Supplemental Appropriation for Grease Night at Venice High School (Executive and Finance Committee) – The Mar Vista Community Council appropriates \$16.86 to cover overruns for Grease Night at Venice High School.

12.4 Appropriation for Business Cards (Executive and Finance Committee) – The Mar Vista Community Council appropriates \$124.76 for business cards for board members.

Item 12.2 considered separately because of improper wording.

*Motion(Liu/Hruska) **approved** at 8:28pm 10/0/1 (Hanna)*

13. Excluded Consent Items – Discussion and further action on items excluded from the Consent Calendar.

13.1 [listed as agenda item 12.2] Appointment of Second Signer - The Mar Vista Community Council appoints Rob Kadota as the Second Signer for the Mar Vista Community Council's credit card.

Tilson: "Rob would be second signer if there were a second signer for a credit card, but there is no second signer on the credit card". Amended as follows:

"The Mar Vista Community Council appoints Rob Kadota as the Second Signer for the Mar Vista Community Council's credit card."

*Motion(Roos/Krupkin) **approved** at 8:30pm 10/0/1 (Hanna)*

14. Unfinished Business and General Orders -

Discussion of the City of Los Angeles' sidewalk vending program – Discussion and possible action regarding the restoration of the "opt-out" clause in the City of Los Angeles' sidewalk vending program (postponed from 8/31/2018 special BoD meeting).

Introduction by Hruska: CD11's report (above) noted this motion must be acted on in City Council shortly and its particulars have changed.

Motion (Hruska/Krupkin), to postpone item 14 discussion to December 11, 2018 regular BOD meeting (with time-certain) so the file can be discussed in its entirety then. **Passed** 10/0/1 (Hanna) at 8:31pm.

15. New Business –

- 15.1 [listed as agenda item 15.3, renumbered] Independent Traffic Study (Great Streets)** – Discussion and possible action regarding constituting a community panel and conducting an independent traffic study of the Venice Boulevard Great Street project.

Introduction by Alpern (8:33pm). This call for a traffic study of the Venice Boulevard Great Streets Pilot Project ("the Project") mirrors a successful collaboration between Silverlake NC and CD4.

WHEREAS, the Great Streets - Venice Boulevard Pilot Project has caused conflict and controversy in Mar Vista and the surrounding communities; and

WHEREAS, numerous requests for pre- and post-project data to the Great Streets Initiative in Mayor Garcetti's office, the Active Transportation and Vision Zero offices in the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), and Councilmember Mike Bonin's office have been non-responsive; and

WHEREAS, the limited data and analysis that has been released from LADOT and Councilmember Bonin's office is contradictory to the experiences of the community members living near, conducting business on and otherwise using Venice Boulevard; and

WHEREAS, numerous requests for Town Hall meetings with question and answer sessions have been denied by LADOT and Councilmember Bonin's office; and

WHEREAS, the Silver Lake community, when faced with a similar situation, asked for and were granted funds to hire a transportation contractor to conduct an independent traffic study regarding the Rowena Avenue road diet by their Councilmember David Ryu; and

WHEREAS, Mar Vista stakeholders, on behalf of the businesses and residents, commuters, emergency responders and others impacted by the Great Streets Venice Boulevard Pilot Project, would like to seek the same remedy in order to receive answers to their questions and concerns that have heretofore been unaddressed by the Great Streets Initiative, LADOT and Councilmember Bonin.

THEREFORE, in the spirit of community engagement, transparency and accountability, the Mar Vista Community Council (MVCC) will assemble a community panel under the auspices of the Great Streets Ad Hoc Subcommittee, and

THEREFORE, the MVCC requests that Councilmember Bonin provide the funding for an independent traffic study of the Great Streets Venice Boulevard Pilot Project, to be done within two months by an independent firm of the community panel's choosing, excluding current Great Streets contractor Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants.

Liu: How much funding was supplied by CM Ryu? Ans: 88K – 90K

PUBLIC COMMENT

Selena Inouye: The Community hasn't gotten straight answers out of LADOT; an independent traffic study might be the only way to get some questions answered that the Community needs.

Sheri Odere: it's about time we have an independent study to get the truth out about how this Project has impacted our neighborhood.

April Petersen: Supports the motion; accurate data would give the Community some foundational knowledge and bring people together with shared understanding. Information is necessary about the impact on side streets as well as on Venice Boulevard. Centinela Boulevard is also impacted with increased traffic and its bus stops too feed into the issues on Venice Boulevard. The absence of sidewalk improvements is troubling.

Jason Fineis: notes this data will bring transparency to the Project. More information about cut through traffic – which residents feel palpably – is necessary.

BOARD COMMENT

Alpern: The Project has safety issues that we need to understand. The optics suggest initially the Project was rammed through without any data, and now after well over a year still without data the Project's inertia simply carries it forward. The optics of non-transparency are brutal; we have no choice but to insist on this independent study.

Tilson: agrees we need the traffic study. The previous mobility chair promised in 2016 that if there were lots of cut-through traffic, a study would be done. Palms, Charnock, Victoria are all streets that in Zone 6 aren't meant to hold the current tremendous amounts of cut-through traffic; the telephone app 'Waze' directs traffic onto streets so narrow that parked cars are side-swiped: a study should be done.

Hruska: the Project shows glaring lack of transparency and incompetence. The Community that has paid for the Project also bears the brunt of its effect and is owed some real explanations.

Roos: how to convene a group that can effectively interact with the Council Office on this matter and accomplish such an open-ended request?

Krupkin: The request is to assemble a community panel under the auspices of the Great Streets SubCommittee, of unspecified size; interested parties can attend the Great Streets SubCommittee and apply to be part of the panel.

Hanna: clarifies that discussion can suggest an amendment to the motion, or to postpone the matter indefinitely but not argue points of it.

Kadota: objecting to oversight by the Great Streets ad hoc SubCommittee on the grounds that it is not a neutral or balanced group, suggests an amendment to strike the SubCommittee's auspices and substitute Board or Chair accountability: "MVCC will assemble a community panel".

Krupkin: does not accept the amendment.

Hanna: Objection is registered via voting on the amendment.

~ **Motion (i)** (Kadota/Roos) **to AMEND** as follows:

...THEREFORE, in the spirit of community engagement, transparency and accountability, the Mar Vista Community Council (MVCC) will assemble a Community Panel under the auspices of the Great Streets Ad Hoc SubCommittee, and ...

COMMUNITY COMMENT

BOARD COMMENT

Shure: we're all worried about conflicts in this Era Of Conflicts; convening this panel under the auspices of the full MVCC could remove the perception of conflict long perceived by some Community members.

Krupkin: Objects to any amendment of the motion.

Motion To Amend (i) **passes** 6/3 (Krupkin, Alpern, Hruska)/2 (Tilson, Hanna) at 8:52pm

Liu: The study is specified to be completed "within two months", ... of what moment – passage of the motion? Agreement of the contract?

Krupkin: Silverlake NC's agreement operated under this restriction.

Kadota: perhaps the timeframe could be specified more helpfully as a "goal"; or to be accomplished in a "speedy manner"?

Tilson: a small traffic study in Zone 6 was accomplished in two days.

Roos: what is to be studied? The question/s sought should dictate the study's length, goals, scope.

Alpern: The Project originally was rammed through without any studies altogether; to be specifying a timeframe now is simply raising the bar – whether two days, weeks or months does not matter. Should the motion be substituted to specify "four months"?

Hanna: to rewrite the motion it must go back to Committee; the Board can send it back. It is inefficient to construct a motion from the ground up.

Selena Inouye: The purpose of the motion is simply to get the ball rolling on this request.

Kadota: a clear charge is needed regarding what data we're asking for.

~ **Motion (ii)** (Kadota/Doyno) **to send the Independent Traffic Study motion back to SubCommittee in order to articulate the specific data set in question.**

PUBLIC COMMENT

Selena Inouye: why make the SubCommittee do all this work absent any commitment from CD11 for funding? The order should be to form a panel in principle, obtain commitment from CD11, then move forward to articulate MOU/scope of the study jointly.

Sheri Odere: this [proposal to remand the motion back to committee] is why we don't trust you [MVCC] guys; we're so frustrated our heads are exploding. We have this mess [on Venice Boulevard], we're waiting for data, we can't get you guys to agree to this proposal, which is frustrating.

Kalani Whittington: More than half [the MVCC Board] are new to the council or are in new leadership positions on it, so this [Project?] is turning out to be a bait-and-switch. For example Mr. Kadota was Chair when the Project was determined, and he is no longer; Ms. Liu is new; it all feels determined. There were community actions and presentations yet now we have scooters as a new example of a project shoved past us with no discussion of Safety. If Safety were really an issue, why are scooters not included (for example tonight I was hit by an individual wearing no helmet, dressed all in black on a scooter without a single reflector). Instead, it seems Safety is not an issue of concern, rather this is a personal political project for the Mayor and local council member, that has divided our community like national Trumpian politics does. We [should be] better than that.

April Petersen: would like this motion voted on tonight. If necessary create a special committee but move it forward tonight.

BOARD COMMENT

Kadota: some level of detail, scope of the study, is important: what are to be its basic six or seven questions? This shouldn't be an exhaustive contract, but more detail would be helpful to guide the discussion forward.

Hanna: the "quickest way to accomplish nothing is to try to do too much". We have to be realistic. The most beautifully funded motion might never see a dime. So rather than squabbling about every word, let's get the general gist and move forward.

Liu: we should request the study, and sooner rather than later. But considering the concern, if we want a study which is expressly what the city did not do – a transparent one – then we must be more specific. For example two months is inadequate – if the City completed a study in two months, we would say that's not enough. The proposal should be extended to four months at least.

Hanna: we're talking about whether to commit the motion back to Great Streets or not. Krupkin: since an amendment was just adopted removing Great Streets from assembling the community panel, it is the Board of Directors who will have to compose these two questions, and right now. Sending this back to Great Streets would be sending it back without teeth as its right to assemble a panel is gone.

Alpern: The Community's anger [re safety issues? remanding the amendment to committee? Debating the motion?] is warranted, this hypocrisy of double standards [re absence of transparent data while demanding unspecified transparency of data collection now?] is appropriate: there is a lack of transparency [in data collected]. We could amend collection to happen within four months, but no one cares. That would be missing the forest for the trees.

Shure: feels a Community Panel [first amendment] is the best way to review the data but the (amended) motion should be amended to specify it is the Community Panel that shall prepare a list of required data once funds have been obtained from CD11, rather than requesting that data list be prepared by Great Streets – i.e., sending the motion back to the SubCommittee [that is, the proposed motion on the floor].

~ **Motion (iii)** (Shure/Hruska) **to AMEND** as follows:

...THEREFORE, the MVCC requests that Councilmember Bonin provide the funding for an independent traffic study of data (or questions) identified by the assembled ad hoc Community Panel regarding the Great Streets Venice Boulevard Pilot Project, to be ~~done~~ completed within ~~two~~ four months of the contract ~~by~~ with an independent firm of the eCommunity ~~p~~Panel's choosing, excluding current Great Streets contractor Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants.

Liu: clarifies this is not another motion, but we are amending the motion.

Selena Inouye: The Community Panel, rather than the Great Streets SubCommittee, should be compiling the list of data or questions, and interacting with the contractor. We would want to have experts advising us.

Elster: Is this another amendment being offered?

Tilson: The amendment [on the floor] micromanages the initial request. "Traffic study" probably has 18 different meanings, yet the community states there is a need for a traffic study (the cut-through traffic is killing us). Which details, are to be determined later by the contractor, and not the committee. If we stipulate a time line, it should start once these details are worked out, otherwise we're facing another whole year.

~ Call (iv) (Liu/Kadota) the previous amendment for a vote [2/3]:

Shure: requests to withdraw her amendment (denied by Chair Hanna).

Call to end debate and vote (iv) on the previous amendment passes 8/1 (Roos)/2 (?)

Amendment (iii) to remand details to the Community Panel and amend the timeline (iii) [as above] passes 9/1 (Roos)/1 (Hanna)

15.2 [listed as agenda item 15.1, renumbered] Support of WRAC Motions Regarding the Community Plan Process (PLUM) - Discussion and possible action regarding motions from WRAC requesting information from the city regarding the community plan process.

(i) The Mar Vista Community Council finds the Community Plans Update Outreach Plan timeline of 3 years to be ambitious (consider that the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert and Granada Hills Plans required 7 years, and the Expo Station Neighborhood Transit Plan required 4.5 years), potentially limiting adequate public input and feedback.

Therefore, we request that the Planning Department be funded to extend the timeline if and as needed to accommodate achievement-anchored benchmarks.

(ii) The Mar Vista Community Council requests the Planning Department provide all information (below), prior to commencing any work on the Community Plan Update process.

These data are prerequisite for meaningful asset-based grassroots planning input to any Community Plan, whether it is for the Westside's first cycle (Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey, Westchester-Playa del Rey, West Los Angeles Venice) or the second cycle (Westwood, Bel Air-Beverly Crest, Brentwood-Pacific Palisades):

- 1. What is the current aggregate population in the Community Plan area?*
- 2. What is the projected population in the build-out year? How is it calculated? Who calculates it? Is the U.S. Census used?*
- 3. What is the population capacity in the current zoning, including R Zones and C Zones with density bonuses (Transit Oriented Communities (TOC), Expo Station Transit Neighborhood Plan (TNP)) and Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)?*
- 4. What is the population capacity in the proposed zoning, including R Zones and C Zones with density bonuses (TOC, ExpoStation TNP) and ADUs?*
- 5. Capacity of jobs or count of jobs currently.*
- 6. Change in jobs as a result of proposed zoning, either by increase in C or M Zones or reduction in jobs if C or M Zones are decreased.*

These two motions relate to the Community Plan update process, and are suggested by WRAC. The first simply requests the timeline be extended. The three years currently proposed is very ambitious; there is concern it cannot be accomplished effectively.

The second requests data. Where will the data be coming from that will be used in their calculations, including housing capacity, population and employment projections? The Community needs to see this data in order that we may follow and properly contribute to the process.

Motion (Hruska/Alpern) passes without public or board comment at 9:25pm 10/0/1 (Hanna).

- 15.3 [listed as agenda item 15.3, renumbered] Town Hall and Data (Great Streets)** – Discussion and possible action regarding a stakeholder petition requesting a town-hall meeting to present the one-year pilot project data for the Venice Blvd. Great Streets Pilot Project and for other related purposes.

Postponed to December 11, 2018 meeting.

16. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:27pm.

* **PUBLIC INPUT AT NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL MEETINGS** – The public is requested to fill out a "Speaker Card" to address the Board on any agenda item before the Board takes an action on an item. Comments from the public on agenda items will be heard only when the respective item is being considered. Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the agenda that are within the Board's jurisdiction will be heard during the General Public Comment period. Please note that under the Brown Act, the Board is prevented from acting on a matter that you bring to its attention during the General Public Comment period; however, the issue raised by a member of the public may become the subject of a future Board meeting. Public comment is limited to 3 minutes per speaker, unless adjusted by the presiding officer of the Board.

PUBLIC POSTING OF AGENDAS - MVCC agendas are posted for public review online at www.marvista.org/calendar and outside the Mar Vista Recreation Center office at 11430 Woodbine Street, Mar Vista, CA 90066.

Subscribe to our agendas via email through L.A. City's Early Notification System at <http://www.lacity.org/subscriptions> or via at our website, <http://www.marvista.org>

* **THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT** - As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and, upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services and activities, including sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices and other auxiliary aids and/or services. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting you wish to attend by contacting chair@marvista.org.

* **SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCION** - Si requiere servicios de traducción, favor de avisar al Concejo Vecinal 3 días de trabajo (72 horas) antes del evento. Por favor contacte a chair@marvista.org para avisar al Concejo Vecinal.

* **PUBLIC ACCESS OF RECORDS** – In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the board in advance of a meeting may be viewed at our website, <http://www.marvista.org>, or at the scheduled meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact secretary@marvista.org.

* **RECONSIDERATION AND GRIEVANCE PROCESS** - or information on MVCC's process for board action reconsideration, stakeholder grievance policy, or any other procedural matters related to this Council, please consult the MVCC Bylaws. The Bylaws are available at our Board meetings and our website, <http://www.marvista.org>. The MVCC Board of Directors meets regularly on the second Tuesday of each month, Mar Vista Recreation Center, 11430 Woodbine Street, Mar Vista, CA 90066.