



Mar Vista Community Council



Minutes

Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors

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

Tuesday, December 10, 2019, at 7:00pm

Mar Vista Recreation Center Auditorium
11430 Woodbine Street, Mar Vista, CA 90066

1. Call to order

-
- The meeting was called to order at 7:01 PM.
-

2. Presentation of flag and pledge of allegiance

-
- *Armond Seretti led the pledge of allegiance.*
-

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

-
- **Attending (13):**
- Andrea Ambriz (*Arrived at 7:20 PM*)
- Elliot Hanna
- Gabriel Hill (*Arrived at 7:08 PM*)
- Mary Hruska
- Selena Inouye
- Rob Kadota
- Michelle Krupkin (*Arrived at 7:11 PM*)
- Martin Rubin
- Stacy Shure (*Arrived at 7:05 PM*)
- Armond Seretti
- Christine Stemar
- Holly Tilson
- Kathryn Wheeler
-

4. Community memorial observations

-
- None.
-

5. Announcements

-
- **Kathryn Wheeler:** Said there would be two more Outreach Committee meetings before the end of the year and they were currently finishing up the Outreach newsletter. The first meeting would be on 12/12 at St. Andrews Church. The second would be at 6:30 on 12/19 at Coffee Connection. More information on the meeting could be found on the Outreach Committee's webpage or the MVCC's calendar.
-

6. Public comment for items NOT on this agenda

-

- **Robin Doyno:** Said that DONE and the LA Department of Elections had put together panel to look into Neighborhood Council elections and he had been appointed as one of the panel members. He was happy to hear the community's thoughts and he asked them to contact him via his email: rdoynophoto@CA.rr.com
-
- **Rob Kadota:** Said he had left three handouts on a table in the back. The first was for the Mar Vista Land Keepers Preservation, a nonprofit that takes care of the medians in the Zone 4 area that was looking for donations. Second was the Mar Vista Neighborhood Association's Fall/Winter newsletter published quarterly. The third was the Street Smarts publication that the MVCC had recently purchased and had the MVCC's sticker on it.
-
- **Stacy Shure** arrived at 7:05 PM.
-
- **Lily Ana Alvarez:** Said she was there representing the nonprofit organization, Connections for Children. They are a nonprofit workshop, resources and referral agency. They provide families with resources for childcare, including programs that pay for child care. They are currently enrolling in their subsidy childcare program for low income families. They also provided free training programs for early educators at their Westchester office. She brought some fliers and her card for anyone who was interested.
-
- **Carlos Salvador:** Said he was there representing the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA). He said the next greater LA County Homeless Count would be between January 21st and 23rd. The Mar Vista Homeless Count would be on January 22nd. The MVCC had agreed to be one of the deployment sites at the Mar Vista Recreation Center. He thanked them for that. There 162 deployment sites across the county. 8,000 people were volunteering across the 3 nights. It is the biggest count in nation. The count helps the organization identify progress, trends and needs for resources and funding. He brought flyers with more information and said he would stick around to answer questions.
-
- **Gabriel Hill** arrived at 7:08 PM.
-
- 7. **Ex-parte communications and conflicts-of-interest** - *Each board member shall declare any ex-parte communications or conflicts-of-interest pertaining to items on or related to this agenda.*
-
- **Kadota:** Had no conflicts to declare.
-
- **Selena Inouye:** Said she had conflict of interest with Agenda Item 15.4, the second motion regarding a longer survey submitted by a stakeholder.
-
- **Gabriel Hill:** Had no conflicts to declare.
-
- **Wheeler:** Had no conflicts to declare.
-
- **Martin Rubin:** Had no conflicts to declare.
-
- **Elliot Hanna:** Said he had communicated with board members regarding items 11.2, 15.1, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5 and 15.6. His communications were all clarifying questions and never involved the majority of the board.
-
- **Mary Hruska:** Said she had communicated with board members regarding items 15.4, 15.5, 15.6, and 15.8.
-

- **Stacy Shure:** Had no conflicts to declare.
-
- **Christine Stemar:** Had no conflicts to declare.
-
- **Armond Seretti:** Said he had communicated with board members regarding item 11.2.
-
- **Holly Tilson:** Had no conflicts to declare.
-

8. Adoption of the agenda

-
- **Inouye:** Said she thought it seemed logical to hear the survey items first before hearing the items about the outreach for the survey.
-
- **Wheeler** moved to remove item 15.1. Without objection 15.1 was removed.
-
- **Inouye** moved to hear items 15.4, 15.5, 15.6 before item 15.2. **Shure** seconded.
-
- **Wheeler** objected.
-
- *With 2 no votes, and 8 yes votes the order of the agenda was so amended. The Chair abstained from voting.*
-
- **Seretti** moved to approve the agenda as amended. **Rubin** seconded.
-
- *Without objection the agenda as amended was approved.*
-

9. Approval of minutes – Approval of the minutes from the November 12, 2019 meetings of the Board of Directors.

-
- **Wheeler:** Submitted grammar and spelling corrections on page 3 and 11 of the November 12, 2019 minutes to Secretary Mary Hruska.
-
- **Rubin** moved to approve the minutes as corrected. **Seretti** seconded.
-
- *Without objection the corrected minutes were approved.*
-

10. Reports

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

-
- **Kasey Kokenda, Field Representative for CA Assembly Member Sydney Kamlager-Dover:** Said she had a few quick announcements. Their office would be hosting a “Lattes and Legislation” session with the Assembly Member (AM) on January 26th, 2020. This would be a good opportunity to meet and speak with the AM one on one. The location was still TBD, but their office would post the location on Facebook and send out an email blast soon. The Legislative Session had just ended and a new one was about to begin. The AM had recently publicly supported legislation to expand the Baldwin Hills Conservancy and legislation to help incarcerated women. They had a public hearing a few months ago and would have another in February. Those interested in attending the . Ask to be put on list. She will announce it again. Will be at 9am.
-
- **Michelle Krupkin** arrived at 7:11 PM.

-
- **Stacy Shure:** Said she had a message from Elizabeth Garcia from Councilmember Paul Koretz's officer. Garcia said she intended to be at the meeting to give her report but could not make it. Garcia will defer to Shure's report. Shure had included what Garcia was going to update them on. Garcia was sorry she could not make it, something arose with her family.
-
- **Venessa Serrano, with DONE:** Introduced her associate Seme Park, who had attended some of MVCC's recent committee meetings when Serrano was not available. Serrano said that DONE would be working with MVCC and other NCs to review their bylaws based on feedback they'd received from stakeholders and board members. They will provide recommendations and clarifications in areas such as absences and censures. She said the deadline for submitting amendments to the bylaws was 4/15/20. She thanked the MVCC for starting to work on those early.
 - **Shure:** Said she noticed the minutes were not up from last BONC, so she was not clear on what comments were submitted involving removal and censure. She asked if they would discuss that at the December 16th meeting. **Serrano:** Said she believed it would be on the next agenda and that she would look into the status of the minutes.
 - **Hanna:** Said, to clarify, the process for revising the bylaws was that any changes to the bylaws had to emerge from and be approved by a majority vote by the Bylaws Committee. Then the MVCC had approve those changes by a 2/3rd vote. They would then have to be approved by DONE before they come back to the MVCC for a final reading. **Serrano:** Agreed that was the process. She added that part of the review that DONE was doing was comparing the bylaws to the MVCC's Standing Rules, which were more comprehensive than most NCs. They were doing this to make sure everything was consistent. **Rubin:** Added that there is a method wherein proposed changes could be brought directly to the board but that the preferred method was through committee.
-
- **Andrea Ambriz** arrived at 7:20 PM.
-

10.2. Officer Reports

10.2.1. Chair – Elliot Hanna

-
- **Hanna:** Deferred his Report.
-

10.2.2. 1st Vice-Chair – Marty Rubin

-
- **Rubin:** Said they should think about getting extra microphones, particularly wireless microphones. Also, the donuts at the meeting were complements of Primo's Donuts. And he asked that his name in the agenda be changed from Marty Rubin to Martin Rubin.
-

10.2.3. 2nd Vice-Chair – Michelle Krupkin

-
- **Krupkin:** Said that committees were meeting in December despite the holidays. They were working on scheduling alternative meetings in first week of January. She was still working on securing the DCRC as an alternate venue for committee meetings, but they had not returned her emails.
-

10.2.4. Secretary – Mary Hruska

-
- **Hruska:** Said her report was in packet.
-

10.2.5. Treasurer – Holly Tilson

-
- **Tilson:** Said she submitted written report. The MER and Budget revisions were left off of the agenda, so the Board cannot take any action on them
-

10.3. Zone Director Reports

10.3.1. Zone 1 – Stacy Shure

-
- **Shure:** Read aloud her written report. (See Page 6 of “Additional Material Submitted”, “Zone 1 Report”)
-

10.3.2. Zone 2 – Marty Rubin

-
- Said he had brought copies of the Zone 2 North Westdale Neighborhood Association Newsletter to the meeting. He said he had been contacted by stakeholders regarding a homeless encampment on Barrington and another on Centinella under the Freeway. He said there were links to the two townhalls that Councilmember Bonin had on Homelessness and Public Safety that can be watched online. He took pictures of the homeless encampments on Barrington the day before, but they were currently no longer there. However, the problem was the sidewalks were blocked for pedestrians. He noted that the Santa Monica side of Centinella does not allow this. He felt that the City of LA needs to figure out a better solution. The encampments were bad for the people within them and are a breeding ground for crime. There had been a fire started in an alley and they later learned that a body was found in the area. There has been an Increase in shopping carts and suspicious looking characters with bicycles that look like they’re scoping out the area. Zone 2 crime has not gone up but it is a public health concern for everyone. It is an emergency situation that should be treated as such on the local state and federal levels.
-

10.3.3. Zone 3 – Mary Hruska

-
- **Hruska:** Said her report was in the agenda packet.
-

10.3.4. Zone 4 – Armond Seretti

-
- **Seretti:** Said there had been an increase in crime and homelessness. On Charnock at LA river, the gates and locks had been cut. The homeless were using the river walkway to get from Venice to the park. It had come to his attention that crimes in the zone were not showing up on crime reports. Including burglaries in his neighborhood, such as his next-door neighbor’s car being broken into and a burglary three doors down from him. He had to clear the house for his neighbors because the police showed up four hours later and then said it was an act of god because the back door was broken even though all the glass was inside. They had to force the police to take report which had still not shown up on the crime report. He did not know if they could trust crime numbers and statistics because it appears they are were being reported correctly in his Zone. He found that very frustrating. Many people were reaching out to him. Not all of the crimes had to do with homelessness. The home break-ins were not typically done by transients. Still, he felt because of the incorrect crime statistics they were not getting the patrols they need. Only 11 cars in the pacific region was not helping. The situation was maddening and was part of the reason he was leaving the city.
 - **Kadota:** Said the Mar Vista Neighborhood Association’s annual meeting would be on January 23rd at 7pm at St Pete’s in Zone 4. He said the topic would be on public safety.
-

10.3.5. Zone 5 – Michelle Krupkin

-

- **Krupkin:** Said crime was up in Zone 5. There had been some break ins near Coolidge, McLaughlin and Venice in Apartment Buildings and a few opportunity break-ins in backyards. There have been several incidents of assaults at Grandview and Pacific and near encampments by the post office. Someone was hit in the head with a bottle near the post office The SLO is aware of them and they are talking about putting patrols near those areas but there have been no developments. A Preferred Parking District is in the works on Herbert between Inglewood and Grand View. One of her stakeholders was having problems with post office carriers not delivering certified mail, she referred to the Congresswoman's office since it is a federal issue. The stakeholder had already gone to the postmaster of Mar Vista and the mail carrier's supervisor. There was a recent Art Walk that was enjoyable although it was lower in attendance due to rain.

-
- **10.3.6. Zone 6 – Holly Tilson**
-

- **Tilson:** Said local schools were preparing for holidays. Most will have Holiday programs which you can check on their websites. Crime is up in Zone 6. There have been a lot of smashed in back windows, attributed to an organized group working the neighborhoods. Some people had immediate police response but if they did not say somebody was in the house they waited 4-6 hours for police to come clear house.
-
- **Kadota:** Said that the Santa Sleigh stops were at 8:25. The first stop is in Penmar and then is stops in Zone 4, 3 and 2.
-

10.4. Committee Reports

- **10.4.1. Elections & Bylaws**
-

- **Rubin:** Said they have been working on the bylaws. They passed breaking up Zone 6 into two zones at Venice Blvd. South of Venice Blvd will be a seventh Zone. They passed Roberts Rules of Order instead of Rosenberg's Rules of Order. They have 7-8 things in queue to look at. He encouraged the community to get involved.
 - **Ambriz:** Said the minutes for the 10/30 E&B Committee meeting were not on the website. She asked where she could find them. **Rubin:** Said that that meeting was technically unofficial so anything at that meeting would be pushed to next meeting. **Ambriz:** Said one of the agenda items from that meeting was missing from the agenda of the subsequent meeting. She asked what happened to the item. **Rubin:** Said he would appreciate if she would contract him or the vice-chair about that. That particular item was put on agenda as a place holder to discuss what would be done for extra board seat. But it was pulled it because there was a mistake in the wording. It will be revised to make it a more realistic item and it will be discussed. **Ambriz:** She thanked him for clarifying. But, she still wanted to follow up on the last 10/30 meeting. She had comments on that meeting in writing that she wanted to submit to the board for the record (See Pages 8-9 Of "Additional Materials Submitted")
 - **Hanna:** Clarified that there was a technical error in the 10/30 Bylaws Committee Meeting's agenda in that the incorrect room was listed, which is technically a Brown Act violation and essentially the meeting never happened. **Vanessa Serrano:** Said that DONE had gotten some calls from stakeholders who wondered where those items had gone. She was tracing back minutes from the past board meeting and saw a report about the room change confusion. It said it was not Brown Act compliant so it was deemed unofficial. Her understanding was the Chair was not available, the co-chair was there but did not feel comfortable continuing with the meeting but public comment was still given, however the meeting was never officially started. She was not present at the meeting so she needed to do some background checking on it.
 -

10.4.2. Planning and Land-Use Management

-
- **Shure:** Read aloud her written report. (See Page 5 of “Additional Material Submitted”, “PLUM Report.”)
-

10.4.3. Public Health & Safety

-
- **Stemar:** Said they was working on the section of PH&S website to update their suggestions for preparing yourself for an earthquake, including instructions for children, seniors, and disabled people. They were working with an emergency preparedness group to schedule trainings throughout the year quarterly for free. She said to check the website for updates on that and to email her with questions.
 - **Rubin:** Asked if there were any updates on the neighborhood watch signs. **Stemar:** Said they were going to be completed and installed within the first quarter of next year.
-

10.4.4. Education, Arts, and Culture

-
- **Hill:** Said they were still working on the coloring book contest to get kids in the community involved. He invited the community to get involved in the committee. They have meeting on the first Wednesday of each month at the Mar Vista Library at 6:30 PM. Also, Mark Twain Middle School is having a mentor program. Please contact him for more information.
-

10.4.5. Transportation & Infrastructure

-
- **Inouye:** Said her written report was in the packet. She added that the next meeting would be rescheduled, as it was currently scheduled for New Years Day. The co-chairs email was transportation@montevista.org. Their webpage is www.marvista.org/transportation
-

10.4.6. Community Outreach

-
- **Wheeler:** Said they were working on the newsletters and their quarterly report would be submitted in January.
-

11. Special Orders

11.1. Update Regarding Mar Vista Parking Demand Study – Presentation and update from CD-11 in response to MVCC’s August 13, 2019 motion requesting that CD-11 reconsider action on the Mar Vista Parking Demand Study.

-
- **Bruins:** Said he knew there had been a series of back and forth about this issue with his office. He said his office did not know what sort of information the community was specifically looking for. He asked what the community wanted to accomplish with the study so that what his office puts forward is responsive to the community’s concern. He heard that they wanted an inventory of available parking in the community, concentrated around Venice Blvd in downtown Mar Vista and in some other areas that may be out of scope. There is interest in understanding occupancy data and the hypothetical demands for parking. He was not aware of any parking studies in other cities or LA that do demographic research or public opinion surveys. They have good vehicle ownership data from the census, so they could get information on current vehicle ownership patterns in Mar Vista residential areas from that. The census would have greater detail than what the city can provide. The question was how to get that information into a forum that is useful for the types of decision in the community the MVCC weighs in on, particularly on community plan update. He also recognized that parking was determined primarily by parking and zoning codes with incentive programs for larger developments. He asked the board what their questions was.
-
- **Krupkin:** Clarified that the parking study started at T&I. While she was no longer a co-chair, during her time as one she attended two meetings at CD11. At one point told to go to Community Plan effectuate this parking study. The DCP clarified that it had no interest in doing the study so it came back to Transportation. So, if he was trying to push the ball the Planning, they did not want it there. She would like to keep it in the realm of transportation. She yielded to Inouye.
-
- **Inouye:** Asked Ken Alpern, the Chair of T&I, to come up and speak briefly because she was only six months into her position as co-chair and this had started before her time.
-
- **Ken Alpern:** Said the survey was not supposed to be a tally of what parking they had but rather a study of the parking demands of the community and the unmet needs that would arise with the rise new development. They already have issues with parking. There is not enough and the problem is only getting worse. For the past 15-20 years the City has given up on providing parking – free or paid. It is a myth that people are not willing to pay for parking. Alex. Had done a great job of trying to work in between in difficult circumstances. When they brought this to Community Plan they were told “we don’t do this.” So There are a lot of Council Districts and LADOT that are interested. Alpern said he thought someone at Planning needed their arms twisted very hard. Parking is part of infrastructure where transportation and planning comes together. Despite the Expo Line, people of all ethnicities, gender, socioeconomic backgrounds, and immigration status are buying cars, and these are the same people willing to tax themselves for more alternative modes of transportation. So they need a Parking demand study on unmet needs and worsening unmet needs.
-

- **Krupkin:** Said in the supplemental material packet they could find the Parking Demand Study Outline. Howard Weisberg had put a lot of work into it for a long time dealing with AB-744 and had been attending Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Meetings. Two years ago, in 2017 he wrote a scope of work request. She thought it was pretty clear that they wanted a Parking Demand Study.
-
- **Bruins:** Said the key here was how does the City go about studying their Land Use Policies. Typically, when they do a parking study they are trying to inventory the resources in the community to figure out where there are mismatches between demand and supply generally coming out of temporal or pricing basis and determine what management strategies they can apply to address those kinds of acute block by block needs by better utilizing that assets that are in the community. That is the scope that their office proposed to the T&I Committee. The difference was that Howard Weisberg’s scope includes a demographic research public survey aspect. That data exists through the census in a much more robust sample size than a relatively low-budget study.
-
- **Tilson:** Said the parking study originally started with the 1244 Venice Development. AB-744 allows cities to do parking studies so they can tell developers, “you aren’t going to get the 0.5 parking spots per unit.” They can increase the amount of parking spots developers have to build to accommodate the neighborhood parking or their overflow parking. They are just asking the city to please do a parking study. They are building many projects and putting half a parking spot per unit. There will be overflow and it needs to be addressed. There are LA Times articles about how people in different LA Neighborhoods are spending hours driving around looking for parking. Howard’s study shows it adds studies show it adds 3000 extra miles, which only adds to climate change. They are asking them to do what they can
-
- **Bruins:** Said that the demand calculation scope that Howard was proposing was not actually specified by AB-744. AB-744 is more like the traditional parking study that they do, which is based on occupancy and availability of street parking. AB-744 also requires the study to include the effect of parking requirements on the cost of market-rate and subsidized apartments. That would not be a favorable assessment for this community because it would show that increasing parking requirements does increase the cost housing in a community that is already very impacted by a severe lack of affordable housing. Doing the study according to the guidelines of AB-744 very likely would come back to haunt this community. But if they do it in a pragmatic way by solving the street by street parking management challenges in partnership with the MVCC. They want to help manage the parking in the community more effectively, so the day to day quality of life is better.

○
11.2 Announcement of Upcoming BoD Vacancy – *Announcement of an upcoming Board vacancy and the procedure to fill said vacancy*

-
- **Hanna:** Said that Armond Seretti had informed him that he would be leaving the board and vacating his seat. Hanna said Seretti was more than a colleague, he was a friend and he was sorry to see him go. So, now they need to fill the vacancy in Zone 4. It will be filled in accordance with article five, section six of the bylaws. The secretary will place an announcements on the website and send a special email announcement. The names of

applicants he receives in time for next agenda will be placed on next agenda. Anyone who's applied may make a statement and supportive his or her candidacy. The chair will make an appointment that subject to majority vote of the board. He asked the community to please make submissions to chair@marvista.org within 25 days of the current meeting, at approximately 8:15 PM January 7th, 2020. This will be a little different from the usual process because generally he does not get notice in advance of a resignation. The appointment will be effective at conclusion of the January 2020 board meeting.

- **Krupkin:** Said the nest board meeting was on January 14th, not the 7th.
- **Kadota:** Asked if it could be pushed back to 25 days after January 14th instead, because of the holidays. **Hanna:** Said the bylaws stated that it had to be effective 25 days after the announcement of resignation, which was technically this current meeting. It would not be fair to leave his Zone without representation for more time.
- **Ambriz:** Asked the Outreach chair to reach out to stakeholder regarding this vacancy. **Wheeler:** Said she would do so.

•
12. **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 Consent Calendar Item 12.3.

•
• **Tilson** pulled Consent Calendar Item 12.2.

•
• **Inouye** moved to approve the remaining item on the Consent Calendar. **Wheeler** seconded.

•
• Vote:

•
• YES: Inouye, Wheeler, Rubin, Krupkin, Hruska, Stemar, Seretti, Tilson, Kadota, Ambriz (10)

•
• ABSTAIN: Hill, Shure, Hanna (3)

•
• *The remaing item on the Consent Calendar was approved.*

•
12.1. **[FUNDING][TILSON] Reimbursement for Hospitality Supplies** – *Approval of a reimbursement in the amount of \$110.72 to Kathryn Wheeler for hospitality supplies.*

12.2. **[FUNDING][TILSON] Reimbursement for Outreach Supplies** – *Approval of a reimbursement in the amount of \$9.76 to Kathryn Wheeler for Outreach supplies.*

•
• **Tilson:** Said there was a typo in the agenda. The amount should be \$92.76. *She moved to amend the amount.* **Wheeler** seconded.

•
• *Without objection the amount was amended to \$92.76.*

•
• **Seretti** moved to approve the motion as amended. **Rubin** seconded.

•
• *The motion as amended was approved unanimously, save for **Hanna**, who abstained.*

12.3. [FUNDING][EACC] Richland Ave. Elementary School NPG – Discussion and possible action regarding an expenditure – in the amount of \$1,654 - for Astro Camp field trip return transportation costs.

-
- **Tilson:** Said she pulled the item because she was opposed to it for all the same reasons she stated at the last meeting. She felt this was more for individuals, rather than larger group of kids.
-
- **Public Comment:**
-
- **Unidentified Stakeholder:** Said if the MVCC gave Richland Ave. Elementary School this amount of funds then they had to give the same amount to every school.
-
- **Ken Alpern:** Said this request was morally and legally problematic. He said it was good to help schools but generally the MVCC provides funds for actual tangible things that they could put their logo on. He thought the intent is wonderful but the NPG was ultimately problematic.
-
- **Board Comment:**
-
- **Hill:** He directed everyone to page 19-22 of the supplemental packet and asked them to read letters from the students of Richland Ave. Elementary School. He said this was something the students did and their parents helped them. He was still in support of this NPG because it was for the kids. It could really change these kid’s lives. It takes a village and the MVCC was part of that village. There was a video and he thought a representative would be at the meeting to present it, but they were not at the meeting. Still, he implored the board to take a minute to read all the letters and to think about the kids.
-
- **Wheeler:** Thanked the EACC for their hard work. She said she appreciated the difficulty of working within the maze that comprised city and school regulations. But, their job was to hold up those regulations. In Article 11, it is very clear that they cannot do this. This NPG was for 40-50 kids, but those funds must be used for public purpose. The NPG does not meet that requirement. However, she greatly appreciated the need for kids to get out of the city and go camping. That is an experience that every child should have at least once in their life. So, if the motion is not passed, she would provide a personal check of \$100 to help the kids with their funding. She encouraged the rest of the board and other individuals to donate. She also felt that DONE and the MVCC had fallen short in training Committee members on what is and isn't allowed for NPGs.
-
- **Hanna:** Clarified, that if they passed something that was not allowed within policy or guidelines the City Clerk would deny the request if they deemed it inappropriate.
-
- **Seretti:** Asked if the DONE representative had any input. **Serrano:** Said the final decision would be with City Clerk and it would depend on what was written on the NPG. **Ambriz:** Asked Serrano if other NCs provided similar NPGs. **Serrano:** Said she had not seen NPGs for transportation, they were mostly for services. With transportation there could be liability issues. Ultimately, it was up to the city clerk.
-
- **Kadota:** Asked Hill if there was outreach to schools or if it was a solo request. **Hill:** Said it was a

solo request from the booster club at Richland. The students had already raised \$25,000 and the NPR was for the last of the money they needed. **Tilson:** Said that Principal asked the booster club to fund it. The NPG states that they lost Title I funding, the booster club is making up that loss and so they're requesting the funds. **Kadota:** Said he appreciated their initiative but the NPG did raise question of how they could support other schools equally.

-
- **Ambriz:** Said she unfamiliar with NPG Committee process. She asked if it was protocol for different applications to come in from various applicants without a request for proposals. **Hill:** Said he did not know if it was common protocol. **Ambriz:** Said she was not sure if this was appropriate, but did not see a problem responding to one particular application. **Hanna:** Clarified that they do not solicit NPGs, individuals come to the MVCC to request funds.

-
- **Shure:** Said that the request was to transport 40 students and three adults. She spoke to the principal of another school and they send four classrooms on this trip on rotating basis. They hold community fundraisers to pay for the trips. Personally, she felt if the MVCC was to make grants for every school for facilities, activities, libraries, etc. that were equitable for all she would support that. But she worried that this MVCC was not equitable to all the other students. She hoped they could come up with other ways to support all the students.

-
- **Seretti moved to call to question. Hill seconded.**

-
- *With 10 yes votes the questions was ordered to vote on the motion.*

-
- VOTE:

-
- Yes: Seretti, Hill, Ambriz (3)

-
- No: Tilson, Stemar, Shure, Hruska, Krupkin, Rubin, Wheeler, Inouye, Kadota (9)

-
- Abstain: Hanna (1)

-
- *The motion failed.*

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

14. **Unfinished Business and General Orders**

[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.

-
- **Ambriz:** Thanked board members for tabling it at the last meeting since she was not present to give her input on the item. She said that thought that Tilson said that the MER potentially did not include this request but she was not sure if insurance money had come yet for the stolen equipment.
-
- **Tilson:** Said as of this meeting it had not come yet. It should have been posted July 1st, but every month since they have not posted it. She was hoping they would get it by January 1st.

-
- **Public Comment:**
-
- **Ashley Zeldon:** Asked if this would broadcast the meetings live. **Kadota:** Said it could. **Zeldin:** Asked if it would the broadcast would be on the MVCC website. **Kadota:** Said it could. **Zeldin:** Said in that case she supported the motion because it would level the playing field for those with disabilities who could not attend the meetings.
-
- **Vanessa Colosio-Diaz:** Said she supported this because it would help who have commutes who could not cannot make it to meetings on time.
-
- **Kalani Whittington:** Said she was on the fence. She did not want the meetings to be overtaken with people with no interest in this particular area who were just trying to promote a cause, such as bicycle lanes on Venice or anti-single-family-housing groups. At a recent townhall with Councilmember Bonin people from Irvine pushed their agendas. She asked what type of restrictions there would be.
-
- *Rubin moved to approve the item. Hill seconded.*
-
- **Board Comment:**
-
- **Inouye:** Asked if there was list of the equipment that they are looking to purchase. She would like to see detailed list before they approved it.
-
- **Wheeler:** Thanked Ambriz for her concern over the video equipment. But Wheeler believed that this should be sent to the outreach committee first. It was already on a future agenda item for that committee. The amount requested was more than four times what is necessary to replace the old outdated video equipment. There was less expensive equipment they could purchase. She believed this needed to be discussed within the outreach committee and then presented to the board. Cell phones could be also be used as many had good quality audio and visuals and streaming apps. There are several Oscar nominated films that have been shot on iPhones. The last video uploaded to the MVCC YouTube page was uploaded in 2011. There are only 25 videos on that page and 7 subscribers. She suggested that Outreach to do more research and form a plan before they authorize any purchase.
-
- **Hanna:** Said he believed the limiting factor with the videos in the past was not equipment, but rather labor. He was in support of the idea, they just need to figure out labor. **Kadota:** Said they were holding back on livestream at the time because it was new to them and they had uploading issues.
-
- **Hruska:** Agreed that the rate-imiting factor was labor. She thought the motion needed to include specification for who would be doing the work of setting it up, cataloguing, uploading, ect.
-
- **Shure:** Asked for clarification, if this equipment would replace what was stolen. **Kadota:** Said that was correct. **Shure:** Said therefore, then the cost would not be a factor here, since they had already received reimbursement **Hanna:** Said the reimbursement has not shown up yet. **Kadota:** Said there may be cheaper alternatives now. **Shure:** Said, granted, the money was there and it

was not a new expenditure. She asked if they were voting on a motion to expend money to replace the equipment, or are we voting on a motion to actually approve videotaping broadcasting of the meetings, because those were separate things. **Hanna:** Said only replacement of the equipment.

-
- **Seretti:** Said it seemed like they were putting the cart in front of the horse. He said they could YouTube live it from their account from any device and be done with it. He asked if they could approve the funds and then approve then commute it to outreach to figure out the labor aspect. **Hanna:** Said generally they would want to send it to Outreach first and then bring it back, because once you approve an expenditure, the expenditure can happen and there's nothing to stop it from happening.
-
- **Kadota:** Said that the equipment they had purchased was a Nivo Camera that could be operated with an iPhone, they had an iPad so it was not on anyone's particular device, and they had microphones, a hotspot for internet and a corded mic. It could also be used at committee meetings to capture guest speakers like that so that people can see presentations. He felt it was better to capture it all with the MVCC equipment as opposed to their own individual equipment.
-
- **Seretti** moved to commit the item to the Outreach Committee. **Inouye** seconded.
-
- **Public Comment:**
-
- **Wayne Wheeler:** Asked if it was just the funding question that was being sent to Outreach or the methodology of recording the meetings too. **Hanna:** Said it could be anything.
-
- **Vanessa Colosio-Diaz:** Said she was concerned that sending it back to Outreach would make the approval process take longer.
-
- **Kalani Whittington:** Suggested that outreach check what other NCs are doing.
-
- **Board Comment:**
-
- **Rubin:** Said they would need some policy on how the video would be operated. **Hanna:** Said they were discussing sending it back to Outreach, not the policies of operation itself.
-
- **Kadota:** Said this was a funding motion. So, they could allocate the money now and hold on implementing until outreach figured out the implementation logistics.
-
- **Ambriz:** Asked Seretti to clarify if his motion was to send it to Outreach to figure out funding or policy. **Seretti:** Said they did not know what they were buying and there was no policy in place. So they needed to figure that all out first.
-
- **Wheeler:** Said that outreach would provide a list of equipment options for the board to consider. They would bring a comprehensive report to the board and the board would decide.
-
- **Ambriz:** Said she wanted a summary of issues with concerning operations, logistics and specific equipment. Those were things that certainly can fall into the purview of the outreach

committee. Her understanding was that the previous body had approved purchase of equipment and this motion spoke to the replacement of that equipment.

-
- **Krupkin:** Said the motion had no specificity regarding vendors, pricing for cameras, etc. She did not think the city clerk would approve a blank check. She thought it was better to commit this to outreach.
-
- **Vote:**
-
- **Yes:** **Inouye**, Wheeler, Rubin, **Krupkin**, Hruska, Tilson, **Seretti** (7)
-
- **No:** Ambriz, Kadota, Hill, Shure, Stemar (5)
-
- **Abstain:** Hanna (1)
-
- *The Item was committed to outreach.*
-

15. **New Business**

~~15.1. [FUNDING][OUTREACH] Flyers to Publicize Community Plan Survey – Discussion and possible action regarding an expenditure – not to exceed \$5,100 – for design, printing, and distribution costs for a flyer to publicize the Community Plan survey.~~

15.2 [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

15.3 [FUNDING][EXFIN] **Appropriation for an MVCC Newsletter** – Discussion and possible action regarding an expenditure, not to exceed \$8,000, for an MVCC newsletter

15.4 [POLICY][T&I] **Transportation Survey** – Discussion and possible action regarding an MVCC Transportation Survey for input to the Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan Update.

-
- **Inouye:** Said there were two motions. The First motion was in volume two of the board packed on page 28. It is for a short, 7-question, Transportation survey to stakeholders to collect feedback regarding general transportation questions. The data will be sent to DCP to inform the mobility element of the Palms Mar Vista Community Plan update. The questions were based on a survey from the Southern California Association of Government that went out over the summer and in addition, there are also demographic questions at the end of the survey. The committee felt very strongly that they needed to collect information about the people who were answering the questions so that they have a full file of who provided this information. None of the demographic questions ask for personal identity information. They are using Google Forms because it is a free platform that provides many of the same features as a Survey Monkey account. The board could take proposed survey online to get a feel for it. If they run into issues with regards to specific questions, this should be sent back to committee to work out those questions because this was not the place to do that.
-

- **Public Comment:**
-

- **Wayne Wheeler:** Said he was supportive of the idea of a survey. But, he had a background in data analytics and his concern was that generally online surveys are not considered accurate

at all. Because they are a push model rather than a pull model. And from what he understood from the packet, the sole identifier respondents to the survey was email, which does not identify a single, unique individual, nor does it identify the individual as being a stakeholder. You can get good surveys from a small sample if it is dispersed properly. In this case their trust in the results of the survey would be near zero because there's no methodology to control the identity of the surveyors.

-
- **Ken Alpern:** Said Wheeler had made good points. On the other hand, it was very important to get this information for the input document and whatever methodology for the survey they use all the committees want the same outcome. He asked them to not let a disagreement about the process to prevent the important work from being done. They did not have much time to do it. Door to door surveys were expensive, but the internet has its own issues. He urged them to listen to each other and if you disagree to find an answer, because everyone wants the same final result.
-
- **Ashley Zeldin:** Sais that as a renter who had lived in this area for 8 years she had never received any correspondence from the MVCC in her mailbox. She was concerned that renters would not be represented if it was a paper, door to door survey.
-
- **Board Comment:**
-
- **Wheeler:** Said she had lots of problems with the online survey. She passed out a handout about Survey Monkey vs Google Forms. Outreach's proposal was well under \$1,000 and would provide a 99% confidence level with less than 5% margin of error. She had it all figured out on how they can do it in a timely fashion. Email was not a good way to get a good sampling.
-
- **Hill:** Asked where the data would be stored and who would have access to it. **Inouye:** Said the chairs of T&I would have access to the Google Forms. It would be in the cloud and google had never had a data breach. Top universities in the country use it.
-
- **Wheeler:** Said she had concerns that Google Forms would place advertising analytics and targeting cookies on Mar Vista Stakeholder's computers. Information would be collected long after the stakeholder had completed the survey. That is a part of Google forms that cannot be disabled, but it can be on Survey Monkey. Online surveys cannot provide the numbers needed to determine the proper sampling size or the margin of error. Gmail allows for people to obtain an infinite number of email addresses. Pew research reports that the accuracy of polls depends on how they are conducted. Online polls do not have a proven record of accuracy and can be more biased. She was also concerned about the demographic information and that the current Google Form was not on a MVCC email address.
-
- **Rubin:** Said that surveys were an excellent way to do outreach. Having volunteers go door to door to get them filled out was the best method, such as when people do outreach for elections. But nothing will be perfect and they had to get the most bang for their buck. All they could do was try to get out there and talk to people and let them know their serious about wanting to help the community.
-

- **Krupkin:** Said they were just voting on the questions to be adopted not the survey method. They should just look over the content and then move on.
-
- **Hruska:** Said that the board had the opportunity to discharge its mandate of providing stakeholder input to the city on the community plan update process. The success of this endeavor was directly proportional to the timeliness of its delivery. The goal was to come up with a survey, do the survey and provide it to city as part of the input process. That should be the driving force of their discussions.
-
- **Shure:** Agreed with Hruska, she thought they were discussing the content. Also, the community plan update committee was a subcommittee of PLUM and all work should flow through PLUM. Input for community plan update, it should run through PLUM. They need to follow the methods that were set out in their bylaws for this process.
-
- **Ambriz:** Said there was a joint T&I and community plan meeting. **Shure:** Said it was not requested before PLUM first and there is a hierarchy that should be followed in terms of committees and subcommittees. This was not done properly.

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

- Vote:

- Yes: Kadota, Ambriz, Inouye, Hill, Krupkin, Hruska, Shure, Stemar, Seretti, Tilson (9)

- Abstain: Wheeler, Rubin, Hanna (3)

- *The motion was approved.*

- **Inouye:** Said she would have to recuse herself if they were going to consider the second motion in the packet on page 38. **Hanna:** Said a second motion on this would be considered out of order because they had already passed something on it.

15.5 [POLICY][T&I][COMMUNITY PLAN] Combined Venice Blvd. and Transportation Survey – Discussion and possible action regarding combining the Venice Blvd. and Transportation Surveys, for input to the Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan Update, into a single on-line and paper survey.

- **Ambriz:** Said they had joint committee meeting with T&I and community plan at which they explored, discussed and approved to insert the transportation survey into a combined Venice Blvd survey so it would become a single online and paper survey.

- Board Comment:

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

- **Wheeler:** Said it was impossible to have it be a single online and paper survey. It is 13 pages when it is printed out so it would too expensive to print a paper version of the survey.

-
- **Inouye:** The goal was to have more people take the survey online than on paper. They would have some paper surveys available at locations such as the library or rec center. In that case, the costs would not be prohibitive.
-
- **Tilson:** Said she reviewed both the 13-page survey and Wheeler’s condensed version. She did not think it made sense to leave the 13-page version out somewhere it ultimately probably would end up in a waste basket. A condensed printed version would make more sense.
-
- **Wheeler objected to the motion.**
-
- **Vote:**
-
- **Yes:** Kadota, Ambriz, Inouye, Hill, Krupkin, Hruska, Shure, Stemar, Seretti (9)
-
- **No:** Rubin, Wheeler (2)
-
- **Abstain:** Hanna, Tilson (2)
-
- *The motion was approved.*
-

- 15.6 **[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 MVCCstakeholders.**
- 15.7 **[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).**
- 15.8 **[POLICY][Community Plan/PLUM] 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.**

16. Adjournment

-
- **Ambriz moved to adjourn the meeting. Rubin seconded.**
-
- *Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM.*