



MAR VISTA COMMUNITY COUNCIL

MarVista.org



REGULAR MEETING AGENDA Board of Directors

MarVista.org > Council > Board

Thursday, March 19th, 2026 from 7:00pm - 9:00pm

PUBLIC WELCOME

Windward School, 11350 Palms Blvd, Los Angeles, Ca 90066 Room 20

Parking: Upon arrival, please enter through the Sawtelle Blvd lot as a member of the security team will show you to a parking space and will guide you to Room 20.

Si requiere servicios de traducción, favor de avisar al Concejo Vecinal 3 días de trabajo (72 horas) antes del evento. Por favor contacte Jakob Meuser, Secretaria, al (424) 256-3633 o por correo electrónico jakob.meuser@marvista.org para avisar al Concejo Vecinal.

Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the agenda that are within the Board's jurisdiction will be heard during the General Public Comment period. Please note that under the Brown Act, the Board is prevented from acting on a matter that you bring to its attention during the General Public Comment period; however, the issue raised by a member of the public may become the subject of a future Board meeting. Public comment is limited to one minute per speaker, unless adjusted by the presiding officer of the Board.

If you are compensated to monitor, attend, or speak at this meeting. City law may require you to register as a lobbyist and report your activity. See Los Angeles Municipal Code §§ 48.01 et seq. More information is available at ethics.lacity.org/lobbying.

1. **CALL TO ORDER 7:01 PM**
2. **SPECIAL ORDERS**
3. **ROLL CALL WITH EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST** - *Roll Call shall include each board member declaring any ex parte communications outside of their duties and conflicts of interest pertaining to items on or related to this agenda.*

Delaram Ahmadyveasi arrived 7:10 no/no

Ian Blue no/no

Derl Clausen no/no

Steven Hedge no/no

Carolyn Honda no/no

Greg Kopelow no/no

Emily Lin absent excused

Andrew Marton no/no

Jakob Meuser no/no

Stephen Paddock no/no

April Peterson no/no

Deborah Poppink absent excused

Jennifer Rafeedie no/no

Charlene Samiley no/no

Chloe Samiley no/no

Aaron Vanek no/no

4. WELCOME, ANNOUNCEMENTS and COMMUNITY MEMORIALS

Carolyn: Football coach at Venice high school passed away, Angela Gascow.

Dorothy: On the 28th there will be a blood donation day at the rec center across the street from 12-4. \$20 gift card to Innout if you give a pint.

Delaram: Historic Community for Fire Station 62 is trying to turn the station into a community center. This year is our big fundraising efforts to raise the money to allow us to renovate it. First fundraiser is at IHOP and I have flyers.

5. ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE, GOVERNMENT AGENCY AND CITY DEPARTMENT REPORTS

Matt Halden with CD11: Dodgers start next week. First, I want to speak about 11484 Venice Blvd. There may be things that we can do in terms of helping make sure there are certain reviews in this process. Because this process is going through a ministerial approval under state housing law, the city is required to review the application for compliance, and if it meets the standards the city does not have the discretionary authority to block the project. It is likely we will see this come to fruition. Many laws in Sacramento have been passed recently that restrict cities from stopping these projects. Our office feels very strongly that when it comes to any review process the city has to have a hold on it because we have a better view of what the community wants. There is a consensus in California that we need affordable housing, but when we take local controls away that makes it uncomfortable for all of us. I will be checking in on public comments from tonight, our office is concerned about a project like this. It is clear to me that the community is united and doesn't support this project. I also wanted to touch base on the flock cameras. We have pursued this in the interest of public safety. There have been data breaches apparently with flock cameras in some areas. The data that is collected by these cameras is owned by LA city. The city has a very strict policy about data sharing. LA city does not share data with the federal government under any circumstances. That is not changing. I understand that there are real concerns with these cameras but I am not personally aware of any data breaches that have happened with any of our cameras. Other locales use these cameras as well. This technology is a reality and as we move forward into the future with less police, the use of technology is likely to increase over time. Yes, there are flock cameras and they are designed to track criminal activity and this data is not to be shared with the federal government. We have seen what has happened over the past year with the feds and if that how is the relationship will be, ok. But we do have to maintain a relationship with the federal government so that we can get FEMA money. Lastly we have confirmed 24 partners will be joining us to give away essentials at an event soon, check our website.

Carlos Penia for 28th district state senator Smallwood Cuevas: The legislative package has been put together. She is chair of the senate labor committee so most of her bills are on labor and employee rights. Earlier this year she was able to

bring about \$100 million to help renovate exposition park which has not been upgraded since the 1984 Olympics. We are also having the paralympics after the Olympics so we have to get to ADA compliance. This is one of the first appropriations to be brought down. The Coliseum is leased by USC so they have invested in that. We are also trying to put up security cameras in the park. Little by little we are trying to bring it up to code in time for the Olympics. Senator abstained from SB79 because she had some problems with it. The author would not take any amendments on the bill. If you have any questions about state agencies, feel free to email me. As far as housing, we have an EDD building that has been vacated for awhile. The senator wants to make it into affordable housing, it is on Crenshaw. That project will take awhile because we need community support. Q: Could the senator change the ministerial review of a specific building? A: I would need more information on that.

Erica with Department of Neighborhood Empowerment: There will be a bylaw amendment extension to May 1, originally it was April 1. Our empower LA youth conference is coming up where we invite 100 youth between the ages of 14 to 17 to come to city hall and learn about the neighborhood council program. Invite stakeholder youth you know! The congress of neighborhoods event is coming up, NCs host an event at city hall with guest speakers and workshops. They are in their planning phase, asking for NCs to contribute.

Karen Caldaron for Isaac Bryan: Glad to see everyone here and engaged today. One of his bills made it this week, AB1883 banning the use of AI and surveillance technology in the workplace in California for any employer. On April 25 we have our annual stewardship event with the Ballona wetlands. Last time it rained but I don't think that will be the case this time! Our African American leaders for tomorrow program brings students across the state of California to CSUDH. They stay in the dorms and learn about the legislative process and get to sit and learn with the members of the caucus firsthand. If you know any students that are current sophomores and juniors let them know. Karen.caldaron@asm.ca.gov

- 6. PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THIS AGENDA** - 1 minute per speaker, if time permits, more time will be given. *The MVCC is built on Stakeholder participation and input; especially through our committees (see MarVista.org > Council > Committees). The Brown Act provides for a "part of the meeting where the public can comment on any item of interest that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the local agency." The MVCC is an advisory board to the Los Angeles City Council and, as such, its jurisdiction is restricted within Los Angeles and most importantly, the Mar Vista Community. Therefore, please keep public comments within the MVCC jurisdiction and on matters that the MVCC may act upon in future meetings. Thank you for your involvement with the MVCC. Please feel free to contact us (info@MarVista.org) if we may be of service.*

Kalani: Nice to see young people here. Our nation is at a crossroads. Authoritarianism is on the rise in the US and that isn't shocking. I have concern when our young and even members say that there is evil on both sides. I am Hawaiian and the person who just pulled all our Hawaiian language funding is a Republican. Nixon was a crook, vote Blue in November.

- 7. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS** - 1 minute per speaker, if time permits, more time will be given. *board members may make very limited comments and briefly respond to statements made or questions posed*

by persons exercising their general public comment rights (no action may be taken on matters brought up during general public comment).

8. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Ian moves/Delaram seconds to adopt, no objections

9. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

9.1. February 19th, 2026 Meeting

Charlene: This is for our 2/19 meeting last month.

Clarifying Questions

Greg moves/Ian seconds

Public Comment

Kalani: Though I would like to thank Jakob for giving detailed minutes, since we have empowered LA in the house, I am disheartened that you loosened the rules on the minutes. Just having general minutes is very Trumpian because then we can't go back and blame people. Jakob has gone above and beyond and should be complimented.

Board Comment

Andrew: These minutes are very comprehensive.

Ian: Jakob is doing a great job.

Greg: Jakob could do better.

Name	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Delaram Ahmadyveasi	x			
Ian Blue	x			
Derl Clausen	x			
Steven Hedge	x			
Carolyn Honda	X			
Greg Kopelow	X			
Emily Lin				x
Andrew Marton	X			
Jakob Meuser	X			
Stephen Paddock	x			
April Peterson	X			
Deborah Poppink				x
Jennifer Rafeedie	X			
Charlene Samiley	X			
Chloe Samiley	x			
Aaron Vanek	x			

Total	14	0	0	2
--------------	-----------	----------	----------	----------

Passes 14-0-0-2

10. CONSENT CALENDAR - *Items deemed to be routine, non-controversial. Any officer may ask a clarifying question instead of or before pulling item(s). - PLEASE SEE SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS FOR DETAILS*

10.1. [Administrative] [Funding] Monthly Expenditure Report - Discussion and possible action regarding the Monthly Expenditure Report [MER] for February 2026

10.2. [Administrative] [Funding] Budget Adjustments - Discussion and possible action regarding the budget adjustments for March 2026

April: This shows our budget and the expenditures that are recurring. We have a check that has been cashed from an NPG for people who were creating a home for disaster preparedness supplies in the neighborhood. Our YTD expenditures have been \$14,000 and our remaining is around \$18,000. I have highlighted things that we have not yet spent or underspent on in orange, so this is extra money we will have. We have not yet needed all doorhanger money. Our street banners will be purchased this year.

Clarifying Questions

Aaron: What would be the best process if we wanted to move more money into the NPG bucket? A: First use the money that’s there, then identify items in the budget that haven’t been spoken for. Then we would need to approve a board motion to move the money. We did that previously from office and expenditures.

Ian: Do we know if we get rollover yet? A: Probably. As long as the City doesn’t say no, up to \$10,000.

Jakob moves/Steven seconds

Public Comment

Kalani: The \$4,000 for the emergency supplies. It should be noted that previous councils rejected that motion. Future councils now have to support that or let it die.

Name	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Delaram Ahmadyveasi	x			
Ian Blue	x			
Derl Clausen	x			
Steven Hedge	x			
Carolyn Honda	X			
Greg Kopelow	X			
Emily Lin				x
Andrew Marton	X			
Jakob Meuser	X			
Stephen Paddock	x			
April Peterson	X			

Deborah Poppink				x
Jennifer Rafeedie	X			
Charlene Samiley	X			
Chloe Samiley	x			
Aaron Vanek	x			
Total	14	0	0	2

Passes 14-0-0-2

11. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

12. OLD BUSINESS - PLEASE SEE SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS FOR DETAILS.

13. NEW BUSINESS - PLEASE SEE SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS FOR DETAILS.

- 13.1. [Policy] [PLUM] Opposition to Proposed 5-story, 81-unit affordable Apartment located at 11848 W Venice Blvd.: Building Case No. EAR-2026-852-AH-VHCA** – Discussion and possible action regarding motion for MVCC to oppose the proposed building project as currently conceived and applying under the ZI-2512 Housing Element Site, which limits review to a ministerial review only.

Mandy: With 360 along with Jeff McConnel on behalf of HGV development. This is comprised from 2 lots at 14000 square feet located on Venice Blvd. Single family is zoned to the rear but this is R3 zoning. There is currently 2 apartment buildings on site which have 7 existing units. This is in a transit priority area so it is within ½ mile of major transit stops. The project would be for 81 unit apartment buildings, all units at or below 120% AMI, this would be for people making from 80-125k per year. The building is 5 stories and the project provides a variety of indoor and outdoor common recreation space. There is no parking provided for this project because it is located within ½ mile of the transit stop. This project is not significantly in excess of what is allowed by right. This project is seeking ministerial approval pursuant to the affordable housing incentive program. AHIP provides a streamlined process in moderate and higher opportunity areas, such projects are also exempt from CEQA. Developers can select from incentives to make the project more possible for affordable housing. This project meets all qualifications for AHIP as it satisfies the definition of 100% affordable housing. The project is not pursuing approval under ED1. The project as designed is not required to comply with any of the ED1 design requirements. As a 100% affordable housing project it is allowed to have 5 incentives and a waiver. It can have unlimited density, no parking, up to 78 ft but we are only proposing 55 ft. Project is also requesting a reduction in the open space and yards. Short term bicycle parking is provided but not all long term. Building is 5 stories. The primary lobby is oriented toward Venice. There was a comment about potential fire department access, the access is through the lobby and the stairs at the front and rear of the lobby. Firefighters will not be required to ladder on the side of the building because it is fire compliant. Floors 2-5 are arranged similarly to the first floor. Project provides almost 4000 square feet of open space. That space will be attractively landscaped, 21 trees.

Stephen: The motion was based on the fact that it is doing the ED1 process. I don't know if there is a way we can oppose it, my motion is written specifically for that purpose. I don't know what the reasoning behind that would be, my motion was written on a different idea. So we would have to amend the motion.

April moves to amend: Keep background the same. The motion itself would say that: "The Mar Vista Community Council does not support the project as currently conceived, while we acknowledge the need for affordable housing the project does not meet the communities desire for setbacks. We ask the developer to provide setbacks similar to the setbacks

required in the executive directive. The MVCC would also like the building to provide parking for tenants.” Directed to all elected representatives that serve the Mar Vista area, council and city.

Clarifying Questions

Stephen: No one has said we don’t want affordable housing, the issue is the lack of parking. People who live in this building will have cars and they will park them in the neighborhood.

Carolyn: Zero parking is a slap in the face to the community around the building because it is pretty lousy with 0 parking. That is not realistic right now.

Ian: Did you in the process explore parking as part of this project? A: All of these projects done by HVN are designed to meet an affordability level and none of them have any parking.

Ian: Did you do any outreach to the neighbors? A: No.

Jennifer: HVN just started? What does that mean? A: It has only been in operation for 2 years, the legislation that allows for this is fairly recent.

Aaron: What happens to current tenants? A: Those tenants will have the right to return and LAUSD will find them housing in the interim. There are 7 existing units and 6 are occupied.

Stephen: Are all occupied units one bedrooms? A: Not sure on the existing situation, but they are offered relocation assistance if it doesn’t line up.

Stephen moves/Greg Seconds

Public Comment

Nina: I live in Mar vista and I support this development. If we only ever say housing should be built elsewhere it should never be built. I get around Mar Vista completely without a car, if you live near bus lines, it is very realistic to get around without a car.

Wendy: I am at 11849 this is literally in my backyard. My concerns are the windows because I will have 0 privacy in my backyard, I have a pool. We have street cleaning on Wednesdays and Thursdays, right now it is hard to find parking on the street. People park in front of my house on Thursday and people park in the middle and sit there until Tuesday night.

Demetrius: Regardless of whether the board resolution makes them change anything. In the long run we want to put this on the record. I agree there are options for public transportation, but the reality is that most of the tenants will use cars. A company is making money for building it but the cost is spread through the neighborhood. I want there to be less cars but right now we are all going to be inconvenienced.

Stakeholder: I would be looking at this building. I agree we need affordable housing, but the parking is already bad here. We have had to park blocks away, I don’t know where people are going to park on those days. In SM they have permit parking which I hate, but if we can do permit parking here that would protect the area from the tenants who do have cars.

Stakeholder: I am an RSO resident and I am able to pay my own rent because RSO made it possible for that. Affordable housing is a farce because they can buy up properties to make millions and millions. Affordable means they pay a certain amount of rent and the rest gets subsidized. This whole project needs to be evaluated. I urge the council to look more into this, the fact that there is no parking is crazy, how would you get groceries, how do you buy a TV and bring it home? This is just not right.

Stakeholder: The affordability rating, is that set by the same rules as the other rules? It’s not for people who are homeless? A: Not this particular project no. Q: It sounds like at this point in time this building will be built and there are problems with the process and people in general believe we need more housing but we need it low to middle income.

Amy: I live on Pacific for 17 years. The thought of having a 5 story building behind me looking in my backyard is unnerving. This project isn't taking into account the neighborhood or the kids that play on the street. People who make 6 figures have cars they aren't taking the bus. This is such a shame because we have a great neighborhood and this is a ***** disaster.

Helena: I come from a land where people live without cars and you can take your groceries on the bus. You can make 6 figures and still feel broke paying \$40,000 for rent. We have an affordability crisis, and to say that we have a car problem and build capacity for cars is deranged.

Cathleen: 11805 Pacific resident. You mentioned 81 units? This could potentially be 160 cars? With the street cleaning and the 1 way, where are those cars going. Us on Pacific avenue are now going to absorb 160 cars, where are they going to park?

Jania: I am on Pacific with my family. I attended the PLUM meeting. I learned that this development was previously zoned for 18 units. This is a 450% increase in density. We need more parking, one at a minimum per unit. I work in SM by Bergamont station. It would take me an hour to get to work through transit. My children who are new drivers are almost getting hit.

Eric: I live across the street from this building. I take the bus, I walk to Ralphs for my groceries. I work from home and not everyone has that privilege, but if I could move to a building like this that would free up my unit with an open parking space for someone who does have a car.

Jennifer: I don't support this. I pay a lot of taxes. Once someone sells their property, a bunch of people are going to be selling their properties for high rises on Venice, you have to not let this happen. Someone has 5 or 6 cars and there is nowhere to park. You get tickets if you park your car, I don't understand how they can allow this to happen.

Julia: I live in Mar vista on Venice not too far away from this. I am excited about it. Part of being in a city is living with diversity and not everyone is going to have the same vision of how they live their life. We have to make room for people who use transit and have buildings for them as well. \$100,000 is nothing these days adjusted for inflation. I don't support the motion.

Stakeholder: I'd like everyone to think about who is speaking and what their needs are. Who is the workforce right now? We are the workforce here speaking about what we would like to see in decades. The Eline is close to here and it would be easy to get to. Think about what young people want.

Stakeholder: I think the lack of parking is a huge problem, why can't they do underground parking? On street sweeping days it causes huge problems. We do have a driveway so we can get cars off the street but it will be a huge problem.

Kalani: When I first read about the units I said YES. And then I saw no parking and I thought hell no. There are good developers and there are bad developers. This is a bad one. Do not allow this to go through. If you set the precedent for this building all the other buildings will ask for no parking. Scott Weiner is the problem and he is running for Nancy Pelosi's available seat.

Tara: I am a homeowner that didn't know about this project. You can never find parking. I know that we really need housing and I agree that we need to make room for everyone. I think we can open our doors to welcome everyone in and find room for cars and help our neighbors out. We are living in an atmosphere of adversity.

Board Comment

Jennifer: People who work in Ralphs won't be able to afford a unit there. There are many people who don't make that much. These are 1 bedroom units so people will grow out. This is a car city and younger people who want it to be strictly not a car city will grow their families and not live in this building forever. We don't know how many empty units are in the city. People aren't going to give up their cars in this city. Hopefully we will get better transit.

April moves to amend: Keep background the same. The motion itself would say that: “The Mar Vista Community Council does not support the project as currently conceived, while we acknowledge the need for affordable housing the project does not meet the communities desire for setbacks. We ask the developer to provide setbacks similar to the setbacks required in the executive directive. The MVCC would also like the building to provide parking for tenants.” Directed to all elected representatives that serve the Mar Vista area, council and city.

Andrew: I think this is terrible because I've lived in a neighborhood with parking fights and I don't like the fact that the developer builds and leaves and the community has to take on the sacrifice. This is supposed to be democracy. If the developer had a restriction on the type of tenants that could come into that unit, that would eliminate at least one major issue. There is enough people I would think in LA that don't have vehicles who would still be inclined to rent here.

Stephen: My concern is that it might not be legal.

Jakob: I wish I could move into this building, but unfortunately I still own a car. Hearing everyone talk about the parking in this area, it sounds like it would be miserable to own a car and live in this building, and that would be evident. I'm not really worried about people with a bunch of cars they need to juggle irrationally moving into this building that offers no parking. We already heard from one stakeholder tonight who does not own a car but lives in a building that offers parking. Some people are paying more than they need to for housing because there are no buildings meant for people who use transit exclusively. I think this project is a good idea to help start filling that niche.

Delaram: I worked in affordable housing in SM right when they were being developed and built. These parents that would bring their children would all have two parking spots they would use to go to their jobs across the city. There are people still making \$30,000 to \$40,000 that these buildings should be designed for. 81 units going up on Venice right where this is located creates a safety issue. As someone who does take public transit, it is dangerous to be trying to navigate this street. The safety concern of people crossing Venice Blvd is going to potentially cause accidents. A lot of the comments we are making is about the law that allowed this to happen. Most people who are low income who need affordable housing are not working from home.

Stephen: Is this subsidized housing? I don't think all 81 will have 2 people. The windows at the back, is it possible to minimize their ability to look down at the neighbors? A: We will take that back to the developer. Q: The surrounding community may want to look at permit parking. You might be able to make it so people in the apartment cannot apply for the permit parking. For awhile I lived in Culver City and I went to look for an apartment that didn't have parking and I didn't take it.

April: What is the target rent? A: 30% of income, the housing community development department keeps track to make sure that the rent is on target. You can potentially be forced to move if you exceed the income threshold.

Ian: I abstained on this at the PLUM meeting. I wish there was parking and am sympathetic to how disrupting this will be. I would encourage you to meet with neighbors and do outreach. We have a supply crisis with housing, I would prefer we have local control, but the reason we don't is because we haven't built. There are younger people who will find this appealing. I hear the concerns from the neighborhood.

Carolyn: Can you like take off two stories and make it 40 units and have two of those stories be a garage? A: No, you have to buy the land so there is a sunk cost there. This could be 7 stories if they wanted it to be.

Andrew: Have you done any demographic studies as to what the likely tenant is? A: The high opportunity area is determined by the tax credit allocation committee. It is close to employment centers and grocery stores. The anticipation is that this will not be multifamily housing, large families won't be renting these.

Greg moves/steven seconds

Kalani: I oppose the amendment because I oppose the project. This is going to add 100 cars possibly to Venice Blvd. This company is buying up RSO properties all throughout the state. I would be surprised if they aren't in bed with Scott Weiner. Some of our local democrats can be mighty corrupt.

Stakeholder: I like limiting the windows on the back of the building and for the rooftop deck. A: The deck is oriented toward Venice Blvd.

Stakeholder: What is the timeframe for breaking ground? A: Timing is unclear.

Stakeholder: I would like to add to the amendment that you should shut down the project entirely, how is it affordable if it is market rate rent? Is this supposed to be by mass transit? It's just by the bus stop? There are no other 5 story buildings in that area?

Stephen: This is an expedited process through the city. A: This project is prioritized but we are in the application phase. It is being reviewed for consistency and compliance. There is no statutory timeline.

Amendment

Name	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Delaram Ahmadyveasi	X			
Ian Blue		X		
Derl Clausen		X		
Steven Hedge	x			
Carolyn Honda	X			
Greg Kopelow	X			
Emily Lin				x
Andrew Marton	X			
Jakob Meuser		X		
Stephen Paddock	x			
April Peterson	X			
Deborah Poppink				x
Jennifer Rafeedie	X			
Charlene Samiley	X			
Chloe Samiley	x			
Aaron Vanek			x	
Total	10	3	1	2

Passes 10-3-1-2

Motion as amended

Name	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Delaram Ahmadyveasi	X			
Ian Blue		X		
Derl Clausen		X		
Steven Hedge	x			

Carolyn Honda	X			
Greg Kopelow	X			
Emily Lin				x
Andrew Marton	X			
Jakob Meuser		X		
Stephen Paddock	x			
April Peterson	X			
Deborah Poppink				x
Jennifer Rafeedie	X			
Charlene Samiley	X			
Chloe Samiley	x			
Aaron Vanek		x		
Total	10	4	0	2

Passes 10-4-0-2

Charlene moves to extend to 9:30PM with 5 minute recess / Andrew seconds

Back at 9:04 PM

- 13.2. [Policy] [TI&S] Removal of Flock Cameras in Mar Vista** – Discussion and possible action regarding motion for MVCC to oppose the installation of flock cameras in Mar Vista and write letter to CD 11 requesting to cease all further installations of these devices and remove all cameras already installed.

Jakob: See 13.2 supporting slides for information.

Derl: We were going to call this what the Flock but Jakob wouldn't let me. CD11 has allocated \$450,000 of discretionary funds to purchase these Flock cameras and access to cloud data storage for 3 years. This was done without community input. Flock is a hardware and software company. It has ALPRs and condor cameras for tracking people. The ALPRs have been installed. They are a software company that takes in images and processes them. They advertise themselves as AI powered analytics. They do not actually need your license plate, they can track it even without a license plate. Flock runs a national database collection across the country. Traditional ALPRs are activated during an amber alert or when a vehicle has been stolen. They are a closed network whereas Flock is uploaded to the cloud. Flock does continuous video surveillance with their license plate readers. Traditional ALPRs use infrared tech whereas Flock does frame selection. Traditional ALPRs are owned by the customer whereas Flock is a service, a subscription the city is paying for. One misconception is that LA owns this data so we are safe. However, there have been many examples of this data being stolen or leaked by rogue departments. Thus, there is a danger of data exposure to the federal government even if LA technically owns the data. Sidedoor sharing allows police departments that are sharing the data to then leak our data to other entities. Also backdoor access allows border patrol or other federal agencies to access this data without the consent of the police department. Another misconception is that data

is only stored if someone commits a crime, but all data is actually stored for at least 30 days unless it is flagged, whatever that means. Under their user agreement, they also have the ability to permanently store all car data. In one instance, Flock misread a license plate and a man was mauled by a police dog even though he was not driving a stolen vehicle. There is potentially high miss rate on these too. There was also Flock data used to chase down a woman from Texas who had gotten an abortion out of state. There are many localities that have banned or canceled flock. (See last slide). I do not trust this company to use Mar Vista as a petri dish.

Clarifying Questions

Stephen: Why were they installed in the first place? Jennifer: We don't have enough police officers and there was mention of the Venice canal killer. A: There is a site called deflock that notes where the cameras are and we couldn't find any in that area. Traci Park unilaterally allocated \$450,000 to install these.

Andrew: Have you considered the other side of this? A: The actual basis for being able to look at whether ALPRs are effective is not well studied. The studies we found were inconclusive. If we want ALPRs we've had those forever and that is not a concern.

Andrew: What if it was a competitor? A: I don't want these in my neighborhood when the data can be stolen.

Aaron: Would you consider an amendment to allow for other ALPRs? A: I don't want this to be weakened in any way, we are targeting this installation.

Jennifer: You don't have any data on benefits that have been found in law enforcement? A: You can go on the flock website and read their salespitch, but all the studies we found were inconclusive. The privacy concerns with this pose too much of a risk to our community.

Stephen: Did you reach out to LAPD? A: I was not particularly interested. They are likely in favor because they will be the ones actively using the data.

Andrew: This may not prevent crime, but what about solving crime? Copper wire was stolen from street lights where I live, if the police can use ALPRs to solve these crimes that would be a benefit. A: Do we see situations where that technology was used to stop that kind of crime?

Carolyn: Isn't it in Culver city and Beverly Hills? A: Yes.

Ian: Did you do outreach to neighborhood watch groups? A: There is a point at which the surveillance state could stop crime, but that is a dangerous point.

Charlene/April move to extend to 9:50

Jakob moves/Greg seconds

Public Comment

Kalani: Fear fear fear. That's what cowardly people do to influence others and it has been used a lot by the Trump administration. Benjamin Franklin said that those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little potential safety gets neither liberty or safety. We have to stop being scared and selling our liberty. We better be careful how much we allow our government, especially this government.

Faith: There were cities that had violations from this company and pulled out of the contract. I don't track my period on my phone because I am afraid of the government getting that information. I don't like the fact that my neighbors have been abducted.

Stakeholder: I want to add that Flock themselves is especially bad because it is real time data handed to a private company. I don't have as big a problem with ALPRs generally, but Flock doesn't have any transparency about this.

Stakeholder: I strongly oppose Flock cameras and urge the committee to ban them from the city. Don't fall for the marketing campaigns on their website. Just because others have installed this doesn't mean the

technology is unstoppable. These infringe on the basic rights of all of us but they will target exploited communities.

Caroline: I have a masters degree in cybersecurity and have been working there for 10 years. People have been able to hack onto current flock cameras and spy on people. They are a private company so they don't owe us anything.

Stakeholder: This technology is not what it is being sold as. The federal government can search and track people over time. This will expand into more invasive forms of monitoring. This is even more alarming because of the direct intervention by Traci Park. It is very unusual for a council member to reach out to a committee.

Spencer: I believe there was some discussion hearing the argument in favor of the Flock cameras. When we passed the motion against the ICE raids, there was not discussion about trying to see the other side of those. The company cannot be trusted. We need to stop Flock.

Julia: I think in general, there is always a cost benefit analysis and we are naming a lot of the risks. There is just not enough of an argument to support it at this point. We all have phones, but there is still some level of control. This is just existing, there is not way to avoid it. We shouldn't be the test ground for it. This motion supports the approach of holding off for now.

Megan: I also am against Flock cameras. On March 3 the LA times released an article that at an LA oversight committee asked for an LAPD report on these cameras. We already know that a lot of things have been linked in other places, we should get ahead of this issue.

Stakeholder: I strongly support the motion. Why haven't we been consulted on the installation of these in the first place?

Stakeholder: I strongly oppose Flock and am not above vandalism. This isn't just about Mar Vista either it is about anyone who exists in the area. These cameras capture everyone in the car. As a woman who left an unsafe relationship, people can hack into things and track you.

Stakeholder: The councilmember said this technology is a reality. But why is it a reality here? Because our council member chose to spend \$450,000 in discretionary funds to install these cameras without any input from this council.

Stakeholder: I think we have to stand together as a community and stand together with our immigrant community members. We should stand against this data being used for kidnappings.

Stakeholder: Echoing everyone else. I am the PTA copresident at mar vista elementary and a social worker. These cameras are designed to keep you safe but I am worried about these cameras because they will make the kids and teachers at these schools unsafe. I strongly oppose Flock cameras and I want you to think about children being separated from their parents.

Stakeholder: I am also opposing Flock. I loved getting the email with the agenda. The ACLU Instagram account had just posted about Flock. They said they use a quid pro quo approach to data sharing, if the police agree to share their data with the whole network then they can search the rest of the network. Many communities have pushed back successfully and ended the use of Flock.

Board Comment

Aaron: Car and driver published today that 53 cities in 20 states have either deactivated Flock cameras or declined to use them. The pushback is large. Law enforcement communities have defended Flock. Police say that they have been able to solve many crimes with the technology. Privacy activists contest that claim because there is not independent research proving it.

Delaram: If anyone watched the superbowl, the national attitude around state surveillance is something to consider. People who pay for Ring were upset when they announced they would be sharing the data. People are creeped out by the extra surveillance and data sharing. Derl thank you for the presentation, this is a bigger issue of state surveillance.

Ian: I echo all the privacy concerns. I am fundamentally skeptical of government surveillance, but this motion seems one sided and we haven't done the proper engagement with LAPD. I don't understand what all the safety implications would be. I think this would be appropriate for the Public Health and Safety committee to consider this.

Ian moves to refer to PHS/Jennifer seconds

Name	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Delaram Ahmadyveasi		x		
Ian Blue	x			
Derl Clausen		x		
Steven Hedge		x		
Carolyn Honda	X			
Greg Kopelow		x		
Emily Lin				x
Andrew Marton	X			
Jakob Meuser		x		
Stephen Paddock		x		
April Peterson	X			
Deborah Poppink				x
Jennifer Rafeedie	X			
Charlene Samiley			x	
Chloe Samiley			x	
Aaron Vanek		x		
Total	5	7	2	2

Fails 5-7-2-2

Vote on original motion

Name	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Delaram Ahmadyveasi	x			
Ian Blue		x		
Derl Clausen	x			
Steven Hedge	x			
Carolyn Honda		x		
Greg Kopelow	x			
Emily Lin				x
Andrew Marton		x		

Jakob Meuser	x			
Stephen Paddock	x			
April Peterson			x	
Deborah Poppink				x
Jennifer Rafeedie			x	
Charlene Samiley			x	
Chloe Samiley	x			
Aaron Vanek	x			
Total	8	3	3	2

Passes 8-3-3-2

Move to extend to 9:56 PM Charlene/Derl

- 13.3. [Funding] [OUTREACH] Giveaways to hand out to neighborhood kids at Mar Vista Recreation Center’s Spring Festival** – Discussion and possible action regarding an expenditure not to exceed \$400.00 to purchase merchandise to hand out to neighborhood kids attending the Spring Festival at Mar Vista Recreation Center on March 28, 2026.

Chloe: Mar vista rec is having their festival 3/28. This would be a \$400 expenditure to purchase giveaways to the youth who attend this event.

April: If it is food you are good, if its items there is a concern.

Charlene moves/Greg seconds

Board Comment

Aaron: Food allergies?

Public Comment

Name	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Delaram Ahmadyveasi	x			
Ian Blue	x			
Derl Clausen	x			
Steven Hedge	x			
Carolyn Honda	X			
Greg Kopelow	X			
Emily Lin				x
Andrew Marton	X			
Jakob Meuser	X			
Stephen Paddock	x			

April Peterson	X			
Deborah Poppink				x
Jennifer Rafeedie	X			
Charlene Samiley	X			
Chloe Samiley	x			
Aaron Vanek			x	
Total	13	0	1	2

Passes 13-0-1-2

13.4. [Administrative] [DIRECTOR] MVCC Venice Blvd. Banners’ content and design –

Discussion and possible action regarding motion to approve proposed content and design for MVCC banners to be installed on Venice Blvd. (Funding for banners were previously approved at the MVCC Board meeting on September 18, 2025)

Carolyn: We have to be very neutral about this and be generic, the City is very picky about what goes on the banners.

Clarifying Questions

Aaron: Are we voting on the designs? A: These are what they are.

Jakob moves/April seconds

Public Comment

Kalani: I’m glad you are putting the website.

Name	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Delaram Ahmadyveasi	x			
Ian Blue	x			
Derl Clausen	x			
Steven Hedge	x			
Carolyn Honda	X			
Greg Kopelow	X			
Emily Lin				x
Andrew Marton	X			
Jakob Meuser	X			
Stephen Paddock	x			
April Peterson	X			
Deborah Poppink				x
Jennifer Rafeedie	X			

Charlene Samiley	X			
Chloe Samiley	x			
Aaron Vanek	x			
Total	14	0	0	2

Passes 14-0-0-2

14. REPORTS

Officer Reports

- Charlene Samiley - Chair
- Jennifer Rafeedie - 1st Vice Chair
- Andrew Marton - 2nd Vice Chair
- Jakob Meuser - Secretary
- April Peterson - Treasurer

Zone Reports

- Zone 1 - Ian Blue
- Zone 2 – Emily Lin
- Zone 3 - Andrew Marton
- Zone 4 - Deborah Poppink
- Zone 5 – Delaram Ahmadyveasi
- Zone 6 - Aaron Vanek (*Zone Report posted under Supporting Docs*)
- Zone 7 - Derl Clausen

Committee Reports

- Elections and Bylaws
- Outreach
- Public Health, Safety and Homelessness
- Planning and Land Use Management
- Transportation, Infrastructure and Sustainability
- Education Arts and Culture
- WRAC, WRAC Committees and Other Liaisons

15. ADJOURNMENT 9:55 Andrew/Stephen move to adjourn

DRAFT

Public Input at Neighborhood Council Meetings – Comments from the public on agenda items will be heard only when the respective item is being considered. Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the agenda that are within the Board’s jurisdiction will be heard during the Public Comments for Items NOT on This Agenda period. Please note that under the Brown Act, the Board is prevented from acting on a matter that you bring to its attention during this period; however, the issue raised by a member of the public may become the subject of a future Board meeting. Public comment is limited to 3 minutes per speaker, unless adjusted by the presiding officer of the Board. Use the Zoom Link and phone numbers listed at the top of this agenda.

As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by contacting the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment by calling (213) 978-1551 or email: NCsupport@lacity.org

Public Posting of Agendas -

Neighborhood Council agendas are posted for public review as follows:

- Mar Vista Recreation Center: [11430 Woodbine St, Los Angeles, CA 90066](#)
- [MarVista.org](#)
- You can also receive our agendas via email by subscribing to L.A. City’s [Early Notification System \(ENS\)](#)

Notice to Paid Representatives -

If you are compensated to monitor, attend, or speak at this meeting, City law may require you to register as a lobbyist and report your activity. See Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 48.01 et seq. More information is available at ethics.lacity.org/lobbying. For assistance, please contact the Ethics Commission at (213) 978-1960 or ethics.commission@lacity.org

Public Access of Records -

In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the board in advance of a meeting may be viewed at our website, [MarVista.org](#), or at the scheduled meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, they may be downloaded from our website; visit [MarVista.org > Council > Board](#).

Reconsideration and Grievance Process -

For information on MVCC’s process for board action reconsideration, stakeholder grievance policy, or any other procedural matters related to this Council, please consult the MVCC Bylaws. The Bylaws are available at our Board meetings and our website, [MarVista.org](#).

Servicios de Traducción -

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

DRAFT