

## BOD12/10/2019-Treasurer's Report

The MER approval and Budget revision approval were left off the agenda so this report is for information only. I will redo the budget to reflect our six month spending (with adjustments up or down for your approval at the next BOD meeting.

November MER was sent to you 12/6 and is in the supplemental packet.

To review, NCs were given \$42,000 this year plus any carry over up to \$10K. Our carryover was \$7535.59 for a total of \$49535.59. (plus our insurance check for stolen items-approx. \$2800-this will be another budget adjustment when it is added to our account, as of today, Shawna, our funding clerk, stated it hasn't been added yet but it is on her list to follow up on next week, when they (the employee(s) in charge of this) return to the office.

PLEASE NOTE: OUR MER STATES WE HAVE A NET BALANCE OF APPROX \$36K. This money is part of our budget. It is for fixed expenses (rentals/printing/web site, mail chimp, minute taker, PO Box, storage) plus all motions approved for Outreach/events/NPGs etc. All office expenses are part of our budget and do not require a separate motion (new this FY). Everything else requires a separate motion .

Some budget adjustments, besides new motions are needed for our recurring/fixed expenses. They need to be increased due to increase in cost and/or use. Some examples:

Storquest ^ \$25/month \$461 to \$488 This is a \$200 increase for the year \$5532 to \$5732

Room rentals- St Andrew's and Coffee Connection are having more than the 2mtgs/mo that were budgeted for. Extra cost can come from dollars budgeted but unspent for Windward and St Bede's Printing costs-budgeted at \$200/month, may need to increase this.

On our agenda this month, are 6 funding requests totally \$17957.48. With your approval I will rearrange the budget numbers to accommodate them. Budget adjustments needed are noted with an asterisk. Most funding motions will just become a line item in the existing budget under the appropriate category.

This month if approved:

12.1 and 12.2 Board reimbursements for items previously approved. (8/2019 hospitality @\$50/mo or up to \$600 for the year and 8/2019 #12.15 Mobile Outreach \$500-receipts with MER show items purchased.) No budget adjustment needed.

\* (#12.3) -A \$1654 NPG requested per Richland ES. Currently there is only \$1400 in the NPG column, I would like to move \$300 of our \$900 saving from the MVFM rental to the NPG column. New amount would be \$1700 (\$1400 + \$300) to cover the amount needed.

\*#14 Up to \$2K to replace video/camera equipment, previously purchased but stolen. Background: This equipment was stolen and not replaced immediately because we had no dedicated person to operate it. Rob had been doing it as Chair and Vice Chair, but stated it was difficult to concentrate on a mtg and run the equipment. For the several times it was used it was never uploaded anywhere and whatever recordings we had disappeared with the equipment. After it was stolen a decision was made to discontinue the hotspot (approx. \$100/month) asap since we had no equipment. Next decision was there was no point in replacing the equipment immediately until we had a dedicated person to operate it. We haven't received the insurance payment yet. The city has had the check since last fiscal year. The funding clerk recommended having it credited to our account after July 1<sup>st</sup>, beginning of new fiscal year, so our carry over did not exceed \$10K. I agreed and unfortunately we are still waiting for it to be credited to our account. The insurance payment could fund this expense when received.

Items 15.1/15.2 /15.3 are for surveys/newsletter design/printing and distribution. Currently we have \$12220 in our budget for newsletters. These 3 motions total \$14100. (Please note: Actual expenditure may be less than what the motions ask for.) The difference is \$1880 ( $\$14100 - 12220 = \$1880$ ). We have \$1835 in unencumbered funds under MISC Outreach. This could be added to the \$12220 and we could reduce the newsletter motion by \$100 (from \$8K to \$7900 to cover the discrepancy until we can approve a new budget. Might also want to call the survey motions survey newsletter so it will fit under the current line item, "Newsletters (fall and spring)" in the budget. The line item in the budget could also just be changed to read printed materials/flyers/surveys/newsletters more of an all inclusive title for individual motion to "fit" under.

To vote, all member must have ethics and funding training and have completed the Code of Conduct acknowledgement. Any Funding trainings completed before July 1, 2018 will expire June 30,2020  
On line training is available for non-Financial Officers, you can find this at empowerLA under self-serve> board member trainings> funding> which takes you to the lacity.org > Neighborhood Council Funding Program> Training, Workshop and Tools  
Funding Documents that you should be familiar with can be found at lacity.org: la city clerk > neighborhood council funding program > documents, forms and reports  
Here you will find under Governing Document > policies and guidelines. This is the latest version (4/8/2019) of our funding guidelines. Also Event forms/NPG-neighborhood purpose grant forms, etc.

The public dashboard can be found at clerk.lacity.org > Neighborhood Council Funding Program > Neighborhood Council Funding Program Dashboard > use the drop down to find the NC you wish to look at <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/NCFundPortal/Dashboard.html>

From the page URL provided by T&I: <https://zapier.com/blog/google-forms-vs-surveymonkey/>  
Zapier is a company that “automates” and “integrates” different platforms.

Finally, here's an at-a-glance feature comparison.

	Google Forms	SurveyMonkey
Pricing	100% free	Free plan available; feature availability increases with each premium tier
Design and Customization	Extremely limited	Robust options with premium plans
Collaboration Options	Limited to multiple editors	Viewing, editing, and commenting available
Question Types, Rules, and Scoring	More specific answer validation options and scoring options	More advanced question types
Templates	16 templates available	~200 templates and ~1,800 pre-written questions
Branching and Conditional Logic	Available for multiple choice and dropdown questions	Available for more question types
Collecting Responses	Email, link, or embed	Email, link, embed, Facebook Messenger, mobile embed, offline data collection
Analysis and Reporting	Limited, unless you use it in tandem with Google Sheets or Google Data Studio	Extensive options for data visualization

## Comparison

+ Add Product

Share <

 **Google Forms**  
by Google

[View Details](#)

 **SurveyMonkey**  
by SurveyMonkey

[View Details](#)

### Product Features

- Custom Survey URLs
- Data Analysis Tools
- Email Marketing
- Mobile Survey
- Offline Response Collection
- Question Branching
- Question Library
- Site Intercept Survey
- Skip Logic
- Supports Audio / Images / Video

- Custom Survey URLs
- Data Analysis Tools
- Email Marketing
- Mobile Survey
- Offline Response Collection
- Question Branching
- Question Library
- Site Intercept Survey
- Skip Logic
- Supports Audio / Images / Video

### Training

Not provided by vendor

- In Person
- Live Online
- Webinars
- Documentation

PLUM REPORT:

12/10/19

At our most recent PLUM meeting we heard a presentation by Oakmont Development who have another TOC development on Overland Avenue. This developer has several parcels in development on Overland and have committed substantial funds to effectuate the Overland Street Plan that was approved by the City several years ago. The Street Plan includes beautification of the street, landscaping, enhanced lighting and pedestrian accessible amenities. This developer has made the most investment out of all developers and because of their efforts the street will be significantly improved.

The most current development is 6 stories, 5 stories of apartments above retail, mixed use with retail on the ground floor in response to the needs voiced by the local community. They will be providing units designated for very low income and have voluntarily agreed to make this development 100% RSO upon time of initial renting. They are working with local employers to attract tenants that will not utilize cars, and offering transit passes, electric cars and an enhanced street side parking area for scooters and bikes. The community has worked well with this developer to get changes and enhancements that work to serve the needs of the entire local community, including enhanced pedestrian crosswalks and bus stops and shelters.

Representatives of the local homeowners were present at PLUM and voiced their approval of this development and acknowledged changes that the developer made in response to community feedback.

They will be presenting this development at our next BOD meeting.

PLUM is waiting to get a date from Windward High School for scheduling a Land Use Town Hall in the early Spring. The event would be used to engage tenants, with specific booths for Community Plan Update engagement, land use and zoning education, exhibits in the parking lot involving micro transit and sustainable transportation and guest speakers that would address affordable housing development and progress on creating more work force housing. We are working with Councilmember Bonin's staff to include their involvement and the Mayor's Office of Design is working with us to announce an upcoming design competition that the Mayor will be having to get design ideas for low and medium density developments in the City of Los Angeles targeted for work force housing (moderate income).

More details as we get specifics worked out.

There is a development in process at the intersection of Mattheson and Francis that has resulted in calls from local community members near the development that have learned that the apartments are being built by a company called Common that intends to use the building for co-living apartments. Stakeholders have expressed concern about the proposed density of residents that this would entail and a lack of any ordinance that addresses the issue. Since this development is by right and was permitted before I became PLUM Chair, I have directed the stakeholders to contact Councilmember Bonin's office to voice their concerns and make him aware of the potential problems that this will create for the community. Common, like other co-living developments, would utilize minimum square footage for each bed accommodation with common kitchen access, at very high prices. The result may be up to 12 people in a regular 2 bedroom apartment. The square footage in similar co-living developments is 450-650 square footage per tenant (would could be a couple), and rental rates of around \$1800-2000 per tenant. It does not increase affordable housing, but rather increases density of tenants to an unsustainable level in an area that has great parking demand and a lack of resources for the number of people that these apartments would home. I will follow up on this issue with Councilmember Bonin's staff who have been very receptive to feedback on this issue.

## Zone 1 Report:

The Westside Village area has encountered problems in our southern portion adjacent to the Overland TOC corridor involving a Preferred Parking District that was established after petition by homeowners on 6 blocks immediately adjacent to multiple developments on the boundary of the area of Palms.

After accepting the Petition and approval of the parking district it was determined that the proposed boundaries had been expanded to an area that included predominantly high density apartment buildings in the Palms portion of the neighborhood, Palms Blvd. and Overland Avenue, all of which were to be excluded.

A meeting was held with Councilmember Koretz's staff with the Zone 1 Director and a few of the local residents and after that meeting Councilmember Koretz's staff determined that a remedy was in order to reduce the final boundaries that were established without the communities' knowledge.

I was informed on Monday by Councilmember Koretz's staff and the department of transportation office that works on PPD that a new resolution is being drafted that will reduce the boundaries to those that were requested on the original Petition and that all sales of parking permits for anyone outside of those boundaries has been stopped pending the new Resolution.

Once the new Resolution is adopted by the City Council then no further permits will be sold to anyone along Overland, Palms or outside of the residential area. Those that have already obtained permits will be able to continue to use them until July, because no recall procedures are in place to end their use.

In other news,

The Westside Village Homeowners Association, has by letter to our Chair, requested that the MVCC help facilitate a meeting between the LAPD, the Homeowners Board and a business representative from our community to discuss a lack of responsiveness in our area when the police are called, an dramatic increase in crime (including 1 store in the CVS center being broken into and robbed on two separate occasions, the first occasion resulted in a loss of over \$150,000), increasing crime along Sepulveda including a rape of a college resident, armed robberies and break ins of both homes and cars. We have also had 2 occasions where an individual has been seen at two schools (Clover Avenue Elementary and the preschool at a local house of workshop) getting undressed in public and masterbating in sight of the children. Police response to both of these incidents was none (the first case) and over an hour later for the second wherein they took no action. We do not have regular patrols and residents have been unhappy with the lack of responsiveness of the current SLO.

On the way here I heard from another resident who had their license plates stolen in the last 48 hours who tried to report it online and the online form would not accept her phone number and would not accept the report. Another resident reports they had the same problem when trying to report a stolen bike and plants from from the front of their home. LAPD must fix their online ability to accept reports.

There will also be additional outreach to the Transportation Committee to get enhanced crosswalks on National Blvd. after one of our local residents was struck by a car in a crosswalk and remains in serious condition. A week later a cyclist was hit on the same corner, and last

week a cyclist was hit on Palms and Kelton who we have learned passed away. The current marked crosswalks need enhancements that may include flashing lights to encourage cars to stop.

**TO: Board of Directors, MVCC**

**FROM: Andrea Ambriz, At-large Director**

**DATE: 12/10/19**

**RE: Reply comments to 11/12/19 Elections and By-laws Committee Report, Meeting  
Agenda Item 10.4.1\***

*\*Submitted as an addendum to the 11/12/19 Minutes, as discussed during the meeting.*

---

### **Our Mission**

The Mission of the Mar Vista Community Council (MVCC) is to “provide a forum for discussion of issues that affect the quality of life of MVCC Stakeholders,” including, among others, the stated goals in the By-laws to “permit MVCC stakeholders to collaborate and deliberate on matters of interest to the community,” and to “encourage stakeholder participation in MVCC activities” (Article II). The most trusted stewards of ensuring that these By-laws are upheld are surely the appointed leaders to the Elections and By-laws (E&B) Committee, along with the elected Board of Directors. In fact, the E&B Committee’s own Mission is to “provide a forum for the creation, changes, and discussion of the bylaws and rules that govern the MVCC.”

With disappointment, on October 30, 2019 during an agendaized and formally announced meeting, the Elections and By-laws Committee Chair and Director Mr. Rubin did not adhere to that Committee’s own Mission, nor uphold the duties of a Director in ensuring that “fair and open procedures for conducting its business”, as outlined by our By-laws (Article V, Section 5). With at least eight MVCC Directors and numerous neighbors in attendance, the meeting and Chair neither was professional nor adhered to the rules of order (Rosenburg’s Rules of Order).

### **October 30, 2019**

The 10/30/19 meeting’s agenda<sup>1</sup> included various motions of concern to myself and neighbors in the community, including proposals to re-shape the composition of the elected Board of Directors. At the beginning of the meeting, I made a formal motion to move up an agenda item to be discussed first (Agenda Item 7.C), as is routinely done in meetings to respectfully allow for stakeholders to participate and discuss issues of most concern. Audience members further asked for the item to be raised to engage in conversation about the Agenda Item.

Chair Rubin immediately denied the motion disallowing discussion. Meeting participants called for the rule of order in allowing the motion to be raised and discussed, and the Chair rebuffed the request. The Chair continued by berating the meeting attendees, calling attendees “members of a gang,” raising his voice, standing up and thrusting his fingers toward the audience, yelling that the agenda would be done in order. Despite a reminder by a present representative of the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment (Ms. Seme Park) that an outstanding motion required discussion and a vote, Chair Rubin persisted to refuse discussion on the motion. This was in direct contradiction to the Chair’s own assertion that he “put this agenda item on to start a conversation.”

---

<sup>1</sup> The agenda for the 10/30/19 meeting has since been removed from the MVCC website, along with all supporting documents.



Therefore, I made a subsequent motion to Call the Question on my motion and vote immediately to move the Agenda Item up for discussion first. Chair Rubin continued to deny that motion and discussion, incorrectly asserting that as the author of the Agenda Item, he could remove it from the Agenda. Ms. Park noted that the Chair did not have the sole authority to remove an Agenda Item without a vote. Nevertheless, the Chair rebuffed the reminder and rejected following the rule of order again. For nearly two hours, the Chair refused to conduct the meeting, at one point hastily gathering his items, storming out of the room, threatening to end the meeting, only to return in defiance without running the meeting. At some point the MVCC Chair was phoned to join the meeting, and both he and the E&B Committee Vice Chair declined to chair the meeting. These facts are maintained through adequate testimony and documentation from meeting attendees. (Note that at the subsequent 11/9/19 E&B Committee Meeting, Chair Rubin did not agendize this Agenda Item in the business.)

### **Concerning Behavior**

What is most concerning to me and should be to this Body, is the unprofessional and uncollegial nature by which Chair Rubin conducted himself during this meeting. As Chair, expectations of upholding civility and respectful discourse during a Committee meeting are both appropriate and required. While I recognize the interest of following a set agenda, Chair Rubin's reaction and response to a formal, procedural request to hear an item first was uncalled for. Through his behavior and actions, he deterred stakeholder participation, which is antithetical to our commission as Directors of the MVCC.

Rather than vilify neighbors and community residents for attending a meeting, the Chair should and could have engaged in the conversation he sought out and allowed for stakeholders to participate and deliberate. I encourage Chair Rubin to issue an apology to community stakeholders for his behavior.

### **Going Forward**

I believe as public servants we have the duty and responsibility to engage in MVCC related issues with respect for opinion and diversity. It is certainly appropriate to disagree on policy in a respectful manner, and that opportunity to engage in discussion should not be hindered or obstructed. Together we must ensure that our neighbor's voices are never disenfranchised. As well, as Directors and stewards of our Council, the decency and civility by which we comport ourselves in MVCC related settings is essential to upholding the fair democracy which we represent. Inclusivity and collegiality are crucial to our work on the Board, and by encouraging stakeholder participation, we can build a rich and inclusive culture of collaboration together.

I encourage anyone with questions to contact me for further information.