



















*the agenda has been left in its original order.*

- 12.4 [FUNDING][OUTREACH] **Appropriation for a Locking Storage Cabinet** – Action regarding approval of an appropriation not to exceed \$976 for a locking storage cabinet for use at the Mar Vista Recreation Center.
- 13. **Excluded Consent Items** – Discussion and further action on items excluded from the Consent Calendar.
- 14. **Unfinished Business and General Orders**
  - 14.1 [FUNDING][EXFIN] **Appropriation for an MVCC Newsletter** – Discussion and possible action regarding an expenditure, not to exceed \$8,000, for an MVCC newsletter.

**Wheeler:** Said that hard copies of the newsletter draft were available at the meeting for everyone to look at. She said there were articles by Ken Alpern and Tom Ponton, the first MVCC Chair, and that many others had participated. They had been working on it for 3 months and had spent 6 Outreach meetings on it. She said, regarding the requests for Spanish, the website had web content accessibility so anything they published on Marvista.org could easily be put into another language. In the outreach report she showed that one could see the calendar, homepage, etc. in over 100 languages including Spanish. She added that less than 3% of people in Mar Vista only spoke Spanish. So putting a Spanish translation was not necessary.

**Hanna:** Said she would clarify that we are just talking about funding and not the newsletter itself.

**Wheeler:** Referred to the packet for the estimates for public information. She noted that the estimates were from 2019 and that there may be some differences in estimates in 2020, which was why the amount was "up to" \$8,000.

Public Comment:

**Tom Ponton:** Commended Outreach Committee for working so hard on this. He said this was not an easy job and this was something that everyone should be helping with. Most people in community did not know about the MVCC and the newsletter was good way to get the word out. The website was great, but not many people go there for outreach.

**Whittington:** Said she hoped that they have a clicker on the online version to see how many people were viewing it. She suggested some sort of metrics on the website to see if the newsletter generated a response to determine if the funding was appropriate or if it should be adjusted in the future. She was not sure if they have broken down the mailers by age groups. Younger people may be better reached by websites and older people by hard copies.

**Tom McHenry:** Asked if Outreach used the Facebook page **Hanna:** Said they did. **McHenry:** Said he had not seen many posts.

**Margaret Posner:** Asked if there was just one distribution for a whole year. **Wheeler:** Said they may do it twice a year. She added that social media and e-blasts only reached less than 5% of stakeholders. This was the only way to reach more people. **Posner:** Asked what the budget was for the newsletter. **Tilson:** Said it was budgeted for two newsletters for \$12,000.

**Alpern:** Said it was times like this that he regretted that they no longer had an annual budget of \$50,000. He said that a lot of time people come out for community events just because of newsletters. Even

apathetic people like those newsletters. It was the right type of expense for a NC.

**Hruska** moved to approve the item. **Watkins** seconded.

Board Comment:

**Hill:** Asked her clarify what Wheeler meant when she said that less than 3% of people in Mar Vista only spoke Spanish so a translation was not necessary. **Wheeler:** Said she did not think it was worth it to spend thousands of extra dollars on a translation when such a small percentage of the population needed that. Most of those families had a 13-year-old that could read the newsletter for them. And she said that the internet had created a universal language so they could read it on any device. Any website, including theirs, could be instantly translated to another language.

**Inouye:** Said her concern was that it would not reach everyone in the community. In Zone 5 there was a newsletter distributed for example, that she never got. She was also concerned that distribution companies could not get the newsletters into apartments. Moving forward, she was concerned about this mode of outreach. She thought they could spend money more effectively.

**Tilson:** Said that one of a NC's main objectives was outreach. She said this is the cheapest way they have even if it sounded like a lot of money. If they are mailed the newsletter to every household they would spend their whole budget. Apartments have always been difficult to deliver to. She said they have a renters engagement committee that was supposed to be helping with outreach to renters. The distributor said they would make a bigger effort to get into apartment buildings but they could not leave a stack outside the door

**Hruska:** Agreed that this would be a good project for the renters engagement committee.

**Rubin:** Said NC designed to take concerns of the stakeholders to downtown LA. The people need to be in contact with the MVCC in order for them to properly be represented. Over the years, all the people that have been involved with the MVCC have known that newsletters are extremely important for outreach. He thought this was a good-looking newsletter and would be very effective. He commended Outreach's efforts. For the next newsletter he urged everyone to get involved and support this effort.

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

*The motion to call the question failed.*

**Kadota:** Said the content of the newsletter was timeless which he appreciated because it would not become outdated. He said he would love to have Spanish and other languages available on website via a drop-down website as many city services have that on their websites. **Wheeler:** Said that was too expensive with the upcoming web redesign but that was on the to do list.

VOTE:

YES: Kadota, Hill, Wheeler, Hruska, Rubin, Krupkin, Tilson, Watkins, Inouye (9)

ABSTAIN: Shure, Hanna (2)

*The motion was approved.*

**NOTE: Per the amended agenda, the board next heard item 14.6. For document structural purposes the agenda has been left in its original order.**

- 14.2 [FUNDING][OUTREACH] Community Plan Survey** – Discussion and possible action regarding an expenditure - not to exceed \$1,000 - for design, printing, and distribution costs for a survey for the Community Plan Input Document.

**Wheeler:** Said that this was actually for the community plan, but they did not have time to get it out. So they made it an outreach item to get it on the agenda.

**Hruska:** Said this is an expenditure for the printing and distribution costs of a hardcopy version of the survey for the Community Plan Input Document which board approved some time ago. Copies for the board were available. **Kadota:** Asked why there were two different versions of the survey. **Hruska:** Said that there was a second version that was an option, but this was just the funding motion for item 14.3.

Public Comment:

**Alpern:** Said this was a good thing and encouraged the board to approve it.

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

Board Comment:

**Inouye:** Said she needed to point out that 14.2 was a motion that came from Outreach and this was not discussed with the T&I Committee. 14.3 was a motion that was passed at a joint Community Plan and T&I meeting, at which Outreach was not present. One version of the survey had questions from the board approved T&I survey, however the questions had been edited. So, she provided copies of the version of the T&I survey that was approved by the board back in December so they could look and see the difference. T&I envisioned this survey to be online with some promotion but not a door to door survey. **Hanna:** Said this was a discussion was for item 14.3, not 14.2. **Inouye:** Said that they needed to address the confusion over the two versions. These motions are out of order. They would not be addressed in logical order.

**Wheeler:** Said that In September/October, Hruska said she wanted to do a Community Plan Survey. That committee discussed it and Wheeler came up with way to distribute them door to door so that there would be a 99% confidence level with less than 5% margin of error. Around that time, Hruska suggested adding T&I's survey. Wheeler attended the T&I meeting and she told them that what they added had to be on one page because that was all the room they had. They went back and forth about it and ultimately T&I did not want to participate and this motion just refers to the one-page Community Plan Survey.

**Hanna:** Said all of this was not germane to this motion. This was not about its content, it was about the funding.

**Rubin:** Said there had been a lot of confusion with the surveys. He advocated initiating surveys online before going to print to get a sense of the response and interest. And then they could ask online if people wanted to go deeper and they could send a more in-depth survey. They may not need to print surveys at all. But, it was all rather disorderly now.

**Tilson:** Send she went both to community plan meeting when they were coming up with the survey and to outreach meetings. Now they were just trying to talk about this one-page survey. Wheeler came up with a plan for people to go door to door that now had a fair amount of interest. They all had to get 20 signatures when they were running for the board, so she did not think getting 26 people each to fill out a survey would be that hard. They needed to submit the input document for the community plan or the city would do whatever they wanted to do to the community. This was a referendum on what would end up on Venice Blvd.

**Hruska:** Said it was the goal of this community plan survey was to obtain statistically significant data on what the community feels about development on Venice Boulevard. It had to be a representative cross section of Mar Vista. They had to get numbers by which they could say, “this is how the community feels.” They needed methodology and this was the only way that she had seen to get statistically significant information.

**Kadota:** Said he was not sure how the \$1,000 was meant to be spent exactly. The motion was lacking in detail. **Krupkin:** Agreed and asked if they planned to print them and then have board members find people to take them in regulated specific geographic areas. Also, how many surveys would be printed?

**Wheeler:** Said she described how it would be implemented in the motion. It would cost way less than \$1,000. They would print 677 surveys doing it this way, we get a 99% confidence level with less than 5% margin of error. She said they would divide each zone into 4 areas, except Zone 6 which would be divided into 6 areas. If they take 26 surveys into each area then they have would statistically significant data with a small margin of error. Zone directors would find volunteers to give the surveys in each area.

**Shure:** Said she was sorry to raise this, but she thought the board should know that yesterday the mayor signed a 12-page executive order that resulted in anything regarding the streets, transportation and other items being removed from any community engagement involving the community plan. This needed to be reviewed by the community plan and T&I committees. So, this whole survey may not be relevant anymore. She said she could email the document to the board for their review. **Wheeler:** Said they should still do it because it would result in good information.

*Inouye move to commit item 14.3 back to the T&I and Community Plan Committees. Shure seconded.*

Public Comment:

**Wayne Wheeler:** Said that as a stakeholder he did not care what the mayor, or governor says. The community’s input was important no matter what. Gathering input was the primary purpose of the MVCC.

**Alpern:** Said he remembered when previous mayors had said there would never be an expo line. They would have to find out exactly what “gauntlet” that Garcetti had thrown down and stand up to him. This was something that warranted joint committee meetings with T&I, Community Plan and Outreach. They were going to need to come up with a response and to make sure that the survey that comes out was both legal and captured the attention of whoever needed to learn about it.

Board Comment:

**Tilson:** Said they need to be proactive not reactive. They needed the information and there was no harm in seeking it. They were trying to get the pulse of community even if it goes nowhere. They should at

least be assertive in their response, with the community's response.

**Watkins:** Said he was in support of survey.

**Hruska:** Said that whatever the mayor had done did not invalidate the public comment. Getting the opinions of the community was valuable.

**Inouye:** Said that in light of the new directive, it behooved them to step back, take a look at it and get adjust their input targeting specifically what the executive order addressed. She was not sure if the surveys were even relevant any more at this point. If they were going to spend money on it, they should make sure they were seeking the correct input in the first place.

**Wheeler:** Said this was important information. It would probably not cost more than \$500 and Hruska had asked for this for months, and had worked incredibly hard on this for the community. They owed it to her to give her what she wanted. They should just let her have it.

**Rubin:** Said this was a credible survey and he would recruit volunteers and conduct the survey himself in Zone 2.

**Krupkin:** Asked how many physical addresses would be assigned to each of the 13 board members  
**Wheeler:** Said there will be 26 zones and each zone would have 26 addresses to go to. **Krupkin:** Said that would mean that each board member would have around 51 addresses to go to.

**Inouye:** Said if you had a 10-15% response rate for a survey and each board member had around 51 surveys, each board member would need to knock on around 346 to 520 doors. So it was not just 26 addresses, because they had to consider response rates.

Secretary's Note: The motion stipulates the study area be divided into 26 areas producing 26 surveys each, for a total of 676.

VOTE to commit back:

YES: Kadota, Hill, Krupkin, Shure, Inouye (5)

NO: Wheeler, Rubin, Watkins, Hruska, Tilson (5)

ABSTAIN: Hanna (1)

*The motion to commit the item back to the committees failed.*

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

*With 10 yes votes, the motion to call the question was approved.*

VOTE on item 14.2:

YES: Wheeler, Hruska, Rubin, Tilson, Watkins, (5)

NO: Inouye, Hill, Kadota, Krupkin (4)

ABSTAIN: Shure, Hanna (2)

*The motion stood approved.*

- 14.3 [POLICY][T&I][COMMUNITY PLAN] Promotion and Distribution of MVCC Surveys** – Discussion and possible action requesting the Outreach Committee to promote and distribute the MVCC Venice Blvd, Transportation and/or the combined surveys to MVCC stakeholders.

*Inouye pulled the motion.*

*Without objection the motion was pulled.*

- 14.4 [POLICY][HANNA] Extension of LAMC 85.02** – Discussion and possible action regarding a Community Impact Statement (CIS) supporting the extension of LAMC 85.02 beyond the current January 1, 2020 sunset date (CF #14-1057-S8).

Public Comment:

**Alpern:** Said it would be nice to have a vote on this tonight.

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

Board Comment:

**Inouye:** Asked Hanna to briefly tell them the status of this council file.

**Kadota:** Asked what was the code was.

**Hanna:** Said that LAMC 85.02 was the restriction on vehicle dwelling in residential neighborhoods. It expired 1/1/20 so this motion asked the city council to extend it.

**Kadota:** Asked if it designated certain areas where people could and could not dwell. **Hanna:** Said yes.

**Tilson moved to approve call the question. Hruska seconded.**

*The board unanimously voted to called to the question, save for **Hanna** who abstained.*

*The board unanimously voted to approve the item, save for **Hanna** who abstained. The motion stood approved.*

- 14.5 [POLICY][PLUM][COMMUNITY PLAN] Co-Living Projects** – Discussion and possible action regarding requesting the Dept. of City Planning implement an ordinance regulating co-living projects as part of the Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan update.

**Hruska:** Said that most of the information was in packet. This is to request DCP to provide zoning and a specific description for co-living projects. They are a new type of themed housing. They are much higher end than SROs, but are not quite market rate. They provide a new niche for housing. They tend to be

short term arrangements; their turn around is about 3 months. There is currently no definition in the zoning code for them so they are requesting that DCP create one.

Public Comment:

**Alpern:** Said they needed to get ahead of this or they would regret it. He encouraged them to vote for the motion.

**Whittington:** Added that they need to ensure that they knew the impact the co-living spaces would have in community in terms of parking, safety, etc.

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

Board Comment:

**Inouye:** Said they already had one in Zone 5 on McLaughlin Avenue between Washington Place and Washington Blvd. It is called "Living the Co." It was an apartment that was demolished and rebuilt. There are two-bedroom units with 5 people per bedroom. There is not enough parking for all the people that live there and it was not built near transit. She was not sure how the project wound up there. So it was already happening.

**Krupkin:** Said they needed to get this sent out. In addition to parking, infrastructure like sewage would be issue. Two-bedroom apartments are not built to handle 5 people's water use.

**Kadota:** Asked if there was an upside to the units. **Mary:** Said they provide a niche that is slightly below market and allows for short term rental. They were somewhere between Airbnb and a dorm/short-term rental. They are a new entity with no definition but right now they could go anywhere with multifamily zoning.

**Shure:** Said under LA Municipal code by definition they were boarding houses, which are illegal except in parameter zones such as near universities. There was no code on the books for enforcement. They were writing the code now for this. But they were already happening – there was one in zone 2 and several more planned in Mar Vista.

**Kadota:** Asked if this was a co-living situation with older couples for more affordable housing. **Shure:** Said this was not the same. This was cramming the most people you can into one bedroom. So, there are 2-3- bedroom units with over 30 people living in them.

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

*The board unanimously voted to call the question.*

*The board unanimously voted to approve the motion, save for Hanna who abstained.*

**14.6 [POLICY][OUTREACH] Approval of January, 2020 MVCC Newsletter** – Discussion and possible action regarding approval of the proposed January 2020 MVCC newsletter.

**Wheeler:** Said that when the MVCC first made the website web content accessibility was very new so it was forward thinking of the board at that time to have that. Because of that the website is translatable

into over 100 languages. There are articles and information on zones and committee meetings' dates and locations.

Public Comment:

**Whittington:** Said it she believed that it is important to list the app or website that does the translations  
**Wheeler:** Said it was translated automatically. **Whittington:** Said she was against printing in different languages. As an indigenous person, her Hawaiian culture's language had almost gone extinct so she realized importance of language. But she believed countries should have one central language otherwise they would end up with issues like Canada and Spain where there were threats of seceding and it could be difficult to communicate a central point of view.

**Alpern:** Said it was great to push for other languages. He asked them all to please realize that the city was to blame. DONE is never thrilled when they bring translation up. The perfect was the enemy of the good. He urged them not to be too hard on this newsletter because it was not ultimately Outreach's fault.

*Rubin moved to approve the item. Watkins seconded.*

Board Comment:

**Krupkin:** Said on page 1 the abbreviation for "cont" should have a period after it. On page 4, under "fund local events" the Mar Vista Library Hopscotch Mosaic was listed, but the MVCC had not actually provided any funding for that so it should not be on the list. **Wheeler:** Said she got that list from the secretary.  
**Krupkin:** Said there was also a typo on page 7, "Mar Vista" was missing the second "a". **Wheeler:** Asked her to circle the corrections and give it to her. She said it would be have been great if Krupkin had come to committee with those corrections.

*Inouye moved to amend the motion to include an insert in the newsletter with links to board approved surveys. Krupkin seconded.*

Board Comment on amendment:

**Rubin:** Said that in order to get surveys properly done, they needed to be done in an orderly fashion. What he saw now was a lot of jumble, good work being done, but it had not been put together properly. it's a lot of jumble, good work being done, but it's not been put together properly. This was something that should potentially be aimed at the next newsletter, so he urged them not to complicate this newsletter now.

**Hruska:** Said that the Community Plan Committee did not want their survey included newsletter. She thought it would get lost in there.

**Wheeler:** Said she had contacted printers when this idea was first brought up. The insert would have to be done by hand. It would cost \$3,000-4,000 to have it inserted into the 25,000 newsletters, which was not feasible. She was happy to consider it for the next one though. She added that they started this process in October and had made many announcements and requests for input. This request was not professional to do at the last minute.

**Hanna:** Said the proposed amendment was in order. Inouye had a right to make it.

**Shure:** Said that all the people on this board worked very hard for free; they were all either chairs or co-chairs and involved with sometimes multiple committees. So, it was not necessarily reasonable to say that a board member who would like to have input on a particular topic should just attend the committee meetings, knowing that a lot of them were spending substantial time in the other positions that they had. Sometimes things happen at the last minute. It's unfortunate. But it doesn't negate the hard work that's gone into something. It just also speaks to the fact that they're all taking their jobs seriously, and are extremely involved with their communities and doing their best for our stakeholders. In that spirit, she asked them all to remember that they are all working hard under time constraints

**Inouye:** Said, in light of Hruska's comments, she only wanted to add insert with a link to the transportation survey.

VOTE on amendment:

**YES:** Inouye, Krupkin (2)

**NO:** Wheeler, Rubin, Hruska, Watkins, Tilson (5)

**ABSTAIN:** Shure, Hanna, Hill, Kadota (4)

*The amendment failed.*

Board Comment on original motion:

**Hill:** Asked if nothing could be added to the newsletter. He thought there could be a little blurb about each of them, something to introduce them to the community. **Wheeler:** Said everyone's name was on the newsletter. When she first brought it up in early October no one responded. She was hoping to pull their information from website, but had she had not been able to get all of them to submit their information. But she was happy to get information from board members in the future and would appreciate their input in the next newsletter. This one was done.

*Without objection the newsletter as presented with corrections was approved.*

**NOTE: Per the amended agenda, the board next heard item 14.2. For document structural purposes the agenda has been left in its original order.**

**14.7 [POLICY][ELECTIONS & BYLAWS] Adjustment of MVCC Internal Boundaries** – Discussion and possible action regarding splitting Zone 6 into two zones.

*Not heard.*

**14.8 [POLICY][ELECTIONS & BYLAWS] Parliamentary Authority** – Discussion and possible action regarding establishing Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, 11<sup>th</sup> edition as the parliamentary authority for MVCC.

*Not heard.*

**14.9 [POLICY][PLUM][COMMUNITY PLAN] Arts District Designation** - Discussion and possible action on the Dept of City Planning's Arts District designation of Venice Blvd. presented at the Department's June, 2019 Workshop at Windward School.

*Not heard.*

**14.10 [FUNDING][INOUYE] Appropriation for the Use of a Paid Online Survey Service for an Approved**

**MVCC Survey** - Discussion and possible action regarding an expenditure, not to exceed \$1,000, for the use of a paid online survey service to host the approved MVCC Transportation survey for input to the Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey Community Plan Update

*Inouye pulled this item.*

*Without objection the item was pulled.*

- 14.11 [POLICY][T&I][GREAT STREETS] String Light Installation on Great Streets Venice Blvd** - Discussion and possible Community Impact Statement (CIS) regarding the String Light installation on Great Streets Venice Blvd. (Council File 18-1124.).

*Not heard.*

- 14.12 [POLICY][T&I][GREAT STREETS] MVCC Position Statement on Great Streets Venice Blvd.** - Discussion and possible action regarding the MVCC's current position on Great Streets Venice Blvd.

*Not heard.*

- 14.13 [POLICY][T&I][GREAT STREETS] Pavement Mural Project** - Discussion and possible action regarding the pavement mural project at the intersection of Grand View Blvd. and Pacific Ave.

*Not heard.*

Draft

**15. New Business**

- 15.1 [POLICY][PLUM] CIS OPPOSING waiver of WLA TIMP Fees** - Discussion and possible motion regarding a Community Impact Statement (CIS) opposing the motion from Councilmember Koretz (Council File # 19-1571) that proposes to waive West Los Angeles Transportation and Infrastructure Improvement and Mitigation Plan fees for the development at Palms/Sepulveda.

**Shure:** Said that CM Koretz introduced an ordinance unannounced to the community and other council members three weeks ago at PLUM proposing to waive West LA TIMP Fees. There were specific dates in the ordinance that indicate it is for the Palms and Sepulveda development, which was 409 apartments, 90% market rate and 600,000 square feet of commercial. She said there were plenty of incentives given and there was no reason for offering to waive millions of dollars in TIMP fees especially since it would create a lot of traffic. Therefore, they were encouraged by several council members to put a CIS opposing it on file. It was her understanding that all of the Neighborhood Councils had been asked to do so and were preparing them. Once these CIS were on file the ordinance would likely get pulled. Recommending against it. She was asking them to have a community impact statement in opposition because it would cost them millions that were needed to mitigate the traffic the development would create.

Public Comment:

**Alpern:** Said that developers pay TIMP fees to mitigate construction and transportation needs. For example, TIMP fees allowed for the expo line to be elevated over Sepulveda. He was a little horrified by this ordinance. He encouraged them to vote to approve the CIS against it.

**Wayne Wheeler:** Thanked them for bring this up. He asked if the CIS stated their opposition to the project itself. **Shure:** Said the project was not yet up before board at this time. They were still at the preliminary stage a five-year planning process and still seeking community engagement. They did not want to take a vote or even consider the matter until they knew what the final design would look like and all members of the community got a chance to weigh in on the project.

**Unidentified Stakeholder:** Asked how units were planned and how tall it would be. **Shure:** Said 409, 389 of which would be market rate. It would be 8 stories.

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

Board Comment:

**Inouye:** Said she strongly supported the CIS. The fees were put in place so developers would pay to mitigate the traffic impacts of their projects. They needed that money. She did not understand why they would propose this. It was outrageous.

**Hruska:** Said, to answer Wayne Wheeler's question, this CIS was in opposition to CM Koretz's motion. They would discuss the project later, but it would be in opposition.

*Without objection the motion stood approved.*

**Shure:** Said she would provide a copy to the secretary.

- 15.2 [POLICY][PLUM] Request for CD11 to assert jurisdiction over development at 3709 McLaughlin Ave.** - Discussion and possible motion requesting Councilmember Bonin, pursuant to City Council

Rule 245(e), assert jurisdiction over the planned development at 3709 McLaughlin Ave. (DIR-2019-4277-DB).

**Shure:** Said the proposed development was presented at the November PLUM meeting. The proposed development would be 40 apt at a height of 68 feet. The property is surrounded by R1 residences, except for to the South, which is R3 multifamily. The prevailing height for multifamily on the two blocks immediately adjacent is two stories. The 44 members of the community that were present asked the developer to make substantial changes and to consider feedback and they would hold bringing a vote of opposition or 245E Rule motion to the board. Despite her efforts by phone, in person, and by email, the developer's representative had failed to communicate with her and to bring back changes. They received notice that night that the Director of Planning was giving preliminary approval for this development, so they were going to proceed. To stop the proposed development they needed to use City Council Rule 245E which allows councilmembers like Bonin to assert personal jurisdiction over development and take it from the DCP. She believed Bonin knew this motion was coming and he would act on it. So, she asked for the board to vote to approve the motion.

Public Comment:

**Alpern:** Said this was like the TIMP fees and that developments need community input. This should be a nonstarter. Even if a project is reasonable, it should not be rammed through. It makes it look like things they have things to hide. They had to intervene. This process was all wrong and should be illegal. He urged the board to vote for the motion.

**Wayne Wheeler:** Asked if this was a "by right" project. **Shure:** Said under 1222A by LA Municipal Code in proposition 18 they received incentives for increased density and height which made it "by right" in effect.

**Whittington:** Said McLaughlin was a busy cut-through street all the way through the West LA area. She believed that all that traffic and parking surveys should be done. She supported the motion.

**Shure:** Said that it should be noted that development representative was told this would be on agenda and had not come to the meeting.

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

Board Comment:

**Kadota:** Asked how many stories the project was. **Shure:** Said it was 68 feet, not including solar panels, so it was probably 5 or 6 stories. It did not come with a complete set of architectural details and plans as required by PLUM and was missing quite a few pages. She had what they filed with the city but the developer did not verify that was what they would build. **Kadota:** Asked what the current height in the area **Shure:** Said the largest height was 3 stories, and the prevailing height in the area was 2 stories. **Kadota:** Asked what was permitted in the area **Shure:** Said R3 allowed 35-feet, but the developers requested incentives for increased height, density, and reduced parking, all of which the DCP granted.

**Inouye:** Said she drove by that corner all the time the time and was shocked to see everything gone. She asked what happened to the tenants. **Shure:** Said they filed Ellis Act eviction well in advance without notifying the MVCC or filing any plans. They removed 8 RSO units and their tenants before it ever came to PLUM. And they were not replacing those units. **Inouye:** Asked if any of the tenants had section 8 Vouchers **Shure:** Said that PLUM did not know. They only knew that through the Ellis Act they were paid

what they had to be and they were evicted **Inouye**: Said she noticed an old mature tree had been removed and asked if they had been given any notice for that. **Shure**: Said no, they had not. She wanted to point out that this was not how other developer had treated PLUM and the community in the past.

*Without objection the motion was adopted.*

**Kadota**: Said his address was 3959 Barry and asked if he lived too close to the development and needed to recuse himself. **Shure**: Said any board member or elected official that lived within 500 feet of a proposed development that came before them had to recuse themselves from board discussion and voting. She checked his address and determined he was outside the 500-foot radius of the project so he did not need to recuse himself.

**NOTE: Per the amended agenda, the board next heard item 14.1. For document structural purposes the agenda has been left in its original order.**

- 15.3 [ADMINISTRATIVE][TILSON] Establishment of an Ad-Hoc Translation Committee** - Discussion and possible action regarding establishment of an Ad-Hoc Translation Committee and appointment of leadership [Chair(s)/Co-Chair(s)/Vice-Chair(s)].

*Not heard.*

- 15.4 [FUNDING][KADOTA] Appropriation for Translation Services-** Discussion and possible action regarding an appropriation of up to \$5,000 for FY2019-2020 for the purpose of providing translation services of documents into Spanish and other languages as needed by the MVCC Board and/or Committee and Sub-Committee chairs.

*Not heard.*

- 15.5 [POLICY][T&I] Longer Form MVCC Transportation Survey** - Discussion and possible motion regarding an optional longer form MVCC Transportation survey to be linked to the Board approved short MVCC Transportation survey for input to the Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey Community Plan Update.

*Not heard.*

- 15.6 [ADMINISTRATIVE][INOUYE] Committee access to web postings and e-mails** - Discussion and possible action regarding MVCC Standing Rules, Section 2 Communications, item 2.2.1 regarding committee access to web postings and emails to the full MVCC stakeholder list for items related to committee agendas, minutes and other calendar items.

*Not heard.*

**16. Adjournment**

**Shure** moved to adjourn the meeting. **Hruska** seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 PM.