WEST LOS ANGELES SAWTELLE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Monday, December 11, 2017, 6:30 PM
Felicia Mahood Multipurpose Senior Center
11338 Santa Monica Boulevard – Community Room – Los Angeles, CA 90025

Attending: Jamie Keeton (Chair), Eric Nakamura (Vice Chair), Jay Handal (Treasurer)*, Naomi Kageyama (Secretary), Desa Philadelphia, Danilo Torro, Ron Migdal, Jay Ross, Jennifer Gavina, Rosie Kato, Jean Shigematsu*
* late

Absent: Arman Ghorbani, Jian Kerendian, Partho Kalyani, Zana Glisovic

TIME BEGINS: 6:46 pm TIME ENDS: 9:20 pm (approx.
Community and Stakeholder members present: count not taken

I. Call to Order

Quorum established (9 NC board members at beginning; 11 after late arrivals)

II. General Public Comment

None.

III. Approvals

a. Outstanding draft meeting minutes (Secretary Naomi Kageyama)

Motion to approve Minutes from Oct. 25, 2017. Yes 8 (Gavina, Kageyama, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Torro), 0 No. 1 Abstain (Kato). Motion Passes.

b. Outstanding MERs reports (Treasurer Handal)


c. Support of SPA5 Homeless Count

Motion to support SPA 5 Homeless Count. 8 yes (Gavina, Kageyama, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Torro). 0 No. 1 Abstain (Kato). Motion to support SPA 5 Homeless Count APPROVED.

d. $40 for refreshments for volunteers for SPA5 Homeless Count

Motion - $40 for refreshments for volunteers of SPA 5 Homeless Count. 10 Yes (Gavina, Kageyama, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Torro). 0 No. 1 Abstain (Kato). Motion to approve $40 for refreshment for volunteers of SPA 5 Homeless Count APPROVED.

e. Draft and send letter to all City Council members and file a CIS in of support of Nov 22 NC action (Council File 03-1459-S3) to strengthen and improve Protected Tree Ordinance 177404

[Shigematsu and Handal arrived to NC meeting increasing total NC members to 11]

Migdal noted some problems with trees and sidewalk by Stoner Park. He believes there should be exceptions on any support regarding trees when public safety (i.e. dangerous sidewalks) may result.

Kageyama wants to wait to get clarification on how NC’s are able to file CIS statements.
Speaker Linda Whitford noted that section IIIe is not about sidewalk repair. The issue for this section is to protect native trees. The current ordinance has a loophole that developers are using in order to remove trees easily especially on hillsides. She would like the NC’s support to strengthen the current tree ordinance. Council members Koretz and Bonin have put forth a motion 11/22/17 to strengthen the current tree ordinance. She would like the NC to pass a motion to strengthen the current ordinance and support the motion put forth by Council members Koretz and Bonin. She would like to expand the number of tree species into the ordinance.

There was general discussion that a CIS cannot be considered at this meeting because the specific wording for the CIS was not presented during the meeting. There was also discussion on whether a support letter could be submitted on behalf of the NC.

Chair Keeton put forth her opinion that more information was needed in order to move forward – including the ordinance itself and the motion from Koretz and Bonin to strengthen the ordinance. She believes any action without more information is inappropriate.

Although several motions had been discussed none were considered. A new motion was put forward to postpone any motions regarding the protected tree ordinance.

| Motion to postpone consideration of any motions for a support letter and/or CIS regarding City of LA Protected Tree Ordinance. 11 yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Kato, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Shigematsu, Torro). 0 No. 0 Abstain. Postponement APPROVED. |

IV. **Motion to add additional $33,355.05 to Outreach Budget (Handal)**

Handal noted that this motion is a way to ensure that the funds that were held during the prior year’s Exhaustive Efforts (EE) can be utilized by the WLA/SNC during the current term. If funds are not used we may lose the funds. Everyone should submit their wish lists for community projects.

Kato asked why the funds need to be allocated to ‘Outreach’. Handal noted it was the best way to ‘park’ the funds until a budget meeting is held. At the current time the Budget Committee includes Handal (Treasurer) and Keeton (who is de facto member of all Committees)

Jasmine Elbarbary from LA City DONE noted that election outreach should start in 2018 and funds would be needed for this. Also these funds can be shifted as needed later.

| Motion to add additional $33,355.05 to the Neighborhood Council Outreach budget. 11 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Kato, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Shigematsu, Torro). 0 No. 0 Abstain. Motion to add $33,355.05 to the Outreach Budget APPROVED. |

V. **Recap of Clean Streets (Kato)**

This was extremely successful and well received by the community. Would have wanted more participation from NC members. Very good turnout at Nora Sterry Elementary school (90 volunteers; 152 bags of trash). Created strong linkages with Uni High School. Adoption of 87 trees at WLA Farmers Market (11/5/17). Gave away 145 bags of compost and about 145 bags of mulch. There was another cleanup at Uni(siversity) High School on 11/18/17 with 142 volunteers, students, parents and UCLA service groups. Collected 6 trash bins of trash. Also a flash clean near Best Buy. Finished 1 hour with 8 bags of trash. Good to continue these on a regular basis. I have a core group of people now so hopefully will do more flash cleanups on a regular basis (maybe 2 per month). Tree adoption (and tree planting) is scheduled for 12/16/17 over at Stoner Park. Local business volunteer promotion is a big success. Got 50 local businesses to participate. Many of these promotions will continue through the end of December. Is requesting more participation from NC members for upcoming events. Keeton noted that Kato led this great effort that included refreshments for volunteers. Keeton also noted participation of Ross. Round of applause from all.

Kato noted that additional volunteers needed for photos and video.
VI. Elect members to both Outreach and Public Safety Committees (5 minutes)

Outreach Committee:

Election of Desa Philadelphia to Outreach Committee. 10 Yes Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Shigematsu, Torro). 0 No. 1 Abstain (Kato). Philadelphia approved for OR Committee.

Election of Jay Handal to Outreach Committee. 10 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Shigematsu, Torro). 0 No. 1 Abstain (Kato). Handal approved for OR Committee.

[Keeton offered her name but withdrew it since only 4 NC members maximum can be on any single committee]

Election of Danilo Torro to Outreach Committee. 10 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Shigematsu, Torro). 0 No. 1 Abstain (Kato). Torro approved for OR Committee.


Election of Ron Migdal for Public Safety Committee. 11 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Kato, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Shigematsu, Torro). 0 No. 0 Abstain. Migdal approved for PS Committee.

Election of Jay Handal for Public Safety Committee. 10 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Shigematsu, Torro). 0 No. 1 Abstain (Kato). Handal approved for PS Committee.

Election of Danilo Torro for Public Safety Committee. 11 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Kato, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Shigematsu, Torro). 0 No. 0 Abstain. Torro approved for PS Committee.


VII. Motion to Reconsider BOD vote on 11800 Santa Monica Boulevard CUB (File # ZA-2017-3083-CUB)(Ross – 10 minutes)

This item stricken from agenda.

Developer not available or notified in time. Can be a new motion in future meeting if this is different than a prior (related) motion.

VIII. PLUM Presentation and possible motion and possible CIS (Ross)

a. 1702 Granville – Small Lot Subdivision (File # A-2017-3856-PMLA-SL)

Developer not present. No discussion. May be suggested for next Month’s agenda.

Note: Jay Handal noted that items in the agenda needs to be more descriptive. Up to 20 words in compliance with Brown act.

b. 12128 Idaho Ave – 4 story apartment (File # ZA-2016-4627) - Please refer to public document dated 11/8/17 from PLUM Chair Jas Ross to NC Chair Keeton with subject line ‘Resolution – 12128 W. Idaho Ave. apartments – revision to design and support for waiver of road widening’

Developer and owner presentation. Developer/Designer is Omrani Group. Owners Mr. and Mrs. Zahiri
4 story apartment building. Currently a single story house. Proposed to have larger setback on side facing Idaho.

Side street is Amherst. Only 30' (not 60'). But other homes are similar so not reasonable to widen the street.

Discussion about the front and rear setbacks. Based on antiquated maps Would only like a 15' setback in the front (building line) in keeping with other buildings adjacent. If so then they don’t need any variance in the rear. They have ability to build an 8 unit building but only want 4 units. Ross noted that it is more about sq. footage rather than about number of units. Kageyama noted that the problem is really with Amherst where the alley is because it is dangerous for those walking along the east side of Amherst. There is some discussion about number of parking spots (whether or not there are enough) and that there may be some driving issues because the in/out goes into a 30' street that is not really a ‘legal’ street.

Some clarification. The developer and PLUM are in agreement that 15' in front and 15' in back is reasonable. However if there is a 25’ set-up in the front (per City regulations that are not in keeping with adjacent properties) then they would need a variance in the back of only 8’ which is not something that PLUM supports. The proposal is for 8 parking units plus 1 guest and 1 disabled parking spot.

Because the Developer already took steps to accept PLUM recommendations to design a building with 15’ set-backs in both front/rear they are no longer proposing a variance for the rear set-back assuming they are allowed to have a 15’ set-back in the front (along Idaho). However they are still asking for a waiver of road widening.

Ross requests to amend the PLUM motion but there is some discussion on “calling a question” (Keeton and Handal). Calling the question means the board will vote on the motion as presented with debate closed.

There is a motion to ‘call the question’ to vote on the motion as originally proposed without further discussion or debate. 9 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Shigematsu, Torro). This requires ⅔ vote which was achieved. Motion passes. The original motion is intact and will be voted upon.

There is motion as put forth by PLUM for compliance of setbacks with the R3 zone and a waiver for street widening requirement (Amherst). 8 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Shigematsu, Torro). 1 No (Ross). 2 Abstain (Philadelphia, Kato). Motion as put forth by PLUM passes. The project is recommended to adhere to R3 zoning with a waiver regarding street widening requirement.

c. Crosswalk resolution – Please refer to public document dated 11/8/17 from PLUM Chair Jay Ross to NC Chair Keeton with subject line ‘Resolution: Crosswalk Locations’

Motion to accept PLUM recommendation for signalized crosswalks with high visibility striping to be installed at the following locations – Santa Monica & Barry Ave.; Idaho & Barrington; Sawtelle & Nebraska. And vehicle traffic signals shall NOT be installed. 11 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Kato, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Shigematsu, Torro). 0 No. 0 Abstain. Motion passes.

d. Sidewalk Repair resolution – Please refer to public document dated 11/8/17 from PLUM Chair Jay Ross to NC Chair Keeton with subject line ‘Revisions to Sidewalk Repair’

Ross noted that PLUM Committee would like to strengthen the current City resolution regarding sidewalk repairs including submission of a community impact statement (CIS). The goal is to ensure tree ratios are more stringently adhered to. Recommendations include (but not limited to) more funding for Urban Forestry Division; create tree database; moratorium on tree removal; and adherence to best practices.

There is a friendly amendment to the motion to ensure ADA compliance even if that entails tree removal.
Motion to accept PLUM recommendation to strengthen the current City Sidewalk Repair Resolution to adhere to best practices, protect trees and also be ADA compliant. A Community Impact Statement is authorized to be submitted. 11 yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Kato, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Shigematsu, Torro). 0 No. 0 Abstain. Motion passes.

There is some discussion about ‘CIS’ statements. Kageyama believes that the exact wording of a ‘CIS’ needs to be written out and approved by the board before it is uploaded onto the City’s CIS system. She believes there should not be a ‘placeholder’ for a potential CIS statement meant for a future Council File. For record purposes a ‘CIS’ should only be voted upon if the exact wording is in place as well as an active Council File. There should be a filing system for all CIS’s submitted by the WLASNC. Ross and others noted that the resolution or motion itself can be used as a CIS statement once a motion is passed. Keeton noted that the format in which Ross submits resolutions would be the actual content of a CIS should one be filed at a later date. Jasmine Elbarbary was asked to clarify this issue. She noted that people were talking more or less about the same thing. She agreed that a CIS is a powerful tool for the community. She also noted that a council file was necessary for a CIS to be uploaded. Jasmine noted that more clarification was needed on the City side as well. Kageyama asked the Bylaws Committee to try and clarify this for the future.

e. Permanent Supportive Housing

The City’s Permanent Supportive Housing initiative will help those most vulnerable in our community – formerly homeless. There is a need for increased density in communities to provide permanent supportive housing. Developers receive incentives to develop these types of housing projects. There is a discussion on ‘expedited’ processing for developers. It was noted that Ross is an affordable housing developer and some questions were asked whether or not this City ordinance impacts his company in any way. Ross does not feel that such a broad ordinance impacts any specific projects so choose not to recuse himself for the proposed motion.

There is a motion to support the proposed City ordinance regarding Permanent Supportive Housing. 8 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Shigematsu). 3 No (Kato, Torro, Kageyama). 0 Abstain. Motion passes. WLASNC supports the proposed City ordinance on Permanent Supportive Housing including expedited reviews (no additional costs to developers).

f. Resolution re: Text for Resolutions – Please refer to public document dated 10/11/17 from PLUM Chair Jay Ross to NC Chair Keeton with subject line ‘Resolution: Text to include in resolutions’

The PLUM Committee believes that more clarification is required when folks interpret actions or motions of the Neighborhood Council. This resolution is a way to provide more clarity on text of resolutions regarding developments.

Ross noted that one example was with the Gateway Project when a staff member of the Councilmember tried to explain the position of the Neighborhood Council.

There is one sentence under ‘Findings and Justifications’ that needs to be stricken from the document because the NC is not allowed to give legal advice. The sentence to be stricken is: “In legal terms, testimony from a third party who testifies on behalf of another party is “hearsay” and not admissible in court.”

There is a motion to accept the PLUM recommendation that language is included in all CIS’ and resolutions that only the Chair and designated board members can speak on behalf of the Neighborhood Council. 11 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Kato, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Shigematsu, Torro). 0 No. 0 Abstain. Motion passes.

g. Speed Limits

Ross reported on a resolution request dated 7/15/09 to past NC Chair Handal regarding Speed limits (a ‘speed trap’ rule that is used to establish speed limits) with the aim to support AB 766. Needs to be updated with proper dates, names etc. This is an old document. Should be more accurate and current. Keeton recommended that this be reviewed after it is updated.

There is a motion to postpone this item until more current data is received. 10 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Kato, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Shigematsu, Torro). 1 No (Ross). 0 Abstain. Motion to postpone approved.
h. Resolution re: PLUM Guidelines – Please refer to public document dated 10/11/17 from Plum Chair Jay Ross to Chair Keeton with subject line ‘Resolution – PLUM Guidelines & Developer Presentations’

Ross provided an overview of PLUM guidelines by committee members and developers. Including attendance, information sharing protocols, representation guidelines, gifts, etc.

Handal made a note that for section #2 (PLUM membership) – there should not be any strikeouts. Items 2A/Membership was already discussed and approved by the board. 2B should also be included as it was already approved. 2E should remain in place because the Board should retain the right to remove a committee member.

Keeton noted that the document seem to be ‘standing rules’ for a specific committee which is prohibited. She noted that Standing rules for a committee is not allowed. They should be incorporated into regular standing rules for the whole NC. Cannot be a separate committee issue. All needs to be the same. So this whole section is not considered at this time.

Ross asked for clarification about basic rules regarding committees. Keeton agreed that protocols for committee membership are an issue of bylaws and/or standing rules and could be presented to the Board as such. Keeton noted that other issues specifically relating to PLUM (e.g. how developers provide information to PLUM) could be determined within PLUM Committee. But anything that relates to membership and committee protocols needs to be applicable for all Committees. This could possibly to recommendations for changes or additions to Bylaws and/or general Standing Rules.

IX. Bylaws Committee Report and possible motion – Please refer to public document dated 10/20/17 from Bylaws Secretary Kato to NC Chair Keeton with subject line ‘Bylaws Committee – Resolutions’

a. Elections and Definitions The Bylaws Committed puts forth a motion for the NC to approve 6 items relating to the current bylaws; Board structure, Committees, Motions, ex parte communications, stakeholder qualifications and Outreach Chair/Committee. Handal noted that item number 5 of 6 regarding ‘stakeholder’ qualification is not in keeping with DONE/LA City definitions. Jasmine Elbarbary noted that the definition of stakeholder includes ongoing participation in the community. She also notes that any changes to the bylaws require proper LA City procedures (i.e. paperwork).

Motion: To strike Item #5 regarding stakeholder qualification from the list of recommended by the bylaws committee. 9 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Ross, Torro); 1 No (Kato); 1 Abstain (Shigematsu). Motion Passes. Item #5 is stricken from the list of recommended bylaw changes by the Bylaws Committee.

There is a general discussion about NC members serving as alternates on Committees (this is item 2 of the recommendations for bylaws changes). Several NC members spoke on this issue – both for and against. There is also a comment regarding several recommendations in Items 1 and 2 that should actually be reflected in Standing Rules. It was also noted that committees (unlike the board) do not have adjudicating powers.

Motion to accept the recommendations from the Bylaws Committee that include all 6 items with the exception of Item 5 regarding stakeholder qualifications. 4 Yes (Ross, Kato, Torro, Migdal), 7 No (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Keeton, Nakamura, Philadelphia, Shigematsu); 0 Abstain. Motion Fails. Recommendations from the Bylaws Committee for changes to the Bylaws regarding board structure, committees, motions, ex parte communications, stakeholder qualifications and Outreach Chair/Committee is not approved.

b. Structure and Committees – please refer to public document dated 10/19/17 from Bylaws Secretary Kato to NC Chair Keeton with subject heading ‘Bylaws committee – Revisions to Bylaws’.

It was noted that the first item of the document had already been approved – i.e that elections for NC members will be held on 2019 and there would not be any ‘selections’ in 2018.

There was some discussion regarding Article V-501 (at-large seats should be restricted to residents only): Handal believes this is violation of BONC because there are already designated seats based on residents living in certain geographic regions.
and by mandating resident status for at-large seats this would create a controlling body of residents-only. If this is adopted then the NC would be similar to a homeowners association and potentially restrict access of other stakeholders who are not residents.

Article VII (limit Committee membership to 7; with no more than 3 non-NC stakeholders): Handal believes this is also against BONC policy of stakeholder inclusion. This is a slap to public members. He asks that this be removed.

Jasmine Elbarbary noted that any proposed changes to the board structure change needs to go before the commission. She agrees that there should not be any majority of a ‘type’ of stakeholder. She noted that the board needs to be “balanced” and “inclusive”.

Migdal noted that it is only the second part of Article VII that is in question. The first section (i.e. requiring committee members to complete training) is not in question.

Kageyama noted that there should not be ‘big’ business and ‘small’ business seats. Business seats should include those who are true stakeholders – size doesn’t matter. Jasmine Elbarbary noted that similarly ‘residents’ can be ‘residents’ without added geographic sub-sections in order to ease recruitment. It is noted that the issue regarding businesses are not relevant to the current motion at hand.

Ross noted that he was not ‘hiding’ anything but wanted to NC to know that overly large committees are unwieldy. He also believes it is a best practice to have a majority that are NC members.

Nakamura noted that it was a positive thing for non NC members to be interested in joining committees.

Keeton added her views that it is important to be inclusive for board members rather than more restrictive. And in regard to Committee while she believes there should be an odd number (so no voting ties) she believes more members the better.

Motion to approve the recommendations to the Bylaws as proposed but to strike out Article V-501. Also strike Article VII (subsection on Committee member limits). And remove Attachment 5 regarding ‘at large’ residents. 8 Yes (Gavina, Handal, Kageyama, Keeton, Migdal, Nakamura, Shigematsu, Torro), 2 No (Kato, Ross); 1 Abstain (Philadelphia). Motion passes.

X. **Budget Advocate Report (Handal)**

Handal reported that the initial white paper has just come out with the final slated for January 2018. There are very large deficits in the City Budget. Jan. 20th – regional budget day in WLA hearing room from 9 – noon. Encourage all stakeholder to attend. We need to hear from people. Please attend.

Ross noted that these Budget hearings are extremely interesting and at the last meeting he attended he suggested applying fees to Developers to address some of the deficits. This is currently being considered.

XI. **Outreach Chair Report (Nakamura)**

Nakamura – no meeting yet.

Jasmine Elbarbary – would like to plug LA City/DONE ‘Ignite’ program for females and civic involvement. Thanks the NC for connection with Uni High.

XII. **Discussion and possible motion regarding reconsideration policy (Handal)**

Handal noted that the WLASNC Reconsideration policy is different than Robert’s Rules as well as the Brown Act. You can bring it up in the same meeting. Or it must be brought up in the very next meeting provided that; 1) someone on the ‘winning’ side must be the one to bring it forward and 2) The Board has not taken action on it already. If the Board has already taken action then it nullifies any reconsideration attempt.

Handal recommended that this should be sent to the bylaws committee so WLASNC can be in line with LA City operations.
There was no argument brought forth and general agreement that this should be taken up by the Bylaws Committee.

XIII. **Discussion and possible motion regarding ex parte communications by Board members (Ross)**

Ross: Would like policy on who may speak and when/how. Per Jasmine the City Dept. does not have position. Other NC’s use Robert’s Rules. Otherwise it is up to each WLASNC. There is general discussion. It was noted that board members should not be stifled. Keeton says it is two-fold. One to make sure that people are not representing their own belief is the same as the WLASNC. And the 2nd issue is if there is a communication with someone then report it to the board.

Jamie – thinks there should be more info on standing rules.

When is something actually ‘ex parte’? Regardless - this is a standing rules issue (not a Bylaws issue).

XIV. **Discussion and possible motion regarding LAPD reporting sexual assaults (Ross)**

Since no one from LAPD in attendance let’s send this to public safety committee.

XV. **Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**

none

XVI. **Board Comment and Announcements**

Naomi – too much paper. The board packets are very dense (today’s packet was 130 pages).

Keeton noted that board ‘tablets’ may help. Jasmine will look into it. But there are ADA guidelines that may be difficult to address.

Keeton wondered if all of the items from PLUM are truly necessary to be part of the board packet.

Philadelphia asked if individuals can just bring their own copies. Kageyama noted that she had asked members to do so for the first 6 months of her term and it didn’t work well. Maybe there is a way to just reduce the amount of information submitted for board review. Someone noted that maybe 6 copies are made and then shared among board members.

Torro noted that all members will try to come up with good ideas on not wasting paper at the next meeting.

XVII. **Adjournment**

Approx. time 9:25 pm