



Mar Vista Community Council



MINUTES

Special Meeting of the Board of Directors

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

Tuesday, May 21st, 2019, at 7:00pm

The Coffee Connection, Station Room
3636 S. Centinela Ave., Mar Vista, CA 90066

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m.

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

Attending (8):

Elliot Hanna
Robin Doyno
Mary Hruska
Ken Alpern
Sara Roos
Holly Tilson
Michelle Krupkin
Stacy Shure

3. Public Comment for Items NOT on This Agenda

Robin Doyno: Said he believed that an agenda item that was submitted properly has been omitted. Himself and the people involved in the homelessness issues committee are concerned about it, and there is nothing they can really do about it. He simply brings it to everyone's attention, and said it was concerning a police petition.

Elliot Hanna: Said that that item will be submitted for the next regular agenda.

Stakeholder: Thanked the board for a great job, and hoped to see them next term.

Sara Roos: Asked if anyone wanted to hear a report about the oil company on Rancho. She explained that before the APC, it was kind of a half-and-half win; it was a tri-partite setup, with an oil company, the public, and the city; the oil company and the people were very happy together. She said that the oil company wants annual compliance to be done, and the city did not know what to do to facilitate it. They made a framework that was applied tangentially for something else, and applied it to the current issue. Inspection of the site was in March of 2017, and they set that up as a protocol moving forward. It's hard seeing how an outside city official will be part of this, but it could be a great public relations win for the oil company. The APC's setup was to forge a protocol. The company voluntarily agreed to line monitoring at the perimeter. So they get kudos in her opinion and others' in trying to do the right thing. They had the biggest flare available on the market with no permits; they removed it voluntarily and requested permitting for it.

Michelle Krupkin: Said that Culver City is having a meeting Thursday at 3:00 p.m, and she will be attending; a sewer project has the possibility to seriously impact the surrounding neighborhood for a year. She will find out more details about it at the meeting.

Ken Alpern: Said that a few of the board will sign off on a letter with the 1170 Charnock project. He said that this was out of order, and that the project did a bait and switch. What the board approved is not what is being submitted to the city; either way, he said that Stacy Shure has a few things for board members to potentially sign. Whoever else wants to sign can sign, saying they were lied to.

Elliot Hanna: Clarified that anyone who wanted to sign can only do so as an individual: without an agenda item, it is not an action of the board.

Stacy Shure: Explained the vacancy rate for rentals is 2.84%, which is representative of city planning previously told a judge on the record that they did not have data on. She explained that they are asking for denials of entitlements to any property that removes rentals to low-income tenants.

Mary Hruska: Added that, related to the Charnock project, there was a CEQA workshop, and one of the things they want to do with the new DCP website is create a map showing all the pending EIRs, so people can follow what's actually being agreed upon. That's how they're supposed to build based on what the EIR dictates.

4. 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.

Elliot Hanna: Had spoken to Holly Tilson regarding 10.2 and Stacy Shure regarding 10.9.

Holly Tilson: Has discussed the budget with Elliot Hanna.

Stacy Shure: Said that regarding 10.9, she has had conversations with Councilmember Koretz's planning deputy, transportation deputy, Hannah Levien from Councilmember Bonin's office, Ken Alpern, the Westside Homeowner's Association.

Robin Doyno: Has discussed 10.4, only with members of the committee.

Ken Alpern: Said that he had talked with WBHA, and published his Citywatch articles, but nothing involving any of their motions, and raising to Len and Hannah about the Charnock issue. The Palms and Sepulveda issue he has discussed with stakeholders.

5. Adoption of the Agenda

Robin Doyno objected to the agenda.

Mary Hruska moved to adopt the agenda.

Ken Alpern seconded.

VOTE:

YES: Hanna, Hruska, Alpern, Roos, Tilson, Krupkin.

NO: Shure, Doyno.

The motion passed with 6 votes

With objection from Robin Doyno, the agenda was adopted.

6. **Reading and Approval of Minutes** – Reading and approval of the minutes from the most recent regular meeting(s) of the Board of Directors.

Michelle Krupkin: Had a correction on 15.5, it should just say mid-page that Krupkin wanted to clarify that this motion does not go back to committee.

Mary Hruska: Said that on page 2 and 8, the name of the person is actually Beau Avril instead of “Bau”. It appears once on page two, and at the top of page eight.

Elliot Hanna: Said that on page 2, he believed it was Michelle he asked, not Mary. Also there are various grammatical and spelling problems that they do not need to list in detail. Also, on page 10, his comment says he feels the inclusion of candidate statements, and it stops, and what he said was he felt the inclusion is inappropriate.

Sara Roos: Added that they should do a global search through the document for “RAC”, it should be “WRAC”.

Michelle Krupkin moved to approve the draft minutes from the most recent meeting.

Stacy Shure seconded.

VOTE:

YES: Hruska, Alpern, Roos, Shure, Krupkin

NO: Doyno.

ABSTAIN: Tilson, Hanna.

The motion passed with 5 votes

With no objections, the minutes were adopted.

7. **Special Orders** - None

8. **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.

8.1. **[FUNDING][ExFin] Approval of April MER** – Discussion and possible action regarding the Monthly Expense Report for April, 2019

8.2. **[FUNDING][TILSON] Approval of Budget Revisions** – Discussion and possible action regarding revisions to the FY2018-2019 Budget

Holly Tilson: Said that she basically gave the whole explanation last time regarding the MER. She added that they are not approving a budget since she has not distributed any budget. All she did was delete anything anyone had not spent, and added in motions that were pending, except for the Movie Madness. Depending on what actually gets spent, there is a possible \$5,000 if people do not spend what they ask for and they do not pay the farmer’s market until the next fiscal year. There might be other motions in June that people wanted funded that they didn’t have their paperwork in for. She went over it all last month and gave everyone the rundown; they also need to replace their equipment which is a couple thousand dollars worth; the green tent could come up, and there are miscellaneous things here and there that are hundreds of dollars.

Stacy Shure: Asked who is buying replacement microphones and sound after the theft of the equipment. Elliot Hanna said that they have not decided on a supplier yet, and he had just received the insurance check made out for the City of Los Angeles. Shure asked Hanna to make a note that they should touch base with her so she can get a competitive or lower bid. She also asked, if they have money left at the end of the year, can they donate it to a non-profit organization representing stakeholders and doing work for them? Tilson said that those organizations can apply for an NPG if they want one. She added that there needs to be a line item added for the replacement of equipment.

Ken Alpern motioned to approve revisions to the FY2018-2019 budget.

Mary Hruska seconded.

VOTE:

YES: Alpern, Shure, Tilson, Krupkin, Roos, Hruska, Doyno.

ABSTAIN: Hanna.

The motion passed with 7 votes.

With no objections, the revisions to the FY2018-2019 budget were approved.

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

10. Unfinished Business and General Orders –

10.1. [POLICY][Great Streets] Independent Traffic Study – Discussion and possible action regarding an item - requesting a community panel and an independent traffic study of the Venice Boulevard Great Street project - amended at the 11/13/2018 BoD meeting and committed to the Great Streets Subcommittee.

10.2. [POLICY][Great Streets] ADA Evaluation of Venice Blvd. – Discussion and possible action regarding an item requesting an ADA evaluation of the Venice Blvd. project

Elliot Hanna: Asked to consider 10.1 and 10.2 together since they're closely related. He suggested that, since they are about to embark on a new term, a lame duck board passing this will make the proposals dead on arrival, and CD11 will not pay any attention. He suggested postponing these indefinitely.

With no objections, items 10.1 and 10.2 were postponed.

10.3. [FUNDING][ExFin] NPG for "Spring Movie Madness" – Discussion and possible action regarding a Neighborhood Purpose Grant (NPG) application in the amount of \$3,600 to fund four movie screenings at Beethoven Elementary School.

Holly Tilson: Said she had not received a signed NPG form regarding the item.

Elliot Hanna: Said that since the NPG is incomplete, they cannot consider it.

10.4. [FUNDING][Education, Arts, and Culture] NPG for Mobile Graffiti Yard – Discussion and possible action regarding a Neighborhood Purpose Grant (NPG) application in the amount of \$500 to bring Mobile Graffiti Yard to the Mar Vista Kids & Craftz Festival.

Elliot Hanna: Explained that this item is to bring the same mobile graffiti yard that was at the farmer's market to the Kids and Craftz festival.

Stacy Shure motioned to approve the NPG in the amount of \$500 to bring Mobile Graffiti Yard to the Mar Vista Kids and Craftz Festival.

Michelle Krupkin seconded.

Holly Tilson: Said that this spending is within her budget, so this is not new money.

Elliot Hanna: Said that regarding this issue, anything that involves children is something very positive, and if they excite the kids, they will get the parents involved.

Michelle Krupkin: Added that this project is in conjunction with Mar Vista Library, and this is actually working with homeless teens and kids and encouraging them to have an artistic outlet.

Ken Alpern: Said that the key issue is that they need to make sure there was some mention of who donated the money, although this is a great idea, so that MVCC is represented.

Stacy Shure: Asked, since they have discussed this and about bringing more people in, could they discuss doing more outreach and getting involved with the community?

VOTE:

YES: Doyno, Alpern, Shure, Tilson, Krupkin, Roos, Hruska.

ABSTAIN: Hanna.

The motion passed with 7 votes.

With no objections, the NPG in the amount of \$500 to bring Mobile Graffiti Yard to the Mar Vista Kids and Craftz Festival was approved.

10.5. [FUNDING][Tilson] Miscellaneous Outreach Expenses – Approval of an appropriation in the amount of \$500 for miscellaneous outreach expenses.

Holly Tilson: Explained that the line item on the budget was \$400, so she just made it \$500; she added that the Green Subcommittee has been asking for a few items for months, including easels, that were stolen when MVCC's unit was broken into. Sherry Cooms (SP?) was going to give Elliot Hanna a list of the items, and that can be considered miscellaneous outreach.

Stacy Shure motioned to approve an appropriation in the amount of \$500 for miscellaneous outreach expenses.

Mary Hruska seconded.

Michelle Krupkin: Said she appreciates that this is going to replace items that are stolen, but asked if there was going to be a transparency of what they are going to spend this on?

Holly Tilson: Said that there would be, and that she will be giving them a list of what she wants. Elliot Hanna added that they will keep a record of what they spend on.

Robin Doyno: The work of the green committee is fabulous, it has to be encouraged at any turn.

VOTE:

YES: Alpern, Doyno, Shure, Tilson, Krupkin, Roos, Hruska.

ABSTAIN: Hanna.

The motion passes with 7 votes.

With no objection, the appropriation in the amount of \$500 for miscellaneous outreach expenses is approved.

10.6. [FUNDING][Tilson] Yearly Booth Rental – Approval of an appropriation in the amount of \$1,200 for yearly booth rental at the Mar Vista Farmers’ Market.

Holly Tilson: Explained that this is their rental for the green and blue tent, and the bike tent is thrown in there. They own the tarp and the equipment; this is for space rental for the next year basically. Instead of paying this in December where half of the year is gone and half is to come, rather than the money going back to the city, she arranged for MVCC to be billed early; so they would either spend it now, or come July/August. They are prepaying the upcoming year. She confirmed that they are allowed to do it under funding rules. They are using the money they have at the end of the fiscal year.

Stacy Shure motioned to approve an appropriation in the amount of \$1,200 for yearly booth rental at the Mar Vista Farmers’ Market.

Mary Hruska seconded.

Michelle Krupkin: Asked how much of this money goes to the space rental for the bike tent, and Tilson explained that it is the same fee they paid last year. Krupkin asked if it was the same area, but they were just cramming the bike tent in, and Tilson confirmed it is the same space.

VOTE:

YES: Alpern, Doyno, Shure, Tilson, Krupkin, Hruska, Roos.

ABSTAIN: Hanna.

The motion passes with 7 votes.

With no objection, the appropriation in the amount of \$1,200 for yearly booth rental at the Mar Vista Farmers’ Market is approved.

10.7. [FUNDING][Tilson] Room Rental – Approval of an appropriation in the amount of \$25 for room rental at the Winward School.

Holly Tilson: Explained that this is a line item for \$5, which is what they charged MVCC last year. The city was going to fix this, they don’t want people giving councils things, which is basically what they’re doing. They should technically be paying them so everything’s on the up-and-up. In the new year they might want to consider paying \$25 like they do for other people. In case they do bump it from \$5 there is no time for another motion. She does not think they will be spending this.

Stakeholder Adrianna: Asked what meetings are held at the Winward School. Elliot Hanna said that the Mobility and PLUM committee meetings were held there. Stacy Shure said that additionally, in arranging legal representation for the tenants, Winward has gone out of their way to provide meeting space for those tenants for free. Hanna said that they have to say that those meetings have nothing to do with MVCC.

Sara Roos: Said that Winward has applications before the CC all the time, and are a for-profit company that is constantly building; part of their business plan is based on public comment, and she believes they are enabling and empowering Winward to curry favor. She thinks they need to think carefully: they want to give us this space for free because it makes people feel warm and fuzzy towards them, so that when they ask for permission to build, it will be more favorable to the council. They should be asked to seek the same permissions as any other developer. Roos does not deny that their donation of space is magnanimous, but MVCC has over 400 not-for profit and faith organizations in the area that we could ask for space, as well as over a dozen public schools.

Stakeholder Kathryn: Asked what building Roos was talking about, and Roos said that Winward has plans in the works. They have not submitted them for approval, but they will be coming before MVCC in the future.

Stakeholder Adrianna: Said that she was in agreement that there are other entities existing in Mar Vista that would like to provide space, and that if they meet only in that one space, it looks like they are showing favor to one organization.

Sara Roos: Said, as a point of order, since they are a small number of people, it would be nice if they relax the rules regarding procedure. Hanna denied the request, and said they are running things according to the rules.

Stacy Shure moved to approve an appropriation in the amount of \$25 for room rental at the Winward School.

Ken Alpern seconded.

Michelle Krupkin: Said she thinks making this \$25 evens the playing field, and she agrees with Roos that they should take advantage of public schools and faith-based organizations. Also, lastly, Winward is in the process of (if they haven't done so already) purchasing two apartment buildings south of their property. Hanna said that they have not purchased them yet. Krupkin said that those tenants will be displaced, and wants to echo Roos' concern that MVCC does not just blindly cater to them. This session, she has not seen any motions before the board from Winward to oust tenants, but just wants to be cognizant about all of the issues.

Holly Tilson: Said that they do have the other building, and thought that its new name was DCRC, and was 89% owned by the city. The other thing is the public schools as far as she knows require additional types of insurance, since they backed out of holding CERT classes in one for that reason.

Stacy Shure: Had two points: one, regarding Winward's purchase of the buildings, this is the first she has heard of it. Nothing has come before PLUM. Should they be buying buildings on Sawtelle that are RSO, she will not be abstaining, and will be voting against it. Regarding the \$25, they have had to scramble sometimes to find a location, and they have had time constraints that have led to them not being able to have meetings in certain locations. Some facilities have wanted to charge them \$250 for renting space. Mary Hruska added that she always calls the library and the churches first, and they tend to need a lot of notice.

Ken Alpern: Said that he has been former Outreach, TI, and PLUM chairs for the better part of 15 years. He has had meetings at Hurry Curry, here, Clover Avenue Elementary School, and it is difficult to try to find things on short notice. If \$25 is too low, he is happy to raise it, he does not want to have any appearance of special favors. All he can say is when push comes to shove, Winward are the ones who are available. There have been issues of pedestrian access to meetings, and they have been very clear to emphasize that there is no conflict of interest. He wants to avoid any financial or ethical conflict of interest, but he wants to also emphasize past meetings where they have been stymied trying to find meeting space. If the \$25 is too low, they can amend the amount.

Holly Tilson: Clarified that this is not increasing their cost, as most other meeting places charge us this.

Sara Roos: Said she appreciated the difficulty of finding places, and she does appreciate the availability and willingness of Winward to be amenable. And that is a function of their being a for-profit business. All the other places they are searching for have more constraints. She said that Winward is not evil, they are what they are; they're a private entity that is looking for approval from MVCC, a public entity. This is the thing about bias; you don't know when you have it. It's a question and a long-term strategy by them. There was public outcry when they were putting water coolers in, and Winward's owners realized that they were being bad neighbors, and made an effort to do better, which is good. As far as public spaces, there are public schools and other open facilities. At a public meeting, Mark Hovater said that he wants to be able to hold more public meetings in the space.

Ken Alpern: Said he would love to have the circumstances he prefers, public rather than private meeting spaces. But if there has been a change and they are being more open, this does not preclude them from pursuing other avenues of meeting. He does not think they are in disagreement.

Elliot Hanna: Clarified that the motion does not say per meeting, it only says \$25.

Ken Alpern motioned to amend the motion to say "per meeting for the future until the end of the fiscal year" after "\$25".

Stacy Shure seconded.

Robin Doyno: Said that to answer Stakeholder Adrianna’s question, as they have heard of all the convenience of Winward, the amenities are great. But they are all guilty, except for Sara, of not realizing that public schools are under attack, and this is in a way normalizing private schooling.

Michelle Krupkin: Said she would like to be able to use public schools as a meeting source, and to move away from committees using restaurants, and from using Atmosphere, since there were ADA issues.

VOTE:

YES: Alpern, Doyno, Shure, Tilson, Krupkin, Roos, Hruska.

ABSTAIN: Hanna.

The motion passed with 7 votes.

With no objection, the motion was amended to say “per meeting for the future until the end of the fiscal year” after “\$25”.

Ken Alpern moved to approve the original motion as amended.

Michelle Krupkin seconded.

VOTE:

YES: Alpern, Doyno, Shure, Tilson, Krupkin, Roos, Hruska.

ABSTAIN: Hanna.

The motion passed with 7 votes.

With no objection, an appropriation in the amount of \$25 per meeting for the future until the end of the fiscal year for room rental at the Winward School was approved.

10.8. [FUNDING][Doyno] Election Yard Signs – Approval of an appropriation in the amount of \$500 to produce and distribute election yard signs in Spanish.

Robin Doyno motioned to approve an appropriation in the amount of \$500 to produce and distribute election yard signs in Spanish.

Ken Alpern seconded.

Holly Tilson: Clarified that she does not buy these signs. Doyno does, and he has to figure out how to get them and translate them.

Ken Alpern: Said that the way he looks at it is he does not look at the money, but instead whether the money will get the job done. The big question is how many signs they will need to get the job done, and whether DONE or anyone looking at it will think that it was enough.

Robin Doyno: Said that he would welcome an amendment.

Elliot Hanna: Said the key is this is addressing a monolingual population, not a bilingual population.

Robin Doyno: Said he thinks the answer may sound on the mark, but the answer is as many as they can get and to get them all deployed.

Stakeholder Kathryn: Said that they got 100 lawn signs for about \$750 in English, and distribution was divided among 10 candidates.

Ken Alpern: Said that is why he was tempted to say up to \$700. He did not want to be accused by the city of spending feel-good money on signs that are not needed.

Ken Alpern motioned to amend the motion to the amount of \$750 instead of \$500.

Robin Doyno seconded.

Stacy Shure: Clarified that the areas that would need to be covered were Zone 6, 5, and 4, and the signs would be beneficial along Palms. Stakeholder Adrianna added that they should have at least two per zone, and Shure thought they would need more.

Michelle Krupkin: Said she did not wish to distract from item 10.8, but she was looking under item 10.4 and in the packet, this was an NPG for \$800. Hanna said they would revisit it later. Krupkin said, commenting on the signs, that she has no objection to amending the motion to increase the amount of Spanish-speaking signs.

VOTE:

YES: Alpern, Doyno, Shure, Tilson, Krupkin, Roos, Hruska.

ABSTAIN: Hanna.

The motion passed by 7 votes.

With no objection, the amount of the appropriation in the motion was amended from \$500 to \$750.

VOTE:

YES: Alpern, Doyno, Shure, Tilson, Krupkin, Roos, Hruska.

ABSTAIN: Hanna.

The motion passed by 7 votes.

With no objection, the appropriation as amended in the amount of \$750 to produce and distribute election yard signs in Spanish is approved.

10.9. [POLICY][PLUM] Opposition to the development at Palms and Sepulveda – Discussion and possible action regarding a PLUM motion opposing the development at Palms and Sepulveda Blvds.

Stacy Shure: Said she would like to open this issue, and must regretfully bring this motion, and bring it with the support of councilmember Koretz and their planning representative, and with the support of the developer's representative, who said that perhaps if MVCC voted against it, it would get the developer to pay attention to the community's thoughts. She explained that the development is the largest parcel in their zone, and basically said that they had listened to MVCC's recommendations, then had not decided to do anything MVCC suggested, and said they would not be meeting with them again. She therefore asks the MVCC to consider a motion against this developer.

Ken Alpern: Added that the situation is rather surreal, and he thinks this is going to be a hostile developer, and it's a no-brainer to move the inevitable conflict forward.

Michele Krupkin: Read from Page 11 from the supplemental: "Due to the developer's unwillingness to meet with the community, get stakeholders' feedback, and take their concerns into consideration, the MVCC OPPOSES the development at 3443 Sepulveda BLVD."

Stakeholder Kathryn: Thanked Shure for opposing this development.

Stakeholder Adrianna: Asked what precipitated this motion. Shure responded that the developer has refused to meet with MVCC or the community. He is asking for entitlements, and he has to meet with the community by law.

Stakeholder Kathryn: Asked if the developer is asking for variances?, and Shure said that he was. The same stakeholder said that it had to go to a public meeting, and Shure said that it did, but the developer is unwilling to have one until they have gotten their approvals.

Stacy Shure motioned to oppose the development at 3443 Sepulveda Blvd.

Ken Alpern seconded.

Stacy Shure: Added that the developer owner here, is well-known to the city of LA, and to the FBI, which is monitoring him in the midst of a federal case related to fraud. A lawyer is filing an amicus brief on behalf of one of the banks, and the developer stands a pretty good chance of going to jail. Shure's husband, who has no dealings in land issues knew who the developer was, so she pulled the case files, and the developer has a history of breaking the law and daring the city to go after him. He is not a friendly or nice developer, and the current plan is a lot like the old Beverly Center: building to lot lines and building it eight stories tall.

Mary Hruska: Wanted to add that this could turn into another Kasden, as monstrous as that is. Kasden, was completely corrupt. If you go to the Preserve LA website and their articles at the time, he wrote checks to so many city officials, it was almost a movie script. It did get reduced (there was also going to be a huge tower), but that was only as a result of a successful lawsuit from Fix the City.

VOTE:

YES: Alpern, Shure, Tilson, Krupkin, Hruska, Roos, Doyno, Hanna.

The motion passes with 8 votes.

With no objections, the motion to oppose the development at 3443 Sepulveda Blvd is adopted.

11. New Business – None

11.1. [FUNDING][Education, Arts, and Culture] NPG for Los Angeles Fire Department Foundation – Discussion and possible action regarding a Neighborhood Purpose Grant (NPG) application in the amount of \$700 to support the Fire Station 62 Open House on June 2, 2019.

Elliot Hanna: Explained that the NPG was for the LA Fire Department Foundation. They are having an open house on MVCC's Election Day at Fire Station 62, and they are asking for \$700 to support children's activities.

Stakeholder Kathryn: Asked if children activities are what they want the money for, and Hanna said that it was.

Stakeholder Adrianna: Asked if they got the issues resolved from when they tried to have an event at that site, and Hanna clarified that they were not talking about historic fire stations, but about the current real one.

Michelle Krupkin motioned to approve the NPG application in the amount of \$700 to support the Fire Station 62 Open House on June 2, 2019.

Mary Hruska seconded.

Stacy Shure: Asked if the Fire Department station was considered city grounds, and Holly Tilson said it was. Shure asked if that meant they cannot put up signs to encourage voting.

Ken Alpern: Said that he has to point out that the city fire people and police have not always been nice to MVCC. This item is under outreach, but they need to get credit for funding this.

Elliot Hanna: Said that in his experience, LAFD has been fabulous; LAPD is another issue.

Ken Alpern: Said that during a previous MVCC era, the LAFD were pretty awful, but that maybe it is a bygone era. He added that especially since it's on election day, if they cannot promise MVCC outreach, he does not think they need to approve it. Hanna clarified that they can put up a generic MVCC sign, but cannot pass out candidate information.

Michelle Krupkin: Said she placed a Zone 5 generic sign in front of there the other week, and it is one of the few that has not been stolen. Hanna clarified that the MVCC seal is official city property, and the event is funded by the LAFD Foundation, and he does not think they can comingle.

Robin Doyno moved that the motion be amended to add the word "active" before "Fire Station 62".

Ken Alpern seconded.

Holly Tilson: Said that they are giving money for an event that happens to be at the firehouse; it is basically Fire Station 62's booster club, and they are the ones asking for the money. Roos asked whether the captain at the firehouse was the same, and Hanna said that it was not the same, adding that it has changed frequently. Alpern said that he was not above looking at this as a singular event, but wants to make sure there is an outreach component to the event.

Michelle Krupkin: Asked if Alpern was talking about problems back when the fire station was designed, and Alpern said that there were some grants that went through that probably should not have.

Stacy Shure moved to close discussion and take a vote.

VOTE:

YES: Alpern, Shure, Hruska, Roos.

The motion to close discussion passed with 4 votes.

For Robin Doyno's amendment adding "active" in front of "fire station":

VOTE:

YES: Alpern, Shure, Tilson, Krupkin, Hruska, Roos, Doyno, Hanna.

The motion to amend the motion to add "active" in front of "fire station" passes with 8 votes.

VOTE:

YES: Alpern, Shure, Tilson, Krupkin, Hruska, Roos.

NO: Doyno.

ABSTAIN: Hanna.

The motion passed by 6 votes.

With no objections, the NPG application in the amount of \$700 to support the Fire Station 62 Open House on June 2, 2019 was approved.

Moving back to agenda item 10.4:

Elliot Hanna: Explained that this is technically a motion to amend something previously adopted, which they can do, and the rules will require a 2/3rds vote.

Michelle Krupkin motioned to amend the adopted motion from item 10.4 to change the amount from \$500 to \$800.

Ken Alpern seconded.

Michelle Krupkin: Said that she thought this was a typo on the agenda; the reason this is \$800 instead of \$500 is because they are providing a water-based graffiti spray, which is an environmentally-safe way for kids to engage with this art medium.

VOTE:

YES: Alpern, Doyno, Shure, Tilson, Krupkin, Roos, Hruska.

ABSTAIN: Hanna.

The motion to amend the motion from 10.4 passes with 7 votes.

With no objection, the motion is amended and summarily passed.

12. Adjournment

Ken Alpern motioned to adjourn.

Mary Hruska seconded.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.