



# Mar Vista Community Council



## Minutes

### Special Meeting of the Board of Directors

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

Monday, November 25, 2019, at 7:00pm

The Coffee Connection, Station Room

3838 S. Centinela Ave., Mar Vista, CA 90066

**1. Call to order**

- 
- *The meeting was called to order at 7:05 PM.*
- 

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

- 
- **Attending (8):**
- Martin Rubin
- Elliot Hanna
- Kathryn Wheeler
- Holly Tilson
- Mary Hruska
- Selena Inouye
- Gabriel Hill
- Michelle Krupkin (*Arrived at 7:09 PM*)
- 

**3. Announcements**

- 
- **Kathryn Wheeler:** Wished everyone a happy Thanksgiving. She asked them to check out email she sent on 11/18 at 4:30 PM in which she made a request for input for the newsletter before it was finalized on 12/19. Hopefully, the newsletter would be on the MVCC's January agenda for a late January/early February distribution.
- 
- **Martin Rubin:** Said that the newsletter was an opportunity for needed outreach for the MVCC and he encouraged everyone to participate.
- 
- **Holly Tilson:** Said that Outreach still needed a permanent meeting place for their meetings. **Elliot Hanna:** Agreed that was important and that we would work on that.
- 

**4. Public comment for items NOT on this agenda**

- 
- None.
- 

**5. 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.**

- 
- **Wheeler:** Said she communicated via emailed with Mary Hruska and Selena Inouye requesting the

survey information, input and design. Also, via email she affirmed with Michelle Krupkin that there was not enough time for the survey to be done door to door; Rubin was CC'd on those emails. She talked with Holly Tilson via phone to refresh her memory on how the printer is paid.

- 
- **Mary Hruska:** Said she spoke with Wheeler, Inouye and Tilson about the surveys.
- 
- **Hanna:** Said he had discussions with Tilson about agenda item 7.1.
- 
- **Selena Inouye:** Said she spoke with Tilson regarding funding matters.
- 
- **Tilson:** Said she spoke with everyone regarding funding matters.
- 

## 6. Adoption of the agenda

- 
- **Wheeler:** Objected to the order of the agenda. She said that 10.2, the actual physical survey, needed to be before any discussion of the surveys or adoption of them because the questions were going to change.
- 
- **Inouye:** Objected to Wheeler's motion. She said she would like to hear the items on the survey first before they moved on to the survey itself.
- 
- **Wheeler:** Said, to clarify, the reason she made the motion was there was some difficulty with people understanding what actually could be on the printed survey – the questions, the size of paper and the costs. She thought it was important to understand what the limits were before they are approved the survey questions.
- 
- *Michelle Krupkin arrived at the meeting at 7:09 PM.*
- 
- **Hanna:** Said that nothing would happen with the survey without money. And the Consent item was about money and not necessarily the content of the survey questions.
- 
- **Hill:** Said, regarding the overall adoption of the agenda, that he would like to move to table item 9.7. **Hanna:** Said he could move to table it when they reached that item.
- 
- **Wheeler moved to hear 10.2 before the Consent Calendar. Rubin seconded.**
- 
- **Board Comment:**
- 
- **Inouye:** Said she wanted to get the surveys approved first before they talked about printing them.
- 
- **Wheeler:** Said there would be limited space and the problem was people imagined they could get more on a page than not. So she would like to have an example of what it could look like before, so they could determine what questions are important enough to be on it.
- 
- **VOTE to move item 10.2 in front of the Consent Calendar:**
- 
- **Yes:** Wheeler, Rubin, Hill, Tilson. (4)

- 
- No: Inouye, Krupkin (2)
- 
- Abstain: Hanna, Hruska (2)
- 
- *The motion to move item 10.2 before the Consent Calendar was approved.*
- 
- *Without objection agenda as amended was adopted.*
- 
- **NOTE: For document structural purposes, the items have been left in their original agenda order. After 10.2 was heard, the board returned to the original order of the agenda.**
- 

7. **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.

- *Wheeler pulled item 7.2.*
- 
- **Hanna:** Said that Ken Frese put 7.1 on the agenda. The city told Frese it was \$192 for overtime and he paid that amount out of his own pocket. So this motion would pay the Park that amount and the park would reimburse Frese.
- 
- *Rubin moved to approve the remaining items on the Consent Calendar. Wheeler seconded.*
- 
- *The remaining Consent Calendar items were unanimously approved.*
- 

7.1 **[FUNDING][EACC] Appropriation for Emergency Preparedness Event** – Possible action and discussion regarding an appropriation in the amount of \$192.00 to the L.A. City Department of Recreation and Parks cover staffing costs for a Disaster Survival Seminar held at the Mar Vista Recreation Center on September 15, 2019.

7.2 **[FUNDING][HRUSKA] – Funding for a Community Survey** – Discussion and possible action regarding an expenditure, not to exceed \$6,000 for printing, distribution and other costs associated with a Community Survey regarding the update to the Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan. Said survey will complement an online version. Distribution and processing of results to be completed, per Dept of City Planning timeline, by Dec 31, 2019.

- 
- **Board Comment:**
- 
- **Wheeler:** Said her job as Outreach chair was to help facilitate what Committees want her to do. But she also has to be an at-large director and find out what the stakeholders want her to do. The amount does not have to be \$6,000, it can be less. But, the problem with the language is that it has to be in by 12/31. That is not a lot of time to get out the word out to anyone. The email blast has roughly 2,500 people, but they have 40,000 stakeholders; 26,000 households and apartments. So, 18-20% of the annual budget would pay for a very minimal amount of exposure for the surveys. So, she was hoping to decrease the document to a single sheet of paper that could be printed for under \$750. And the distributors could get it out into the community for around \$2,300.
-

- **Wheeler** moved to amend the amount to \$3,000. **Hill** seconded.
- 
- **Board Discussion on Amendment:**
- 
- **Hill:** Asked how the distributor would get the documents to those who live in apartments. **Wheeler:** Said the distributor was very good about getting into apartment buildings. He knocks on doors and has been doing this for a long time. Some apartment you just cannot get into but he did a really good job with the election newsletter for example and the election turnout was roughly three times what it normally is.
- 
- **Wheeler** moved to increase the amount to \$4,000. **Hruska** seconded.
- 
- **Krupkin:** Asked if they had quotes for this amount. **Wheeler:** Said yes, she had three quotes for one-sheet documents.
- 
- *Without objection the amount was amended to \$4,000*
- 
- **Board Comment on Main Motion as Amended:**
- 
- **Tilson:** Said she thought they had decided that physical distribution of a survey or a flyer would not be effective with the timeframe they had. It seemed like a lot of money for something they all thought they would not get any return on.
- 
- **Hruska:** Said they could not do anything about the timeline because that is what DCP had imposed on them. But, the alternative was to do nothing. But, since this would be a flyer directing stakeholders to the online survey, they would not need to wait for the survey to be returned via mail. The input document needs to be written by the January 14th board meeting, so the survey return deadline could be pushed back from 12/31, which could make it more effective.
- 
- **Wheeler:** Said that every word in the survey had to be approved by the board, which the survey would not be approved until the next meeting on 12/10. And the city needs to approve it. So, the flyers would not be distributed until around 12/22.
- 
- **Rubin** moved to send the motion back to the Community Plan Sub-Committee. **Wheeler** seconded.
- 
- *Without objection the motion was sent back to the Community Plan Sub-Committee.*
- 

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

9. **Unfinished Business and General Orders**

- 9.1 **[POLICY][T&I] Rose Ave. Sidewalk Installation in Zone 6** – *Discussion and possible amendment to a previously-passed motion regarding the installation of a sidewalk on the South side of Rose Ave. between S. Centinela Ave. and Colonial Ave. in Zone 6. **Amendment:** The MVCC also supports CD11 using WLA TAMP funds for this project.*

- **Inouye:** Said this item was passed in last meeting
- 
- **Wheeler** moved to postpone the motion. **Inouye** seconded.
- 
- Without objection the motion was postponed.
- 

9.2 **[FUNDING][OUTREACH] – Outreach Door Hangers** – Discussion and possible action regarding an expenditure - not to exceed \$1,000 - for the designing, printing, and distributing of Outreach Door Hangers.

- 
- **Wheeler:** Said the motion had been sent back to Outreach and they had made changes based on suggestions from Rob Kadota and Stacy Shure and a few others.
- 
- **Public Comment:**
- 
- **Ashley Zeldin:** Suggested changing the language from “the MVCC is inviting you” to “the MVCC invites you”.
- 
- **Board Comment:**
- 
- **Wheeler** moved to approve the item. **Hruska** seconded.
- 
- **Hill:** Said he was not opposed to the door hangers, but that he would prefer that the hangers apply to all committees, instead of just PLUM. **Tilson:** Said that PLUM had requested these door hangers. **Hanna:** Said they could use door hangers for other committees as well.
- **Wheeler:** Said Outreach would be happy to do this for other committees, they just need to reach out to her. PLUM specifically requested these particular door hangers.
- 
- **Wheeler** moved to amend the language to from “Is inviting you” to “invites you”. **Tilson** seconded.
- 
- Without objection the language was amended.
- 
- **Inouye:** Asked if there was a sample of a back half of that hanger that they could see. **Wheeler:** Said that the back half was space for an Avery label that could be applied with pertinent information such as to the construction schedule or times of PLUM meetings. It is less expensive to order a bundle of generic hangers that they can then apply the Avery labels to. **Inouye:** Said she was not sure if that fit with the feedback Outreach got at the last meeting. She asked if there was an Avery label that fit the size of the back half. **Wheeler:** Said there was a label that would fit on the back and it was one of the suggestions they had received. **Tilson:** Said Rob Kadota had talked about lines for hand written information. **Wheeler:** Said Avery labels were part of the budget.
- 
- **Hill:** Said that part of the feedback had been including other languages on the door hangers. He asked if there were any plans to print the hangers in other languages. **Wheeler:** Said that they were currently just in English and they would need a motion to include the information in other languages. **Hill:** Said that Spanish should be considered in particular, as there was a

large Spanish speaking population in Mar Vista. **Wheeler:** Suggested printing Spanish on the Avery labels. But, they had not budgeted to print twice the number of hangers – one in Spanish, one in English. **Hill:** Asked if they could print half of the hangers in Spanish and half in English. **Wheeler:** Said all the hangers had to be the same design to order this amount for the quoted cheap price. But they could print the Avery Labels in Spanish.

- 
- **Tilson:** Said is there was a large development going into a predominately Spanish-speaking neighborhood then Shure and PLUM would know and would make sure the labels were in Spanish.
- 
- **Krupkin:** Point of Clarification – she asked if the \$1,000 was for this fiscal year for one printing. **Hanna:** Said yes, it was \$1,000 from this fiscal year.
- 
- *Without objection the motion as amended was approved.*
- 

**9.3 [ADMINISTRATIVE][INOUE] – Neighborhood Council Policies and Procedures Manual – Discussion and possible action regarding a request to the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment and the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners to provide a Neighborhood Council Policies and Procedures manual to all Los Angeles Neighborhood Councils.**

- 
- **Inouye:** Said this motion arose out of a conversation at the last ExFin meeting where it was determined that there is not a Policies and Procedures manual for Neighborhood Councils. She put a motion together to make request to DONE to provide a manual.
- 
- **Public Comment:**
- 
- **Ashley Zeldin:** Said that this was a great idea. She asked if DONE already had a NC manual. **Tilson:** Said at that at the Congress of Neighborhoods they distributed some hand outs that looked like they came out of a manual. So, that is where the idea for this request came from. **Hanna:** Said the honest answer was that they did not know. **Zeldin:** Asked if the MVCC and other NCs could collaborate on creating a manual. **Hanna:** Said it would have to be a separate motion, but he did not see why they could not do that.

- 
- **Rubin** moved to approve the motion. **Hruska** seconded.
- 

• **Board Comment:**

- 
- **Krupkin:** Said she seconded Ashley Zeldin’s comment and agreed that it would be nice to have a simple letter to send to DONE about this. They have asked what training material exists quite a few times.
- 
- *Without objection the motion was approved.*
- 
- **Inouye:** Volunteered to start writing the letter.
- 

**9.4 [POLICY][PLUM][COMMUNITY PLAN] – Co-Living Arrangements – Discussion and possible action regarding suggested requirements for co-living projects in Mar Vista.**

- 
- **Hruska:** Said there was material about this item on pages 6-7 of the packet. They had talked about this a bit in Community Planning. This is a new type of project that is popping up everywhere – it is neither an apartment nor a dorm. It is somewhere in between. On one hand, it offers a unique financial option between affordable units and market rate units. They have private bedrooms and bathrooms that share common areas, such as a kitchen, living space and wifi. Some have themes, so there is a whole spectrum of these new places. They are not SROs but they share some qualities, but they are not affordable housing. The turnover rate for the units is less than 6 months. The motion requests that the department of City Planning defines and regulates this unique type of housing. Currently this type of housing can go into any multi-family zoned property. They are cheaper to build because you are building one kitchen for up to 10 bedrooms. They could offer a niche that could be great for some people. On the other hand, they are specifically targeted at young professionals that do not stay long. They are not family places, but Mar Vista tends to be a family neighborhood. It was asked how dense do we, the community, want these co-living places to be? Such places might displace families. At the Community Planning meeting they came up with suggestions about parking, density, on-site managers, size of units, and how the units should adhere to the open space requirements that already exist. And they want the units to be exempt from density bonus, because they already are a density bonus.
- 
- **Public Comment:**
- 
- **Ashley Zeldin:** Asked if other NCs supported the same restrictions that the MVCC was proposing. And she was curious if DCP had an enforcement system to regulate housing.
- 
- *Wheeler moved to approve the motion. Rubin seconded.*
- 
- **Board Comment:**
- 
- **Inouye:** Said there is currently a project called “Living the CO” on McLaughlin Avenue between Washington place and Washington Boulevard. It is set up as 2-bedroom apartments with five people in each bedroom and some communal spaces, one of which is on the roof. Parking is an additional charge. From what she saw there was not enough parking to accommodate the number of people in the building. The question has already been raised about how this will affect street parking in the area. Also, the project is not near transit so there is a question about how it was approved. She lives in the neighborhood and she knew that this project replaces an older building, so she was not sure what happened with the Ellis Act and RSOs when the project went in. There was no notification to neighborhood that this would be a co-living space. **Hruska:** Said that was why they needed regulation.
- 
- **Krupkin:** Said that as zone director, she had not gotten any notifications about the co-living nature of this project either. She suggested adding a provision into the motion banning short term rentals. They do not want housing that is designed for Airbnb, that sneaks a hotel into a residential zone. She said she was concerned about the number of bathrooms – one bathroom for 10 people was not sustainable in terms of infrastructure.
- 
- **Hruska:** Said that only one bathroom for 10 people was not allowed under current regulations. She referred to codes she had listed on page 8 of the agenda packet. But,

because there are no specific regulations for co-living spaces this project was a “by-right” project and did not required discretionary approval.

- 
- **Krupkin:** Referred to the term “transient” as defined on page 9 of the agenda packet and said that was her major concern. They prefer to have people moving to Mar Vista that want long-term leases, which would result in people who want to invest in community.
- 
- **Hanna:** Asked when the second input document was due. **Hruska:** Said she hoped to get it on to the January Board agenda to be approved and then submitted to DCP as soon as possible. **Hanna:** asked if they needed to vote on it tonight or if they had time to send it back to be amended. **Hruska:** Said they could send it back.
- 
- **Tilson:** Wondered if the proposed bathrooms would be half-baths or full-bathrooms. She also asked them to explain why they would prefer co-living spaces to be in commercial zones. **Hruska:** Said that Stacy Shure suggested that could be a way to limit density and to ensure they would not be allowed in multi-family zones. That would also put them closer to transit.
- 
- **Tilson:** Said there was a similar project in Venice at Rose and Lincoln. It is a 9-unit condominium building and each condo will have 5-6 bedrooms in it. There is one parking space per unit by right. This will be a co-sharing, 6-people to a bedroom situation. The LA Times featured four houses in Venice that have 95 people living in them. 6 people to a bedroom, \$900-\$1,000 a month per bunkbed. The article said 3 months was the average lease time.
- 
- **Rubin** moved to commit the item back to committee. **Hruska** seconded.
- 
- *Without objection the item was committed back to committee.*
- 

9.5 **[POLICY][PLUM][COMMUNITY PLAN] – Venice Blvd. Survey** – Discussion and possible action regarding a survey to be distributed regarding Venice. Blvd. as part of the Community update process.

- 
- **Hruska:** Said that this was the survey they approved at Community Plan and at PLUM. It came out of discussions about development on Venice Blvd. There is a focus on big developments planned for that area so they felt it should be addressed specifically with a survey. So, they came up with this 6-question survey which basically what kind of businesses, heights and access the community would like to see on Venice Blvd.
- 
- **Wheeler:** Point of Order – She said the survey was not actually in the agenda packet. **Hruska:** Clarified that she had brought a hand out of the survey that she passed around. She added that question 5 asked stakeholders if they thought businesses on Venice Blvd should be rent stabilized. In August they asked the Department of City Planning about rent stabilization, and they said it had never been done. So, they added this question because often business will close due to an increase in rent that they cannot afford. The community likes the small town, local business, walkability style of downtown Mar Vista, but they cannot keep that if they cannot control the rent. There are also questions about parking. They will take this survey

into account with their next input document.

•

• **Public Comment:**

•

- **Ashley Zeldin:** Said she participated in the process of creating this survey in the Community Plan Committee and thought it would provide useful information. She thanked them for listening to the stakeholders.

•

• **Board Comment:**

•

- **Tilson:** Said, regarding rent-control for businesses, that a lot of businesses have 10-15 year leases because they are the ones investing capital in the space. Many will not sign a lease unless it is a 10-year lease. The issue is that often the businesses do not do well and buildings get sold.

•

- **Rubin:** Asked if the survey would be online or a hard-copy. **Hruska:** Said they were hoping it would be online. **Rubin:** Asked about an item on the original survey in the agenda packet to do with the Santa Monica Airport. **Hruska:** Said that item was originally in there because the DCP said they were talking to Santa Monica about the plans for the airport. But, the new plan will be presented to Santa Monica on December 11<sup>th</sup>. **Rubin:** Asked what Zones would be most affected by the airport. **Hruska:** Said the areas south of the airport would be most affected - Zone 2, Zone 6 and to a certain extent Zone 3.

•

- **Rubin moved to approve the item. Hruska seconded.**

•

- *Without objection the motion was approved.*

•

9.6 **[ADMINISTRATIVE][INOUEY] – Civic University (CivicU®) in Mar Vista – Discussion and possible action regarding a request to the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment to bring Civic University (CivicU®) to Mar Vista to conduct a mock Board meeting as a training opportunity for the MVCC and other local NCs.**

<https://calstatela.patbrowninstitute.org/what-we-do/civic-university-2/>

•

- **Inouye:** Said this came about from an ExFin meeting in November. Stacy Shure informed them that CivicU could come out to run a mock board meeting as a training opportunity for MVCC and other NCSs. This motion is a request to DONE to facilitate this.

•

- **Inouye moved to approve the item. Hill seconded.**

•

• **Board Comment:**

•

- **Krupkin:** Said this was a great idea. She had been attending Del Rey NC meetings and helping them and they were shocked that they let anyone come to committee meetings and vote. So she thought the Venice and Del Rey NCs could benefit as well.

•

- *Without objection the motion was approved.*

•

9.7 **[FUNDING][AMBRIZ] – Replacement Video Equipment** – Discussion and possible action regarding an expenditure - not to exceed \$2,000 - for replacement video equipment for use in broadcasting MVCC meetings.

- 
- **Hanna:** Said Andrea Ambriz had requested to postpone this item until she could be in attendance.
- 
- *Without objection the Item postponed until the regular meeting.*
- 

10. **New Business**

10.1 **[POLICY][T&I] Transportation Survey Regarding Community Plan Update Mobility Element** – Discussion and possible action regarding an MVCC Transportation Survey regarding the Mobility Element of the Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey Community Plan update, which will be combined, promoted, and distributed online and on paper with the Community Plan Subcommittee’s Venice Blvd Survey.

- 
- **Inouye:** Handed out an updated copy of the survey. The survey was developed by T&I Committee because they wanted to input for the mobility element of the Community Plan Update. The questions are based on survey done earlier this year by the Southern California Associations of Governments (SCAG). T&I had input on the 7 questions on the survey and there is an “other” section at the end for stakeholders to leave general comments. And there are demographic questions at the end of the survey. It will be a Google Forms survey that will promoted through email, the MVCC website, social media and now the flyer. And, it was her understanding that the MVCC has a bulletin board at the Mar Vista library, so she recommended putting the flyers there.
- 
- **Public Comment:**
- 
- **Ashley Zeldin:** Said she though tan online was preferable. But that it was also good to make it available to people offline. She asked if someone would be appointed by T&I to input the data into the Community Plan. **Inouye:** Said yes, someone would be appointed.
- 
- *Inouye moved to approve the item. Rubin seconded.*
- 
- **Board Comment:**
- 
- **Hruska:** Said she really liked demographic questions but she was afraid it made the survey too long and it risked losing people. She said there five questions on the Venice Blvd survey, seven questions on the T&I survey, for a total of 12 questions. With the demographic questions it would amount to around 20 questions total. So, she thought they should shorten the demographic questions.
- 
- **Wheeler:** Said the demographic questions were not discussed at the T&I meeting. Besides that she approved of the survey, save for the email address which she thought would be flooded. She thought Survey monkey was better option than Google Forms because they could limit responses to IP and other things. She did not think email addresses were the best way to identify survey takers. She did not know what the methodology was for how the data

would be analyzed and stored nor who would have access to that data. The current Google Form was not made with the MVCC approved Google account. She had a lot of questions that she did not see answered with this. She had issues with it as it was now.

- 
- **Wheeler** moved to strike the demographics questions. **Hill** seconded.
- 
- **Board Comment on Amendment:**
- 
- **Inouye:** Said the demographic questions were discussed and it was left up to the chairs to add them after the meeting. **Wheeler:** Said she and her husband were not aware of that, so it was not made clear at the meeting.
- 
- **Tilson:** Said in terms of privacy issues regarding the data, she assumed the city should have some sort of guidelines to follow. She asked if they were following those guidelines. **Wheeler:** Said she contacted city and they approved and use survey monkey. **Tilson:** Asked if there was a formal policy so they could avoid getting into any sort of trouble.
- 
- **Inouye** objected to the amendment.
- 
- **Vote on Amendment:**
- 
- **YES:** Hill, Hruska, Wheeler, Rubin (4)
- 
- **NO:** Krupkin, Tilson, Inouye (3)
- 
- **ABSTAIN:** Hanna (1)
- 
- *With 4 yes votes the amendment was approved.*
- 
- **Board Comment on Survey as Amended:**
- 
- **Inouye:** Said she thought the effectiveness of the survey was diminished without the demographic questions. Because they are collecting information from people without knowing who they are. When they submit this data to DCP they cannot tell them where exactly the data comes from.
- 
- **Hruska:** Said if the T&I survey is combined with the Venice Blvd survey, there would a demographic question that asks what zone of the MVCC the surveyor lives and works in. **Inouye:** Said they had not discussed combining them yet. The surveys were currently separate on the agenda.
- 
- **Hanna:** Said if they were having this discussion now at the board meeting then it meant that it had not been sufficiently discussed at committee level yet. Meaningful work has to be done at the committee level first, and then the board can serve as a rubber stamp of approval.
- 
- **Hruska:** Point of Clarification – She asked if they needed a separate motion to combine the

surveys. **Inouye:** Said they were currently separate on the agenda. **Hanna:** Said if the board was putting out a survey then the entire survey needs to be approved by the board.

- 
- **Rubin** moved to commit the item back the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. **Wheeler** seconded.
- 
- **Board Comment on Motion to Commit Item back to the T&I Committee:**
- 
- **Inouye:** Said the questions were agreed upon by the T&I Committee, so there was no more work to be done. **Wheeler:** Said the demographics were struck **Inouye:** Asked if they redid the demographic questions if it would be struck again. She did not want to get stuck in a loop.
- 
- **Rubin:** Asked if it was possible for the surveys to be combined back in committees in such a way that there would be a demographics question. **Hruska:** Said yes. Logistically, the next T&I is 12/4. She asked if they could agendize the combination of the two surveys for that meeting.
- 
- **Inouye:** Said the issue of combining them was never thoroughly discussed at the committee level.
- 
- **Wheeler:** Said her understanding was that if it was sent back to committee then they could add the demographic question, combine it and they would not lose anything in the process.
- 
- **Hruska:** Suggested having a joint meeting. **Inouye:** Said they could do that on 12/4/19.
- 
- **Rubin** called the question. There was no objection to calling the question.
- 
- **Inouye** objected to sending the motion back to committee.
- 
- Vote:
- 
- YES: Hill, Hruska, Wheeler, Rubin, Tilson (5)
- 
- NO: Inouye, Krupkin (2)
- 
- ABSTAIN: Hanna (1)
- 
- *With 5 yes votes the item was sent back to the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.*
- 
- **Wheeler:** Said she had a Brown Act question regarding the joint committee – how would they proceed since so many MVCC members would be in attendance. **Hanna:** Said he spoke with a DONE representative about this last week because there has been a lot of confusion over the Brown Act. He was told that a majority of body may not conspire outside of a properly agendized board meeting. The city defines it a majority of the board as a quorum. The MVCC had previously believed that a majority was 7 members, but the City says a majority is 4 members. The DONE representative was supposed to send guidance but Hanna

had yet to received it, but the representative had suggested that board members may go to committee meetings but may not participate. They did not know what to do about chairs and co-chairs of committees. Hanna said he did not know what they should do but he thought that it was best for sitting board members who are not on committee leadership to refrain from attending committee meetings.

- 
- **Unidentified Citizen:** Said he was president of Marina Peninsula for 26 years and he knew of demographics organizations in Venice that they could reach out to and coordinate with for information. Also, the boat parade that he organizes in Marina Del Ray at the Harbor would be on December 14<sup>th</sup>.
- 

**10.2 [POLICY][WHEELER/HRUSKA/INOUYE] Transportation Survey Regarding Venice Blvd. and T&I Mobility Elements – Discussion and possible action regarding a hard-copy edition of a Community Plan survey combining Venice Blvd. and T&I Mobility Element online surveys.**

- 
- **Hanna:** Said there was a version of the survey in the agenda package, but it was his understanding that Wheeler had an amended version.
- 
- **Wheeler:** Said the version in the package is just community plan survey, not the combination of the community plan with the T&I survey. So she sent everyone a soft copy of the combination and she had a printed hard copy, which she passed around. She said basically, the community plan committee came up with one-page two-sided survey, which was approved and was coming to the board but then it was decided that they wanted to add T&I questions. Wheeler was at the T&I meeting and she stated that they only had a page because they needed half a page for “why you should fill out the survey” and a half page for people to mail it in. The questions at T&I committee were whittled down to 6 questions. But problems arose because the online survey added another 6 questions, which would not fit onto the paper version. So, it is a question of whether they want to go back to having a two-page or four-page version.
- 
- **Board Comment:**
- 
- ***Wheeler moved to approve the item 10.2. Rubin seconded.***
- 
- **Inouye:** Said she objected to this discussion because the T&I survey was done that past Wednesday. She put the survey together as directed by the committee members. The survey was approved by the committee, not by the board, and already Ms. Wheeler was making changes to it before it could be discussed or approved by the board. So, it needed to be discussed and approved first, because it was the work of the T&I committee. Then, after approval, they could give it to Outreach for distribution.
- 
- **Hill:** Asked why in the survey they were backtracking to questions about Venice Blvd again. He asked what was the purpose of that. He said he had not had a chance to look over the survey and asked for clarification as to which survey they were discussing. **Wheeler:** Said this was a discussion about the combination of the T&I and Community Plan surveys. **Inouye:** Said there was no mention of Venice Blvd on the T&I Survey. **Krupkin:** Said the T&I survey should not have been changed for this agenda after it was approved by the T&I committee.

- **Hruska:** Said, to clarify, they developed two surveys. They developed a Venice Blvd survey in the Community Plan sub-committee and T&I developed a transportation component survey. This discussion was about combining them into one survey. The Venice Blvd survey was approved in PLUM and the T&I survey was approved in T&I. There will be an online version and a hard copy version.
- 
- **Hill:** Asked if the survey would be just in English or in other languages as well. **Hruska:** Said they could discuss that.
- 
- **Wheeler:** Said there was a timeline printing issue in getting it out by 12/31. She passed around drafts of the hard copy version.
- 
- **Inouye:** Said she has a general issue about including surveys in the MVCC newsletter. They are relying on people to take the survey and mail it back and she did not know if people would actually do that. She thought the online survey should be the same as the hard copy version. And if there was a printing issue with fitting all of the T&I survey in the newsletter than they should consider not putting it in the newsletter, but rather distribute it at the library or park or other places where people could pick it up, take it and drop it off. Another alternative could be to provide links to the surveys in newsletter or a phone number to call board members who could conduct the survey via phone or deliver it to their home. So, there were other options besides the newsletter that she thought they should consider.
- 
- **Wheeler:** Point of Clarification – she said they not sending the survey out with the newsletter. They are discussing a separate 4-page document that was requested by Community Plan. There is a timeline problem because in the upcoming motion they requested that it all be done by 12/31 but logistically even if they get the funding approved by the city in time, the earliest the printers and distributors could get the survey out was 12/14 – which does not leave enough time for them to be both returned and then analyzed by 12/31.
- 
- **Hruska:** Said surveys had to be returned by 12/31 but she would analyze the data after.
- 
- **Wheeler:** Said they were talking about \$4,800 to \$6,000, depending on the printer, for a window of two weeks for people to submit 26,000 surveys if everything goes well – which she felt was a lot of money for a very limited time.
- 
- **Krupkin:** Said she was involved with the Centinela Streetscape, which got a \$15,000 Great Street Grant which required a survey. They put a survey online with SurveyMonkey and close to 700 people took it. They only used paper surveys at specific events at which people would take and return the surveys in person at the events. There were no similar upcoming events that she knew of where they could distribute paper surveys in person. She worried about intelligence of spending this amount of money to do this during the holiday season, when people were unlikely to take and mail back surveys. She thought it made more sense to have an online survey and to put up and distribute simple one-page fliers around Mar Vista informing the community of the online survey.
- 
- **Tilson:** Said printing cost-wise, a flier would cost less than a four-page survey.
-

- **Hanna:** Said he generally hated paper surveys since the return rate is typically low. There is a 1% return rate if your lucky. He believed that this survey would have a 0% return rate because of the survey takers have to provide their own postage to mail it back.
- 
- **Wheeler:** Said she was doing this as the Outreach chair, not as the director. Someone made a request and she was doing her best to fulfill it. She said they could get about 1,500 fliers done for \$500-700 and do a person to person distribution, as was discussed, but there just was not time to arrange that.
- 
- **Hruska:** Said everyone had made valuable points and this was a valuable discussion. The problem was they were not given a lot of time by the Department of City Planning (DCP) to do the Community Plan survey. She brought up idea of paper survey because she did not want to miss population that does not do things online. So, her question was how did they reach those people. Maybe they just could not reach them in this time frame, and they had to just accept that.
- 
- **Tilson:** Said she thought they had to discuss it further since no one agreed on how to proceed. A two-sided flier would be the most affordable option.
- 
- **Wheeler:** Asked if in the second Community Plan input document, they could put a section that says “Survey info coming by XYZ date” or if they had to submit it all by the DCP deadline.
- 
- **Hruska:** Said the problem was that the DCP was very bad with communicating; they do not tell you the process and they do not give a set deadline. She was trying to stay ahead of then. What she knew for sure was that they had to get their input into them before they put pen to paper for substantive input, because once they write that document it is done. Based on what the DCP told them in August, once they come up with draft plan, it is too late. She has been trying to find out from them when is the real deadline and the best she could find out was January. So, the best they could do is get the document to DCP by mid-January. Everything that she puts in that document has to be approved by the board, so if it doesn't get approved by the January meeting, it's going to get approved in February, which was, in her opinion, going to be too late. So her question was, instead of doing a survey that they have to return, could they spend this money to do a flyer with full distribution that has a website on it or a telephone number. **Hanna:** Said the answer was yes, but that is not what this particular discussion is. **Tilson:** Said they did not have a phone number. **Wheeler:** Said they we could do a Google voicemail via the MVCC's Gmail.
- 
- ***Inouye** moved to amend the motion to replace the word survey with “flyer directing stakeholders to online surveys and locations of hard copy surveys.”*
- 
- **Hanna:** Said the problem was they could not make a motion to approve a flyer they do not yet have. So the only thing to do was to postpone it indefinitely and discuss the flyer at the next meeting.
- 
- ***Wheeler** moved to table the motion. **Rubin** seconded*
- 
- *Without objection the motion was postponed indefinitely.*
-

**11. Adjournment**

- 
- *Hruska* moved to adjourn the meeting. *Krupkin* seconded.
- 
- *Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 9:02 PM.*