



# Mar Vista Community Council



## Minutes

Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors  
<http://www.marvista.org/minutes-and-agendas.php>

Tuesday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019, at 7:00pm  
Mar Vista Recreation Center Auditorium  
11430 Woodbine Street, Mar Vista, CA 90066

### 1. Call to order

*The meeting was called to order at 7:08 PM.*

### 2. Presentation of flag and pledge of allegiance

Mary Hruska lead led the board and the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

#### **Attending (11):**

Andrea Ambriz  
Gabriel Hill (*arrived at 7:54*)  
Mary Hruska  
Selena Inouye  
Michelle Krupkin  
Marty Rubin  
Stacy Shure  
Armond Seretti  
Christine Stemar  
Holly Tilson  
Kathryn Wheeler

#### **Absent (2):**

Elliot Hanna  
Rob Kadota

### 4. Community memorial observations

**Kalani Whittington:** Said she had a memorial observation for the “Slow death of Venice Blvd. May it rest in peace.”

### 5. Announcements

**Kathryn Wheeler:** Said that the North Westdale Neighborhood Association’s block party was on Saturday, September 21<sup>st</sup> and the MVCC would have a booth at the event.

### 6. Public comment for items NOT on this agenda

**Marty Rubin:** Said he was leading the meeting as Vice-Chair. He said that each public comment would be limited to one minute because there were a lot of people in the audience who wanted to get opinions on the record. He asked speakers to state their names for the record.

**Kalani Whittington:** Said that the past weekend she had attended the Pacific Palisades Democratic Club meeting. She talked to Council Member Bonin. She asked him when he would address the citizens “south of the tracks” regarding the homelessness issue that has left Mar Vista lawns with discarded needles and human waste. His response was: “It’s a bigger problem than we realize.” She said the MVCC would not be able to assist in this issue as they are not sanctioned to help. The LA City Council and Mayor are the ones that the community needs to approach. The citizens need to start a movement.

**Rob Watkins:** Thanked the MVCC for their service to the community. He said he had three recommendations for Councilmember Bonin. First, he needs to oppose AB 1197, which was up for a vote in the legislature that week. Bonin has already supported it, but he needs to reverse his position. It allows for low-barrier shelters in their neighborhood, which meant drug use was allowed and residents could go in and out at any hours of the night. The community could not have that in their schools and neighborhoods. He said it needed some rules and control. Second, Bonin needs to support section 41.18, a modification by Mitch O’Farrell, which doesn’t allow encampments within 500 feet of daycares, schools and parks. The community needed that help. Bonin has said that this is like “giving the middle finger to the courts” and is totally opposed to it, but he needs to step up and help the community. Third, he invited Bonin to join them in their March on Mayor Garcetti’s house on September 21<sup>st</sup>. They would be marching against the drugs and the crime that has taken over their neighborhoods. Watkins said he was a doctor and a caring person who wanted to help people and build houses and shelters, but stop the drugs and the crime because it was killing the neighborhood.

**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.**

*Andrea Ambriz, Selena Inouye, Kathryn Wheeler, Mary Hruska, and Christine Stemar had no conflicts of interest to declare.*

**Rubin:** Said he had a lot of communications with executive board and the chair, Elliot Hanna, about how Rubin would chair the meeting in Hanna’s absence. He thanked the Hanna and the executive board for all of their assistance.

**Michelle Krupkin:** Said she had no financial conflicts. She spoke with board members and stakeholders about agenda items and to committees and chairs about scheduling meetings.

**Stacy Shure:** Said that regarding agenda item 15.2 she attended a public meeting arranged by a private stakeholder in Zone 4, she also attended a stakeholder meeting at the private residence of Tom Ponton where she heard stakeholder feedback, and she spoke with Councilmember

Bonin's office. She also spoke with Elliot Hanna about the scheduling of that motion on this meeting's agenda.

**Armond Seretti:** Said he had no ex-parte conflicts. He worked closely with Councilmember Bonin's office in drafting item 15.1, specifically with Hannah Levien. He also talked with Tom Ponton about the project at McLaughlin and Charnock, which is in Zone 4. And he spoke to almost every board member about miscellaneous items on the agenda.

**Holly Tilson:** Said she spoke to most of the board members regarding board business.

## **8. Adoption of the agenda**

*Inouye moved to adopt the agenda. Shure seconded.*

**Wheeler:** Said that Outreach was supposed to be in the committee reports section of the agenda and that Elliot Hanna keeps forgetting to put it in.

**Krupkin:** Said she did not think they were doing committee reports at this meeting because of time constraints.

**Marty:** They could do brief committee reports.

*Wheeler made motion to add an agenda item 10.4.6 - Outreach Committee Report. Shure seconded.*

*Without objection, the item was unanimously approved.*

*Wheeler moved to approve the agenda as amended. Shure seconded.*

*Without objection, the agenda as amended was unanimously approved.*

## **9. Approval of minutes – Approval of the minutes from the most recent regular meeting(s) of the Board of Directors.**

*Wheeler moved to approve the previous meeting's minutes. Hruska seconded.*

**Hruska:** Asked anyone who had corrections to email her or give her hardcopy.

*Hruska moved to table until next month. Krupkin seconded.*

*Without objection, the approval of the minutes was tabled.*

## 10. Reports

### 10.1. Elected official and city department reports – Reports from any elected officials, their representatives, or representatives of city departments in attendance.

#### **Elizabeth Garcia, Field Deputy Mar Vista and Del Rey for Councilmember Paul Koretz:**

Introduced herself. She took over for Joseph Galloway, the previous Field Deputy for Mar Vista. She had a few announcements:

- Councilmember Koretz had introduced a motion to ban assault weapons in the city in the light of the recent events in Dayton and El Paso. Their office wanted to be on the forefront of the fight against gun violence. She asked for the community's support via a Community Impact Statement.
- Koretz deferred to the DOT to design decals warning that riding e-scooters on the sidewalk will result in a ticket. She believed the ticket was about \$197.
- There is a lot of resurfacing going on in streets and alleys in Mar Vista and the Council District in general. They were lucky to quite a bit of funding for resurfacing in the district. She reminded the community not to drive on streets or alleys that are being resurfaced.
- Preferential Parking District 282 has been established. It was officially passed in council this past July. She did not think this effected Mar Vista, but they may see signage going up in Palms. She said to be aware that there may newly restricted parking in the community.

**Rubin:** Said that the MVCC had recently sent a letter to Koretz and Councilmember Bonin to visit the MVCC. **Garcia:** Said she was aware of the letter and they were looking into scheduling a time when both councilmembers could be there. They were looking early November, because of the holidays in October.

**Krupkin:** Said that she wanted to clarify that this item was for reports only and it was not the time for public comment or board comment. They had many stakeholders who wanted to be heard on item 15.2. She asked the public and board to hold their comments and let the representatives give their reports. **Rubin:** Said he disagreed. He thought a little back in forth was appropriate if it were pertinent. **Krupkin:** Said she just wanted to keep things going so they can respect everyone's time. **Rubin:** Asked everyone to be on point and as concise as possible with their questions, without repetitions.

**Shure:** As Zone 1 director, she said she was pleased to see Garcia as they have not seen anyone from Koretz's office in about a year. In Zone 1, on September 24<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 PM there was a special meeting hosted by their homeowner's association at St. John's Church, regarding the Palms of Sepulveda development. Shure asked if someone from Koretz's office would be there. **Garcia:** Said there would definitely be someone from their office there.

**Wheeler:** Asked, regarding the e-scooters, if there was anything in the works so that they could not be parked on and blocking the sidewalks. She has seen the scooters blocking sidewalks which makes using the sidewalk impossible for handicapped people in wheelchairs. **Garcia:** Said when their office gets calls like that their transportation deputy contacts the e-scooter company who then removes it. **Wheeler:** Asked if there was any way to identify who did that so they can be fined. **Rubin:** Said this was a revolving issue, where they never get any answers. He said they go through communications or committees

**Garcia:** Said she would leave her card in the back for them. **Krupkin:** Referred her to the Council File on the -scooters. In the file the MVCC submitted a CIP in October 2018 before





they had \$5,900 worth of new funding requests on the agenda. With the approval of budget revisions, she said she would rearrange the numbers to accommodate those requests. In summary, she said most of the requests would become line items in the existing budget under the appropriate categories.

- \$2,300 will be under miscellaneous Outreach funds and there will be a \$600 NPG line item. She moved money from different categories for only two items: \$1,000 is for the budget advocates and \$2,000 for the Congress of Neighborhoods. She will move \$1,000 from NPGs to outreach and \$2,000 from community improvement to outreach.

- A brief explanation of some of the funding motions in the consent calendar:

– **12.1:** Since Tilson became treasurer in 2016, the MVCC has not funded the Budget Advocates. They are LA residents, Neighborhood Council members, and stakeholders. They are the watchdogs of how tax dollars are spent. Their source of funding is from Neighborhood Councils, the City of LA does not fund them. Their Budget Advocate, Christine, suggested funding them this year.

– **12.5:** The MVCC funded the Congress of Neighborhoods in 2016 for a total of \$2,000. It is a great networking experience with other NCs, it's a great learning experience and it is always well attended. Many MVCC board members have attended in the past three year. The funds would move from community improvement to outreach.

– **12.6:** Due to the homeless situation around the farmer's market the manager has stated she needs to move the stalls around and as a result the MVCC's space has been reduced by half. The manager will reduce he rent from \$1,200 to \$300. The extra funds will be added back to miscellaneous outreach.

– **12.8:** \$600 for an NPG for Venice High School's annual Grease Night, celebrating the movie that was filmed on their campus. A Grease Night Committee works Alumni Association to organize it and they asked the Del Rey NC, Venice NC and MVCC for funds. Del Ray gave them \$1,000, Venice turned them down and the MVCC ExFin Committee recommended allocating \$600.

– **12.9 & 12.15:** She said one of these motions is a duplicate, so they really only need \$300, not \$600. This funding is for a disaster preparedness seminar demonstration on Sunday, September 15<sup>th</sup> at the Mar Vista Recreation Center from 3PM to 6PM. It is a free event; she encouraged the community to attend.

– **12.10:** She said this was a duplicate motion that had already been funded and should be disregarded.

– **12.11 & 12.12:** These are for Outreach via the Westdale Homeowners' Association.

– **12.13:** She said this motion could be disregarded because CD 11 was now covering the cost.

– **12.14:** She said they had published the Homeless Resource Guide in the past and she was sure they would in the future.

– **12.4:** The door hangers will be disturbed around Mar Vista to inform the community about the various new development projects in the area. The prices she was given were \$350-450 for 5,000 doorhangers and \$190 per thousand to have them delivered.

### **10.3. Zone Director Reports –**

**10.3.1. Zone 1 – Stacy Shure:** Said that on September 24<sup>th</sup> the Westside Village Homeowners Association was holding a meeting for Zone 1 stakeholders involving a large development that is planned. This would be the first Zone - only meeting. The development process would take up to 3 years. The project was now considered a major development project with Department of City Planning. So, there would be a lot of opportunities in the next three years for the rest of the community to weigh in. The annual Westside Village Homeowners Association Preparedness Fair would be on Thursday October 3<sup>rd</sup> from 6:30 to 9:30 PM at St. John's Presbyterian Church at National and Military. All are invited to attend and typically, hundreds of people from outside the zone attend the event. This year's theme is disaster recovery. The California Earthquake Authority, FEMA, CERT, the LA Fire Department, the LA Department of Public Health, the American Red Cross and insurance coverage Specialists will be discussing how homeowners can be prepared.

*Gabriel Hill arrived at 7:54 PM*

**10.3.2. Zone 2 – Marty Rubin:** Said the 6<sup>th</sup> annual North Westdale Neighborhood Association's block party was on Saturday, September 21<sup>st</sup> from 3PM to 6:30 PM in the parking lot of St. Andrew's Lutheran church.

**10.3.3. Zone 3 – Mary Hruska:** Said group on Grandview was working with a neighbor who seemed to be using their property for filming once or twice a month. This has created a lot of safety and noise issues. There have been private parties. It seems to be a new way for people to create a revenue stream in their homes. They are working with various departments and with local citizens to come to a compromise on that. She urged the community to attend the emergency preparedness seminar.

**10.3.4. Zone 4 – Armond Seretti:** Said aside from homeless issues, Zone 4 had a new turning arrow on the corner of Sawtelle and Palms. Neighborhood Watch groups are getting set up in Zone 4, which seems to have helped a little with homelessness situation. He said Public Health and Safety is a good committee to check out for anyone who wants to get involved with neighborhood watches.

**10.3.5. Zone 5 – Michelle Krupkin:** Said the area's LAPD Senior Lead Officer Hector Aceves was back from vacation. He has not responded to emails. She was trying to set up a Neighborhood Watch on Herbert street, between Grandview and Inglewood, South of Washington Place. They are trying to deal with the encampments near the post office and Farmer's Market. She said she hoped that the SLO would be responsive soon.

**10.3.6. Zone 6 – Holly Tilson:** Said that Venice High School was under construction. It was applying for a variance or waiver to start hauling cement at 3am. It will be up to the neighbors to determine whether or not that is going to be allowed. They have not said how many days it will be. She encouraged affected stakeholders need to weigh in before CD 11 approves or doesn't approve it. There is a phone number provided to the residents and the LAPD was going door to door as part of the city process to obtain a waiver.



#### 10.4. Committee Reports –

**Rubin:** Urged the community to check out the MVCC’s website for information on the committees’ meetings, agendas, minutes and reports.

**Krupkin:** Said that on the MVCC website, most regular meeting dates are posted with the exception of a few committees that are still working out their regular day of the month. She updated it two days ago.

**10.4.1. Elections & Bylaws – Rubin:** Said the report would be on the website.

**10.4.2. Planning and Land-Use Management**

**Shure:** Said she would defer committee meeting report until next month, but she did have an announcement: LA County had just passed a rent control cap and the State Assembly and Senate passed a rent control cap of 5% plus inflation, which would affect their community, and the Governor signed it into law just before the meeting. Skinner’s bill SB 330 was passed the day before the MVCC meeting. She would update the community on the effects of this bill, as well as the effects of SB 592 if it passed, at the next PLUM meeting. She encouraged the community to attend that meeting on the first Tuesday of the month at 7PM.

**10.4.3. Public Health & Safety**

**Stemar:** She said their meetings were normally scheduled for the first Thursday of the month, but they are sometimes changed due to other events happening that month. So, she encouraged the community to check the website for their meeting schedules. Their committee was dealing with homeless, as well as signs for the Neighborhood Watch and issues with food trucks. They are also communicating with LAPD SLOs and requesting that they attend meetings. She encouraged the community to email her if they had questions.

**10.4.4. Education, Arts, and Culture – No representative was present.**

**10.4.5. Transportation & Infrastructure**

**Inouye:** Said she submitted a report to the board packet, but since then she had learned that the Culver City Stormwater project has been pushed off until the summer of 2020. So, the joint town hall on this issue with Culver City, Venice and Del Ray that was scheduled for next month will be pushed off as well. She said there would be a small meeting with all interested NCs, Homeowner Associations and other interested parties soon. She said she would keep the community updated as the project because it would limit the lanes on Washington Blvd, right in front of Costco for almost a year. She said she would put a link about the project on the T&I Committee’s website to keep the community updated.

**10.4.6. Outreach**

**Wheeler:** Said that Outreach’s first report should be online. She encouraged everyone to read it and to subscribe to the “Weekly Roundup” newsletter, which provides a preview of what meetings are coming up that current week and a summary of what happened the prior week. She also asked for anyone who liked to design or blog to contact her to get involved. She would love to put their talent to work

**Rubin:** Said there was a lot of talent in Mar Vista that should be tapped into. He urged the community to participate in the MVCC process.

## 11. Special Orders

### **Appointment to StreetsLA Stakeholder Advisory Council – Discussion and possible action regarding approval of a letter recommending Selena Inouye to represent MVCC on the StreetsLA Stakeholder Advisory Council.**

*Wheeler moved to approve the letter. Hruska seconded.*

**Gabriel Hill:** Asked if anyone else was selected besides Inouye or if she was the only one submitted. **Krupkin:** Said that since this is Transportation and Public Works related issue, someone had put her Inouye’s name forward. There was a portion in which all interested parties were encouraged to apply. **Hill:** Asked how long that portion was open/ **Krupkin:** Said he would have to refer to prior minutes, she believed in July.

**Ambriz:** Said that she discussed this with her co-chair of the T&I Committee and they both thought that this should maybe be an issue to discuss in a T&I Committee meeting first, which was not to say that the end result would be any different. But, it would give the stakeholders a chance to attend the meeting and express their interest. She did not believe there was a formal process in expressing interest and she did not recall in timeline by which names should have been submitted. But if there was a concern, she believed they could discuss it further

**Inouye:** Said she talked to Elliot about this issue, and she believed he was handling this the way he handled all the committee appointments, which is why there is a letter in the packet and he made this recommendation. She asked if it was something they could discuss in the T&I Committee and he said no, he would make the appointment.

*Seretti moved to table until the next meeting in order to get clarification from the chair. Shure seconded.*

#### **VOTE:**

**YES:** Ambriz, Hill, Shure, Seretti, Stemar (5)

**NO:** Hruska, Krupkin, Tilson, Wheeler (4)

**ABSTAIN:** Inouye, Rubin (2)



they did not need to vote on those three. **Krupkin:** Asked if 12.10, 12.13 and 12.15 needed to be struck. **Tilson:** Said they were already struck.

*Wheeler moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Shure seconded.*

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**YES:** Ambriz, Hill, Hruska, Inouye, Krupkin, Shure, Seretti, Tilson, Wheeler (9)

**ABSTAIN:** Rubin (1)

*With 9 yes votes the Consent Calendar was approved.*

**Shure:** *Point of Information* – Shure noted that although Stemar had completed all her board training, apparently DONE had lost all of her certificates and was therefore not allowing Stemar to vote on funding matters.

*The board heard item 12.8 first, then heard items 12.4, 12.5, and 12.9. Due to time constraints Items 15.3, 15.4 and 15.5 were not heard and the meeting was adjourned (see Item 16).*

- 12.1. **[FUNDING][Tilson] FY2019-2020 budget revisions – Action regarding revisions to the FY2019-2020 budget to support the funding items below and for other purposes.**
- 12.2. **[FUNDING][Tilson] Monthly Expenditure Report – Approval of the Monthly Expenditure Report for August, 2019**
- 12.3. **[ADMIN][ExFin] Authorization to submit Community Impact Statements – Approval for the following officers to submit Community Impact Statements regarding actions previously taken by the Board: Chair, First-Vice-Chair, Second Vice-Chair, Secretary, Treasurer. This authorization shall exist until modified or revoked by the Board.**
- 12.4. **[FUNDING][Shure Tilson & Stemar] Appropriation for Budget Advocates – Approval of an appropriation in the amount of \$1,000 to support the work of the Budget Advocates.**

*Inouye moved to approve this item. Hill seconded.*

**Shure:** Said there was just a small correction - the motion was made by just Tilson and Stemar.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**YES:** Ambriz, Hill, Hruska, Inouye, Krupkin, Shure, Seretti, Tilson, Wheeler (9)

**ABSTAIN:** Rubin (1)

*With 9 yes votes, the motion was approved.*



**Andrea:** *Point of Information* – She asked if they were allowed to accept or entertain an additional application for an additional amount of funding expenditure. **Cupen-Ames:** Yes, but it would be a whole new application. But he told them to follow up with the City Clerk regarding this, not DONE.

**Shure:** Asked Rubin if she could ask a question of a member of the audience. **Rubin:** Said she could. **Shure:** Asked Hannah Levien if would Councilmember Bonin’s office was contributing to the Grease Night and if they would consider contributing \$400. **Levien:** Said they had not received an official request but they could talk to the Grease Night Committee about that.

**Ambriz** moved to call the question. **Shure** seconded.

*Without objection, the question was called.*

**Wheeler** moved to approve this item. **Shure** seconded.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**YES:** Ambriz, Hill, Hruska, Inouye, Krupkin, Rubin, Shure, Seretti, Tilson, Wheeler (10)

*The motion was unanimously approved.*

**12.9. [FUNDING][PH&S] Disaster Survival Training – Approval of an appropriation in the amount of \$300.00 for Disaster Survival Training.**

**Wheeler** moved to approve the item. **Shure** seconded.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**YES:** Ambriz, Hill, Hruska, Inouye, Krupkin, Rubin, Shure, Seretti, Tilson, Wheeler (10)

*The motion was unanimously approved.*

**12.10. ~~[FUNDING][Outreach] – Booth Rental at North Westdale Homeowners’ Association Block Party – Approval of an appropriation in the amount of \$150.00 for booth rental at the annual North Westdale Homeowners’ Association Block Party.~~**

**12.11. [FUNDING][Outreach] – Booth Rental at Westdale Homeowners’ Association Block Party – Approval of an appropriation in the amount of \$150.00 for booth rental at the annual Westdale Homeowners’ Association Block Party.**

**12.12. [FUNDING][Outreach] – Advertising in Westdale Homeowners’ Newsletter – Approval of an appropriation in the amount of \$150.00 for advertising in the Westdale Homeowners’ Association newsletter.**







meeting and hoped they would come again, but that freedom wasn't free. He said the community needed to keep showing up or others would make decisions for them. He said he knew it was hard – he had three jobs and kids and he sometimes had to sacrifice his time with his family to go to these meetings. The balance is better in Culver City vs LA. Culver City is in the same state and deals with the same laws but they made a decision. He said there was no shortness of kindness from the community and they all needed to be motivated by heart, but make decisions with the head. He also said they just passed more mandatory vaccine laws for public health purposes and it is only the start – like this motion.

*Shure called the question. Hruska seconded.*

**VOTE ON CALLING THE QUESTION:**

**YES:** Hill, Hruska, Inouye, Krupkin, Shure, Seretti, Stemar, Tilson, Wheeler (9)

**NO:** Ambriz (1)

**ABSTAIN:** Rubin (1)

*With 9 yes votes, the motion to call the question was approved.*

**VOTE TO APPROVE THE MOTION:**

**YES:** Hill, Hruska, Inouye, Krupkin, Shure, Seretti, Stemar, Tilson, Wheeler (9)

**ABSTAIN:** Ambriz, Rubin (2)

*With 9 yes votes, the motion was approved.*

**15.2. [POLICY] Stakeholder motion in opposition to development at 11700 Charnock Rd. – Discussion and possible action regarding a stakeholder motion in opposition to the development at 11700 Charnock Rd.**

**Rubin:** Noted that the stakeholder author of the motion was Tom Ponton, the first ever Chair of the MVCC.

**Tom Ponton:** Thanked everyone for showing up and for their emails and support. He said they had presented a motion through the stakeholder process and it had been widely distributed. He said they felt very adamantly that the development planned for the corner of Charnock and McLaughlin was a bad project. A year ago, the developer came before the MVCC and got approval for the project. However, some things stated at that time were not accurate in the stakeholders' opinion. The developer said it would be three stories with parking, but the parking is actually a story because it is above ground – making it a four-story building. Ponton said the open space on the project was basically just rooftop

decks looking down into the backyards and windows of the neighborhood. The project is on a very small lot at the tip of the finger of three two-story apartment properties which were surrounded by residential neighborhoods. Another issue was that the 6 driveways were the size of half a car. The request is to turn a tiny lot into 6 lots and put up 6 townhouses, which in the picture look like a large industrial office building. There are a lot of issues with the project so the stakeholders were coming to the board to ask them to overturn, rescind or change the decision was made a year ago. He acknowledged that the developer was in attendance and would say some things and maybe even make some threats. But this is a different board than a year ago and there were different ways to do the motion. The motion asked the board to rescind the decision made a year ago but the board could also amend the motion, take out the word “rescind” and just say that the MVCC does not support the project if the board was worried about threats from the developer. He hoped the board would support the stakeholders.

**Rubin:** Thanked Ponton for showing what a community can do when it puts its mind to it, for getting together a petition and bringing people together to speak on their own behalf because this is what it’s really about. Many Mar Vista neighborhoods are under the siege of developments and they would benefit from Ponton’s examples. **Ponton:** Said he wanted to add that a year ago there was no outreach about this project. The community did not hear about it until a week before the planning commission meeting. He said motion 15.5 could rectify that problem in the future.

**Krupkin:** *Point of Order* – She said the entire motion was on page 24 of the supplemental materials packet which was available on the MVCC’s website. The signatures are on pages 24-30.

**Rubin:** Asked the audience for a straw poll of who wanted to speak out against the project. He said it appeared to be almost everyone in attendance. He said Hannah Levien had reported that Councilmember Bonin was willing to go along with this motion. He said the board had basically heard from everybody and that the people in attendance did not need to go up and repeat what someone else had already said.

**Shure:** *Point of order* – Clarification. She said she had previously spoken to the former PLUM chair, who was not present at the meeting, who wanted her to inform the board of a couple of facts relating to this development. The project came before the April, 2018 PLUM meeting and was then presented at the June 2018 MVCC board meeting. No vote taken was taken at the board meeting as there was concerns that the 3-story project was actually 4-stories. It was sent back to PLUM in July, 2018 and then heard again at the MVCC July, 2018 board meeting. According to the minutes from the July meeting, there were two issues that were not specifically addressed that are the grounds for this appeal. First the 4-story height issues. Second, in the minutes, there was a request for a clarification of egress, for the creation of an alley. The developer, Mr. Futterman, said that development is primarily on McLaughlin and the most easterly spaces will exit via a singular exit onto Charnock – which was not accurate to what they are now considering.

**Public Comment:**

**Ken Alpern:** Ask the Board to please call the question as soon as possible.

**Lewis Futterman:** Said he was developer of the project. He said he could not possibly respond to the motion in the allotted one-minute. He said this meeting was not functioning under the rules of the MVCC. He said they had Bylaws and Rosenberg's Rules. He said no one notified him that this meeting was going to occur but he had been following the MVCC's monthly email updates. He sent the motion to his attorney for review. His attorney said that it is unheard of for a board to rescind approval once officially given. He said there was no provision in the Bylaws or rules for rescinding approval. Request that they put it off making a decision since the hearing with the city was not until October 16<sup>th</sup> and the next board meeting was scheduled for October 9<sup>th</sup>.

*Shure moved to call the question. Wheeler seconded.*

*Ambriz, Inouye opposed calling the question.*

**VOTE ON CALLING THE QUESTION:**

**YES:** Shure, Wheeler (2)

**NO:** Ambriz, Hill, Hruska, Inouye, Krupkin, Seretti, Stemar, Tilson (8)

**ABSTAIN:** Rubin (1)

*With 8 no votes, the motion to call the question failed.*

**Board Comment:**

**Inouye:** Said that as a new board member she wanted to make sure that if they passed the motion, they did it in a way that is proper. Per Robert's/Rosenberg's Rules, she asked if they were allowed to rescind the board's decision and if it was rescinded did it have to be a motion that was generated by that voted on it previously and accepted it. Or, did they need to change the language so they could vote on it without any issues?

**Ambriz:** Said her understanding of parliamentary procedure was that only individuals who voted in opposition to the original motion can make another motion to rescind. She said if they choose to vote on the motion as is, they had to amend the language.

**Hruska:** Said she believed that a motion could be brought up again for discussion and vote again by someone who originally in favor of it.

**Tilson:** Said there was no one present who had voted in favor of motion. Rob Kadota, who was not present at the current meeting, had voted for it and everyone else who was present abstained.

**Wheeler:** Asked how that vote related to the stakeholder motion.

**Tilson:** Said because it involved rescinding a MVCC motion.

**Rubin:** Said it was his understanding is the project was presented in an inaccurate fashion and therefore the original board vote was based on information that was now known to be false. He said perhaps they could reword the motion to reflect that.

**Shure** moved to send the motion back to PLUM to reconsider the development as it exists now, address the issues that they felt were inaccurate, take a vote and then send it back to the board. **Ambriz** seconded.

**Seretti:** *Point of Clarification* – He said there was a DONE representative in attendance who could clarify about the rules.

**Seretti** moved to recess for five minutes to consult with the DONE representative. **Wheeler** seconded.

*Without objection the motion was approved. A recess began at 8:56 PM.*

*The meeting was called back to order at 9:03 PM.*

**Freddy Cupen-Ames, with DONE:** Said that he was operating under the bylaws and Rosenberg's Rules in giving his instructions. He considered Article 8, section 2 and 4 for Agenda and also for reconsideration. Reconsideration was intentionally left blank in the bylaws, under the assumption Rosenberg's would be the default. Rosenberg's states that "a motion to reconsider may be made only by certain members of the body. Accordingly, a motion to reconsider may be made only by a member who voted in the majority in the original motion. If such a member has a change of heart, he or she may make the motion to reconsider. Any other member of the body, including a member who voted in the minority on the original motion, may second the motion. If a member who voted in the minority seeks to make the motion to reconsider it must be ruled out of order." He asked how many of the current board members had voted on the original motion. **Krupkin:** Said four current members voted on the original motion. **Shure:** Asked if a member that was seated on the board who voted the affirmative but is not currently seated make the motion. **Cupen-Ames:** Said they could not, it had to be a current member. **Tilson:** Said the only current member who voted in the affirmative on the original motion was not present at the current meeting. The other three original members abstained. **Cupen-Ames:** Said there were two options. Option 1: One of the three present members who voted on the original motion could bring the motion and another of those three could second it to bring

it forward and proceed. Option 2: Send the motion back to PLUM, discuss it and then bring it back into committee.

**Krupkin:** *Point of Clarification* – She said that she and Tilson were the only members present at the current meeting who voted on the original motion and that although Hruska was on the board at the time, she was absent when the original vote took place.

**Ambriz:** *Point of Clarification* – She said she believed only those who voted in the majority who had a change of heart could move to reconsider and second the original motion.

**Cupen-Ames:** Said that was correct.

**Shure:** Asked if those who abstained could move to reconsider. **Cupen-Ames:** Checked the rules, and confirmed that only those who voted in the majority could move to reconsider.

**Wheeler:** Asked if they could amend the language of the stakeholders' meeting so that they could pass the stakeholders' motion that night. **Cupen-Ames:** Said that one could objectively see that motion was a reconsideration of previous agenda item which meant only someone in the majority could make the motion.

**Shure:** Said that the record reflects that **there** were changes to the project that were not accurately reflected in the record. She asked if that gave them the ability to then amend their previous motion and then vote on that amended motion as a board. **Cupen-Ames:** Said he believed in that case they could amend it.

**Wheeler:** Asked Tom Ponton if he had language for an amendment. **Tom Ponton:** Indicated the last paragraph of the stakeholders' motion, beginning with "The MVCC does at this time rescind its approval..." Ponton suggested replacing the entire last paragraph with: "At this time the MVCC does not recommend approval of the small lot subdivision at 11700 Charnock Rd by the West LA Planning Commission, and now recommends that the developer consider other options for the property which are more in context with the neighborhood."

**Wheeler** moved to amend the stakeholder motion with to Tom Ponton's suggested language. **Hruska** seconded.

**Inouye:** Asked if amending it this way would **have** the effect they wanted. Was the motion was forwarded the Planning Commission the first time it was passed? Would the Planning Commission allow them to change their mind on this project?

**Hruska:** Said that the project that was presented to PLUM and the board last year was not the same **as the** current project. There was a different architect associated with the previous design. So, this current project never went to the Planning Commission. As per the County Assessors report, the property was sold in August of last year. The original owner is listed as George **Noutsios**. **After the sale**, the new plan was submitted. The plans they were looking at now were not the same as the plans that were voted on last year.

**Shure:** Said that Hruska's statement was an accurate reflection of what was in the city file. The property records reflected that the owners of record changed and the plans changed.

**Ambriz:** Said it sounded like there was new information in regard to the property description but was interrupted before she could complete her statement.

***Wheeler** called the question. **Rubin** seconded.*

**Rubin:** Said there were many other items on the agenda to discuss. He said he would weigh in as chair. He said there was a 2014 MVCC policy **on record**.

**Shure:** *Point of Order* – She said the policy did not pertain to the stakeholder's motion.

**Rubin:** Said he was allowed to use the policy in discussion. **Shure:** Said she understood but there was a call to the question. **Rubin:** Said Shure was out of order. **Shure:** Said Rubin was out of order. **Rubin:** Said Shure was not allowed to interrupt like that. **Shure:** Said she had a point of order since they had called the question.

**Cupen-Ames:** Said that Ambriz should complete her statement since she was after Shure and she was still speaking when the question was called. **Rubin:** Thanked him for clarifying and apologized to Ambriz.

**Ambriz:** Thanked Rubin. She said that it sounded like there was new information with regard to both the property description as well as a couple of other details. She did not think they'd had sufficient time to hear from all of the audience members in addition to the developer. She thought the PLUM committee should take a second look at it and have the ability to put on record all of the issues of concern so the board could align itself appropriately with the right motion when they send it forward to the Planning Commission and City Council.

***Wheeler** moved to call the question. **Hruska** seconded.*

*Without objection the question was called.*

**VOTE TO AMEND THE MOTION:**

**YES:** Hill, Hruska, Inouye, Krupkin, Rubin, Shure, Seretti, Stemar, Wheeler (9)

**ABSTAIN:** Ambriz, Tilson (2)

*With 9 yes votes the motion was amended.*

**VOTE ON THE AMENDED MOTION:**

**YES:** Hill, Hruska, Inouye, Krupkin, Rubin, Shure, Seretti, Stemar, Wheeler (9)

**ABSTAIN:** Ambriz, Tilson (2)

*With 9 yes votes the amended motion was approved.*

***Shure:*** Point of Order – she moved that the chair of the board create a Community Impact Statement to be sent to the Planning Commission advising them of the change of the vote.  
***Inouye*** seconded.

**VOTE ON CIS MOTION:**

**YES:** Hill, Hruska, Inouye, Krupkin, Rubin, Shure, Seretti, Stemar, Wheeler (9)

**ABSTAIN:** Ambriz, Tilson (2)

*With 9 yes votes the motion was approved.*

**Rubin:** Said that as chair, the reason he personally voted yes on the motions was that, in 2014, the MVCC passed a policy statement titled “Mar Vista Community Council official low-density policy statement protecting neighborhoods.” He said it was a well written and distributed policy statement. This development would set a bad example which would affect the entire Mar Vista community.

**Tilson:** Said that item 12.8 was time sensitive.

***Wheeler*** moved to hear items 12.8, 12.11 and 12.12 as they were all time sensitive. ***Hruska*** seconded.

*Without objection the motion was approved.*

- 15.3. [POLICY] [PH&S] Increased community engagement from LAPD – Discussion and possible action regarding a request for increased presence and community engagement from LAPD.
- 15.4. [POLICY][T&I] Centinela Blvd. Street-Sweeping Services in Zones 3 and 6 - Discussion and possible action requesting that CD 11 assign the “Clean and Green Team” to clean up Centinela Blvd. between Palms Blvd. and National Blvd. until regular street sweeping service can be established.
- 15.5. [FUNDING][Outreach] Outreach to Stakeholders Regarding Proposed Construction – Approval of an appropriation not to exceed \$1,000 for door hangers – including distribution costs - to inform stakeholders of proposed construction projects (note that PLUM passed a competing item not to exceed \$500).

**16. Adjournment**

**Ambriz** moved to adjourn the meeting. **Hruska** seconded.

*Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 9:46 PM.*