WEST LOS ANGELES SAWTELL NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, August 22, 2018, 7:00 PM
Felicia Mahood Multipurpose Senior Center
11338 Santa Monica Boulevard – Community Room – Los Angeles, CA 90025

Attending: Chair Jamie Keeton, Jay Ross, Arman Ghorbani, Eric Nakamura, Naomi Kageyama, Danillo Torro, Ron Migdal, and Desa Philadelphia. Jay Handal arrived at 7:29 p.m.

Absent: Jian Kerendian, Jennifer Gavina, Jean Shigematsu, Zana Glisovic.

TIME BEGINS: 7:29 p.m. TIME ENDS: 9:57 p.m.
Community and stakeholder members present: count not taken

I. Call to Order

Chair Keeton began the meeting at 7:13 without quorum, instructing the board that they would receive community partner reports and other activities allowed in a non-quorum situation, and would discuss all agenda matters if they gained quorum. With the arrival of board member Jay Handal at 7:29, she officially called the meeting to order with quorum.

II. Community Partner Reports

SLO Lavenson introduced fellow West Traffic police officers Captain , and said he likes them to come to the meetings as much as possible. He knows people have questions about a pair of robberies in the area in last two months. He has met with detectives responsible, who have concluded that they are not linked, and that suspect descriptions and vehicle descriptions for the two robberies do not match. The MO's are different as well: one person was on the computer outside their home when the robber came up with a gun and demanded property. In the other robbery, the robber came up to someone just walking down the street to rob them. SLO Lavenson said that the LAPD would be beefing up patrols with their patrol cars and undercover cars in full force overnight. They are currently working with other agencies to determine any possible link between the robberies. He explained that ideally, he would love for residents to have cameras around the exterior of their house, so that they could get a picture of the suspect or a license plate on their vehicle. If they have a license plate number, it will give them somewhere to go. He said he would stay at the meeting all night if stakeholders have any questions.

Then, West Traffic Captain Elaine Morales introduced herself, and explained that she's been at West Traffic for about ten days. She at North Hollywood, then Captain at Foothills. She was also the head of a gang unit previously. Just so everyone knows, she explained, West Traffic covers 200 square miles, south of mulholland all the way to Sunset, PCH, all the way over to Cooper and Pico. Their jurisdiction is anything traffic-related, including DUI’s, checkpoints, and hit and runs. They cover basically six divisions, and just like every other station, they are short on personnel, so they will do the best they can with what they have. SLO Lavenson was saying he’s the SLO for West LA, so she introduced her SLO’s for West LA, Officers Perez and Basinger.

She then offered her city cell phone number, 213-926-0297, and said stakeholders could call her anytime with concerns, since Captains' cells are on 24/7. She was confident that the officers with her could address the stakeholders' concerns, introducing them as motorcycle patrolmen. Chair Keeton thanked her for coming.

Officer Basinger introduced his partner Officer Perez, explained that they cover 64 square miles. When someone has a traffic complaint, they go out and address it, and that their approach to traffic issues involves engineering, education, and enforcement. One of the big hot topics right now is the Bird and Lime scooters. We are enforcing a whole list of laws for motorized scooters. Basinger noted that the arrival of Bird and Lime scooters hit this area pretty quick. It seemed like the community had barely heard that they were having problems with them in Venice and then they moved East. Just for the stakeholders’ information, Officer Basinger and Officer Perez were out there doing as much as they can.

Officer Perez said that they had started off educating people about the laws regarding the Bird and Lime scooters, and had now frequently moved past that into a warning. The fines are $200, and it's written on the scooter app about what riders have to do to comply with existing laws, so it's they're responsibility now. Officer Perez said that the situation was getting hot and heavy; some in the community are saying they should be banned all together, some are being hit by cars, so it’s a big issue. Officer Perez then opened the floor for questions from stakeholders.

A stakeholder asked what she could do about getting more handicap-accessible traffic light buttons. Because of the size of her wheelchair she can’t reach the traffic crossing button, can’t move it closer, and some traffic lights don’t give a walk signal automatically. Officer Perez said he could give her a direct number to the DOT Engineering Division who could help...
work with her to develop a solution. Another stakeholder asked about a new, weird curb design outside of Ralph’s. He said his partner was at home with a broken ankle because he had tripped on the curb design. Chair Keeton offered that it was an issue for DOT engineers again, and Officer Perez said he could give the same direct line to the DOT engineers to the stakeholder. Stakeholder Rosie Kato asked if they could report scooters on MyLA311 to be picked up, and Officer Basinger said that there was not in LA in place legislation to deal with it, and Officer Perez said she could always move them on her own.

The stakeholder who had spoken previously about wheelchair access added that she complained to the police station that she can not pass by or pick up the scooters with her wheelchair. She’s forced to wait for someone to help her.

Chair Keeton then said there’d be one last question.

A stakeholder asked if Birds were supposed to stop and obey traffic signs and signals, and Officer Perez confirmed they were. Captain Morales said that they were also supposed to not ride against the flow of traffic and wear a helmet, which frequently doesn’t happen.

A stakeholder asked if the cops could do something about it, such as tow it or impound it, if the stakeholder put the scooter in a no-parking towaway zone. The officers said they could not.

Shannon Louis, Field Deputy from Supervisor Kuehl’s office introduced herself and thanked the council for having her back. She explained that Measure H quarterly updates were out, and will provide them with a link. The biggest highlight was that in the last year 700,448 individuals are now in permanent housing, and 2200 of those placements were in last 3 months. These placements were funded in part or in whole by Measure H. Also we participated in the National Night Out. Participated in West LA at Stoner Park, then did West Hollywood, Santa Monica, Hollywood, and Beverly Hills. The City Council Board would not be meeting for two weeks, returning September 4.

Chair Keeton officially called the meeting to order with quorum at 7:29 with the arrival of Board Member Jay Handal.

A representative from Assemblymember Richard Bloom’s office introduced herself and said that they were having an event on August 25 at the Yucca Community Center. They would be giving out backpacks with school supplies to deserving students, and the students don’t need to live in Hollywood. She asked the board and stakeholders present to spread the word to deserving students.

**III. General Public Comment**

Stakeholder Charles introduced himself, and said that he would be speaking during public comment on agenda items III and X. He explained that he helps run the Movies on the Lawn series at Stoner Park, and that they would have a free movie at Stoner Park from 8 PM to 10 PM on Friday, August 24. This week it would be *Coco*. He would also be putting a concert series together on Sundays, and invited stakeholders to attend both.

Stakeholder Rosie Kato asserted that for the SafeParking LA panel from last week, the board said that questions would be read, and said that hers were not. She hoped they would not censor questions today.

**IV. Approvals**

Chair Keeton asked whether anyone wanted to take an item from the approvals agenda out to consider by itself, and Jay Ross said that he would like to consider item IV.b. separately. Ron Migdal moved to approve IV.a., c., and d. Handal seconded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion to approve agenda items IV.a., c., and d. 9 Yes (Keeton, Ross, Ghorbani, Nakamura, Kageyama, Torro, Migdal, Philadelphia, and Handal). 0 No. 0 Abstain. Motion passes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Outstanding draft meeting minutes

b. Outstanding MERS Reports

Jay Ross went over the items and asked about individual items, with $8,000 in funded items. Jay Handal reminded him that he sent out the MERS previous to the meeting for questions. Ross also asked whether invoices were approved by the board,
and Handal said that it depends on the expense. Ross asked whether the board had to approve the $4,000 invoice for movies in Stoner Park, and Handal confirmed that they had.

Stakeholder Rosie Kato questioned a charge for Frontier, saying $240 a month seems high, and wants to know who’s using the services and what for.

Migdal motioned to approve item IV.b. and the outstanding MERS report, and Handal seconded.

**Motion to approve the outstanding MERS report (agenda item IV.b.) 9 Yes (Keeton, Ross, Ghorbani, Nakamura, Kageyama, Torro, Migdal, Philadelphia, and Handal). 0 No. 0 Abstain. Motion passes.**

c. Motion to amend budget to move cost of business cards from Outreach into Administrative

d. Motion to approve of compact speaker and microphone system for all NC Meetings

V. Westside Community Plans Update team from the Dept of City Planning: Jonathan Hershey, Kinikia Gardner, and Simi Aliu presentations then Q and A.

Jonathan Hershey introduced himself as a senior city planner who oversees city planning policies and community plan updates. The city has committed to updating all 35 of their community plans. The community plans are elements within the city’s general plan for LA. This is a framework by which the city can plan future land uses, developments, and services. He explained that the community plans make up a framework, and just here to tell them the city is starting the update process and get input from stakeholders and neighborhood councils.

He explained that a couple of issues had come up recently, so they wanted to update community plans. He introduced the Westside Community Plan land use map, one of four elements they’ll be updating as part of this process. He wanted to draw the board’s attention that all of the info and documents they’re passing out or showing are on their website, [www.planningthewestside.org](http://www.planningthewestside.org). The community plan process is very reliant on maximizing community participation. These plan documents help decision makers in the planning department decide whether to develop or modify projects in these areas. They want to upgrade the vision and guiding principles for how they are evaluating these projects. Without broad communication, some of the policies they develop may not address community issues, and the document has a shelf life of about 20 years. He explained that neighborhood councils know their communities more than the planning department ever will. As a part of this program, they are updating four city plans simultaneously. They are visiting with all the neighborhood councils to plead for their assistance and networking and feedback to help inform them so they can help them get to community plans that they can agree on and that reflect neighborhood values.

Hershey explained that the CP Process will consist of four parts. First, policy tasks: developing a broad vision, guidance, and language that helps future decision makers determine whether large projects should be approved, modified, or rejected. The second is the plan land use map. Third is zoning regulations, and the fourth part is environmental review. He explained that Emily Gable would go into more detail.

Gable introduced herself and explained that the Community Plan text establishes goals and vision for community. She has acopy of the West LA Community Plan to leave with the board. This will guide development projects moving forward.

The second part of plans update is the Land Use Map. She will leave them with a large copy, but it is also available on the website. General Plan Land Use defines general categories: commercial, residential, industrial, open space. It gets into the intensity of use a little too. So when they update the map, they will have to go through what they have now to see if there’s anything in particular they need to change. For the most part, it will probably stay very similar to what it is right now.

The third component is zoning, which is what the board may be most familiar with. It’s where they get into the nitty-gritty of what’s allowed. It can influence the shape and size of buildings through updating zoning, and in updating they will be looking at whether projects conform with the general plan. They will also be asking if there are things that aren’t working or they would like to be different. Also, they will be implementing Recode Zones which they didn’t do last time. They will be implementing those new zones through this community input process. For the most part, they are translating existing zones into new nomenclature so they can be a little more nuanced about the zoning rules. They will be coming to neighborhood councils with a lot of questions to help shape those.

Fourth is the Environmental Impact Report. For the Westside, they will be doing one EIR for all four plans. It allows them to investigate more comprehensively the cumulative impact.
The timeline is for a three-year project. Year one is working on policy documents in collaboration with neighborhood councils, year 2 they will start working on zoning in-depth and working on the EIR. Year three will wrap up all of that and go through an approvals process, including an open house with the committee and public hearing. She then turned it over to Antonio.

Antonio introduced himself and explained that they’re planning on having events all through these three years for outreach. Right now, they are at the “Listen” stage. A neighborhood council roadshow was the first step. The next phase is a community planning workshop, Community Planning 101. It will allow NC’s and stakeholders to be better equipped to ask questions and be involved in the process. Workshops will be on August 29, Sept 8, and Sept 13. Then there will be kick-off events, West LA’s date is to be determined. Towards the end of year 1, they will be going through the “Share” stage, asking if they got it right. Next is in year 2, the “consult” phase. There will be zoning feedback activities, and an environmental scoping meeting. At the end of year 2, at the “Finalize” section there will be open houses and public hearings. Then in June of 2021, the “adopt” phase, involving commissions, the committee, and council hearings. He welcomes the public to the process, and encourages them to be involved. What they are doing right now could conceivably have implications until 2031, since Community Plan updates are mandated every 10 years.

Hershey then explained that they were also looking for people who have not been previously involved in community planning: the linguistically challenged, etc. All the dates for meetings mentioned are all reflected in handouts provided to them. Once they get some of the early feedback, they will be assembling additional meetings. He then asked for questions.

Danillo Torro said that he had attended a meeting for LA 2040 and asked how that tied into this effort. Hershey explained that LA 2040 is more about updating the city-wide general plan, and is ongoing. Their process is more locally focused, all the way down to the area’s zoning, and all of their policies need to reflect that.

Desa Philadelphia asked Hershey to clarify whether all the Community Planning 101 meetings would provide the same information to give people multiple chances to attend, and Hershey confirmed this. Philadelphia asked whether the EIR’s all-encompassing approach was a money-saving effort, and asked why it wasn’t being presented per community. Hershey explained that City of LA staff do not provide the EIR directly, they contract to a consultant. The primary benefit of doing this is they will be able to conduct a more regional impact analysis, on a larger more regional scope. Philadelphia asked whether they would be able to pull out data for their specific community. Hershey did not know, and explained that they had had one experience with doing a combined EIR for the South and SouthEast community plans. He added that if it is important for their community, they can work to ensure easy access and that as the EIR analysis is done, some information may be aggregated according to use. Naomi Kageyama asked if there would be separate data for all separate areas, and Hershey said that there would be separate data for each of the four CP areas.

Keeton said they would put the info on the WLASNC website and if there is interest, then have a subcommittee. Hershey strongly recommended forming an ad hoc committee to work with them.

VI. Presentation by the American Red Cross re: Map Your Neighborhood; possible motion

Julie Thomas introduced herself and talked about getting the neighborhood more prepared for disasters, saying that LA residents all know the big earthquake is coming. She talked about the Map Your Neighborhood initiative, and how they have 88 volunteers ready to help stakeholders meet with their neighbors and develop a plan for that neighborhood street by street. This was important because neighborhoods where residents don’t know their neighbors are always more dangerous following a disaster, and they won’t bounce back as quickly if they don’t know the help that’s available.

She explained that there are 9 steps in a Map Your Neighborhood plan, and basically all mapped out. Residents want to plan where they will meet up after a disaster, and talk about potential strengths and weaknesses: who’s a doctor, who might need help moving out, etc. Then they create a map walking the neighborhood, finding gas and water shutoffs. In a big disaster, they want to turn the water off where it comes into their home since debris may have contaminated it. Then get all contact info for the neighborhood.

Thomas displayed a packet of essential emergency documents plus training documents that she had brought copies of for stakeholders present. Then, she recommended putting the packet in their freezer or a fire-proof safe. The packets also include info on what the Red Cross does. She added that summer is a great time to give blood. They collect 40% of a patient’s blood supply and provide it to people at no cost. They also respond to 2 or 3 homes every day due to house fires and provide them with info and resources to get back on their feet. Chair Keeton asked her to send to the board a link of where to get more info to post online. She also requested to move agenda item X up, and the board agreed.
X. Discussion and possible motion regarding SafeParkLA parking program at Civic Center parking lot

Handal moved that the West Los Angeles Sawtelle Neighborhood Council support the SafeParkLA parking program with a 120-day program from the begin date and a report at the end of the 120-day period as to the progress, number of nightly visitors, number registered for services or put in for services as well as any issues or positive outcomes. Kageyama seconded.

Migdal explained that originally when he heard the presentation about the program, he was on the fence because he didn’t know how much of a dent 10-15 spots will make. But he knows someone, a stakeholder named Mike, who puts on their movies in Stoner Park. Mike works harder than anyone he knows at those events. And Migdal was speaking with his permission in saying that Mike asked if he could get put in this program since he lives in a car with his family. Migdal added that once a personal face was put on this issue, it made an incredible difference for him. This is a guy who busts his butt to provide for himself and family, and him and other program participants will be getting social services, and opportunities to be tied into other services.

Handal wanted to reiterate a lot of what Migdal said. Handal said that they all talk about the bogeyman, the crazy people, etc, and how they don’t want them in their neighborhood. First of all, its a fact that the homeless are in their neighborhoods: on street corners, in garages, and the only thing keeping them off the streets are the damn Bird scooters. Mike has worked for WLASNC for 8 years; he lives in his car and not by choice. Handal asserted that if there was no compassion left in their neighborhood, then they don’t have a neighborhood. They have a bunch of buildings being dwelled in while they watch people suffer. This is an opportunity to do something good, and Handal implored the council to get Mike and everybody else into a safe place.

Kageyama wanted to give a slightly different take, from different standpoint. She does not believe she’s heard that there was shade thrown that people living in cars were criminals. She has heard there was a lot of support, however; it is true that they have a lot of homeless, and a lot who want to help. CD10 has said there is no space for vans, and West LA is a safer area. She would rather the money go for social services and health advocacy, and thinks it would be better spent if there were mobile units on call to help people who need it. She is not saying there’s no room for other types of housing programs, and Safe Parking is great for other parts of city.

Torro wanted to echo Kageyama’s concerns about cost. $100,000 a year to have 10 to 15 cars in a parking lot is excessive, in his opinion. West LA is a safe place, if people want to be in a parking lot, he thinks they’re not threatened. He thinks if a family wants to Safe Park, that should be discouraged, and the money used to find them housing.

Philadelphia said that in theory she supports a program like this if it benefits their community. She is just not sure how exactly it is benefiting their community, and which populations it’s addressing. If she could be sure that this was addressing families, for example, who are from their community who couldn’t have access to permanent housing or even short term housing provided by city, she would support them being able to park there as a stopgap measure. Or for people like Mike, if that were a reliable place for him to spend the night. She just has not seen a presentation for what this program is targeting for their community. And a lot of her skepticism is because of the cost. She thinks $100,000 a year, $88,000 of which is security, seems very much like a Band-Aid rather than a progression to a conclusion. A concrete problem that it’s addressing would garner her support.

Chair Keeton explained that her understanding was that the $100,000 was to provide security, 7 days a week, 12 hours a day, overtime for four hours every day, then double-time. That means the person is making about $22 an hour. If it’s two people, they’re making $50,000, and they can’t even get an apartment in this area. She thinks 10 cars won’t make a dent, but if they don’t do it now, who will be the first one? How can they tell the city “We won’t support that, go build a shelter”. Keeton explained that the point was to it being an excessive expense, which she does not think it is. They talked in previous presentations about how people were chosen and what sort of help they get. The program doesn’t just serve anyone who rolls in at sunset. What she keeps hearing is, if it’s people we know like Mike, it’s okay. But the other potential participants are Mikes to somebody.

Philadelphia clarified that when she talked about people like Mike she was talking about people who live and work in this community because with 10 to 15 spots, they have to prioritize. She is sure there are thousands who could benefit from programs like this. So what she is asking for is clarification for how they are prioritizing this and she is not saying it is something they shouldn’t support. She DOES think that they will have neighbors who have concerns, and so need to prioritize.
Handal explained that the cost amounted to $27.35 per car if it’s 10-15 for a year. Also, people who come into program need to sign up with services. This is a gateway to get people into housing. He said he would be happy to amend his motion to state that the SafePark LA program should do outreach into the neighborhood first, so each person living in a car in the area gets a knock on the door. He is chair of the budget committee in LA, and believes that they frequently spend millions of dollars in a dysfunctional way, so for $100,000, why don’t they take a chance? Handal then amended his motion as previously described.

Nakamura asked if it was 10 spaces or 10-15. Why not do 20 guards if they can do it? Then, he thought having a security guard watch 20 cars, if that’s possible, they are getting more people off the street. But for a smaller amount of cars, why not fund an apartment? He added he would like to hear as much public comment as possible.

Arman Ghorbani said that to his understanding, it was not the same 10 cars every year, that they would be constantly rotating cars out, so it might help more people. He added that when he first heard about it, it did seem like a Band-Aid, but Band-Aids are useful: they stop cuts from getting worse. He would also like information about how many people transition into housing from Safe Parking programs.

Migdal added that homelessness is a problem being worked on by minds far greater than his, but if the program is a Band-Aid or a dent in the problem, they should kill homelessness by a death of a thousand little cuts. 10 cars won’t affect the community around the lot, so they should use this as an incubator and see if it has an effect.

Stakeholder Rosie Kato said that she had brought up last time whether each of the board members would want to live across from this program. She added that this program was temporary, based on 15-year programs in San Diego and Santa Barbara. Their city has allocated 442 million dollars for homeless services, and they should be using that to build more housing. She asked whether the board was saying that homeless living in cars are more deserving, and accused them of pitting one group of homeless against another group.

Stakeholder Kareem said that he lived in this neighborhood his whole life, and fully supports this project. Temporary housing leads to permanent housing, and people have to start somewhere. Money’s already been allocated, and he explained that his mother would be living in her car right now if he couldn’t provide housing for her, and he would want to make sure she could park safe. Also, there no houses around this project, just a wall and a government building.

Stakeholder Charles, who had commented in agenda item III, said that Mike is a mega asset to this neighborhood. And there’s other people like Mike, and if they don’t spend this money and do this they are not helping anybody. He believes they should spend it, be a neighborhood, and do something good. He lives next to the proposed lot, and fully supports this.

Stakeholder Sandra explained that she was here on behalf of herself and several neighbors on Tennessee south of Olympic. They have many homeless people in campers and cars, and they are very enthusiastically for this program. They understand that it is not intended to address bad people. She has seen women living in cars in her neighborhood and she worries about them because it’s not safe for people to sleep.

A stakeholder said that she was not happy about this program. She knows one homeless lady who can’t get help even though she always cleans up and doesn’t make a mess, and thinks it is too expensive and could be used more wisely.

Stakeholder Blessed thanked the board for allowing her to come and speak, and said that she was one of those homeless women living in her car. She is the new face of homelessness, and was vetted for the Safe Parking program in Koreatown. The issue is the lot is so far from her doctor’s office in Venice, and it costs a lot to get gas. She would appreciate the band-aid, whatever they can do, and described being pepper-sprayed and assaulted in a previous place she had been put that was supposed to be safe.

Ron Kato introduced himself as a member of the Del Rey Neighborhood Council Ad Hoc Homeless Committee, and thanked the board for taking the time to listen. He was born and raised in LA, and his parents still live in house I grew up in. As part of the DRNC Ad Hoc Homeless Committee, they have had people in cars speak at meeting. What other communities are looking to help these people in committee? He added that the issue was how they can help these people: there’s a difference in reality and perception, and this will not take away money from HHH funding.

Stakeholder Austin thanked the board for their leadership, and introduced himself as a housing advocate for Del Rey. Every person in the room wants sustainable solutions, but that’s a much bigger conversation than this one. He said it will require looking at the root causes of homelessness. In the meantime, they need these bandaids, they serve as a reminder that these folks are here, their neighbors, and need help. They have an out of sight out of mind mindset sometimes.
Stakeholder Chelsea explained that she was part of the With Every Woman campaign through United Way, and that interim solutions are critical to permanent solutions. Housing takes a long time to build, and if they don’t have a safe place for people along the way, they are losing them through the cracks. She added that she recently made friends with a woman who uses her laundromat and is homeless, and that it is not about “good” or “bad” homeless people, it’s about hard and harder decisions.

Field Deputy Louis thanked the board, and expressed Supervisor Sheila Kuehl’s support for this project.

Stakeholder Cory thanked the board; he said that he hears money being spent, and that $100,000 sounds like a lot. It was also his first time hearing about $80,000 for security, and thinks the amount of spaces is not enough. He wanted to know where it was located and why it was not behind the police station. Then they might not have to pay somebody. He recommended an amendment to the motion.

Stakeholder Timothy introduced himself as being on the Del Rey committee as well. He has lived in the neighborhood for about 25 years and is a strong supporter of the program. He thinks the scale of the housing problem is enormous here and it will take a long time to build enough housing to get folks into places. He noted that this was not the most dangerous neighborhood, but they still need security and support folks coming in to help with the next step in the process. As a community, they’re here and they can accept them where they are, but he thinks they should try to help them.

Chair Keeton noted that a stakeholder, Rob, did not want to speak, but wanted his support recorded.

A stakeholder asked if there was any thought put into how the lot was chosen, and Keeton explained that there was, and that they were not in charge of the process. The stakeholder asked if there had been a study done about what people are within visual range. Keeton clarified that what they have seen from Safe Park and the city is the parking lot will start off with 10 vehicles, maybe increasing to 15, but the space cannot sustain more than 15.

Keeton then read an email from stakeholder Sylvie, saying she was unable to attend the meeting, but is in support. She believes they have to give it a shot rather than letting it get worse.

Keeton then read an email from stakeholder Allison, who explained that she was a resident in Sawtelle unable to attend the meeting. She believes it’s important to support this project after doing some research into the Santa Barbara program, and was impressed by the length of time this program’s been operating. She believes it is an option that does not disservice the community, and benefits groups that are close to being on the streets of LA, and urges the council to approve.

Keeton then introduced an email from stakeholder Nathan Bartley: he has been in the neighborhood near Olympic and Butler, and urges them to take action on it. He is grateful to see WLASNC make steps to help the homeless.

Philadelphia wanted to address what Handal said about amending the motion; she thinks doing outreach to everyone living in cars in their borders is not feasible. She believes they should amend the motion to say, “with priority given to people who live or work in our area”.

Emily Kantrim introduced herself as representing Safe Parking LA. She explained that the program is targeted for 67 identified vehicle dwellers in this area already. They’ve done that by working with St Joseph’s Center, a great community partner already. Service providers are always dealing with how you stabilize a client immediately, housing is an issue and if you have to make someone wait three months for housing, the issue is where they sleep. Do they risk getting tickets on their vehicles to be safer, or do they stay compliant and park on commercial space? While it’s 10 spaces for the pilot program, they usually have a roster for those 10 spaces of about 30. Not all stay every night, most have a family member or grandmother and while they can’t drive back and forth to these family members all the time, they maybe go there once a week, have a shower, etc. Like Mrs. Blessed said, it’s too far from where she needs to be to move forward with her life meaningfully. There has also been a lot of senior homeless increase, about 25%. Yesterday they got three applications from people who’ve been homeless for less than a month. They have programs like Rapid Housing that help people. As long as they’re in a safe place and won’t fall into further homelessness, they can get them housed. This program can make sure these people are still seen as a valuable part of community.

Handal wanted to comment: a very smart businessman once said, don’t hire smart people and then tell them what to do. These people know how to run the programs, they know the problems, WLANC knows them, and his motion gives 120 days for them to get back to WLASNC. He urged the board not to cause paralysis by analysis. He thought they should move on with this, get it open, and see how it works.
Nakamura asked whether SafeParking LA actually does outreach to the public? Because this seems like it was on WLASNC to do, and he feels like they didn’t get to really do it. It sounds like someone passed out flyers to apartments. Other than that, he does not know what else was done.

Handal explained that he lives on Purdue now, and a sign was illegally posted by somebody on the front door of his building, and that sign specifically said Bonin and West LA Sawtelle have avoided a town hall. They have had two meetings about it. So you can’t say nobody did outreach, and all they did was malign WLASNC.

Chair Keeton called the vote.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion that the West Los Angeles Sawtelle Neighborhood Council support the SafeParkLA parking program with a 120-day program from the begin date and a report at the end of the 120-day period as to the progress, number of nightly visitors, number registered for services or put in for services as well as any issues or positive outcomes (amended as described by Handal)</td>
<td>8 Yes (Keeton, Ross, Ghorbani, Kageyama, Torro, Migdal, Philadelphia, and Handal). 0 No. 1 Abstain (Nakamura). Motion passes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this point, the board agreed to hear agenda item XV.

**XV. Renter’s Rights Fair Committee Report**

Ghorbani explained that they had had a logistical meeting about the renters’ rights event. Flyers had been sent out and were at the back table about the fair at the farmer’s market on September 16, and they are having representatives from the housing department and some non-profits come, and are hoping to get a few lawyers experienced in renters’ rights to come as well. A stakeholder suggested distributing the flyer in Spanish as well.

At 8:56, Chair Keeton announced a 5-minute break. The meeting reconvened at 9:01 PM, at which point Jay Handal had left. Jay Handal returned and restored quorum at 9:03 PM. Chair Keeton called the meeting back to order at 9:03 PM.

The board then went back in the agenda to item VII.

**VII. Nomination and appointment of WRAC delegates**

Chair Keeton asked if anyone was willing to be a delegate to the WRAC meetings. Handal, Ross, and Philadelphia volunteered. Keeton emphasized that it’s once a month, and Ross volunteered to withdraw. Handal said he was the delegate as chair for years to LUPEC, and now nobody goes. Philadelphia decided to withdraw, so the appointees were Handal and Ross.

**VIII. Discussion and possible motion to appoint new members to the Board.**

Chair Keeton announced that there was one applicant for becoming an at-large Board member, Dylan Wright.

Dylan Wright thanked the board for their consideration, and said his friend was here and going to run for this spot, but had to leave, and he could be a real asset to the community. Wright thought it was so much fun to see people in the community actually care about what’s going on, and that’s why he wants to be a part of it. He works at a university, is a political science major, and thinks what happens here is amazing, and unique, and he realized when his friend withdrew that not everyone thinks that. He said he was just a working schmuck basically, and thinks he could be an asset and be of service.

Handal said that, based on the fact that Wright is a working schmuck who thinks this is fun, he deserves to be on the board. Handal moved to accept him, Nakamura seconded. Kageyama talked about logistical errors leading up to this item; they had received three applicants for three spots, but everyone is only eligible for an at-large position. She thinks that before they make a decision, they should talk about several names that have come up so they don’t seem like they are making a hasty decision.

Migdal asked what Wright’s affiliation with the West LA community was, and he explained that he lives and plays here, and his residence is on Corinth and Nebraska.

Handal added that if people don’t show up for a position that they’ll need to go to meetings for, he has no confidence in them and is happy to move forward. Kageyama explained that she knows that there was one received at the last minute. The
third one didn’t have a chance to email and was named Shyon. Wright explained that he was his friend who had to leave. Kageyama added that sometimes their meetings are very long, and other people have family obligations. She reiterated that Galen had emailed a statement, and Shyon withdrew his application.

Nakamura read Galen’s statement. Galen couldn’t make it, and writes that he moved to Brockton Avenue with his wife who grew up on Westgate where her parents still live. He said there were big changes coming to the area due to LA’s overall evolution and proximity to Western and Santa Monica’s new job and transit centers. Galen wants to maintain the area’s current lifestyle while being realistic, and became part of the PLUM committee to help shape future development of their area. Philadelphia asked why he didn’t come to the meeting, and Nakamura explained that he had a work dinner.

Stakeholder Cory commented that he had been kind of interested in the position for a month or so, and came tonight to feel out what this is like and what the requirements are. Keeton explained that everybody is up for election next year, and that board members are supposed to come to every meeting and supposed to be on a committee.

Philadelphia asked Wright to tell the board his West Sawtelle story, and what he tells people when they ask where he lives. Wright said it was the greatest neighborhood he has ever lived in. He grew up in South Boston, lived in San Francisco for about 16 years or so, and moved here because his partner got a job at the VA. Someone gave them a good tip to move into an apartment on Corinth after a year. He explained that in West Sawtelle, you’re close to the beach, close to the highway, close to the mountain, and close to work. He added that it has a real neighborhood feel, which he thinks is rare in LA.

Migdal asked where he was born, and Wright replied he was born in Brockton, Massachusetts. Migdal said that he seemed like a great candidate, but asked whether they should table the issue in the interest of fairness until Galen can come. Keeton explained that her thought was, Galen is involved with the PLUM committee. He’s not being removed from being involved with the community since he’s on there, and everyone’s seats will be up next year anyway. She added that this sort of thing happens a lot where they get 4-5 applications, they don’t all show up, they table it, then lose quorum. Right now, a motion is on the table.

Philadelphia said she would like to amend motion to consider Dylan or Galen, and Handal said that that was not allowed, it would have to be a separate motion. Keeton confirmed that procedurally, there is a motion on the table, adding that the bylaws do not have an appointment method. Ghorbani added that he didn’t think it would hurt to wait a month and see who shows up and who is committed.

Philadelphia asked what the solution was for Galen. Keeton explained that procedurally, they need to vote down this motion or confirm. If it passes, Wright becomes a member of the board. If it does not, he does not become a member. Or they can table it. If they say yes, he is in, and they move on to another agenda item. If it is tabled, they cannot introduce another motion that would make that motion void later on.

Ross added that he thinks Galen is great, he told him he wants to be on the board, so Ross knows he is very dedicated. He said he was lucky all 4 stakeholder representatives on PLUM are fantastically smart and enthusiastic. Then again, the board will all make their choice.

Motion to approve Dylan Wright as an at-large member of the WLASNC Board. 6 Yes (Keeton, Nakamura, Torro, Migdal, Philadelphia, and Handal). 2 No (Ross, Kageyama). 1 Abstain (Ghorbani). Motion passes. Dylan Wright is admitted to the board.

XVIII. Public Safety Report

Chair Keeton moved up the Public Safety Report. Migdal explained that he had attended the Resilience LA meeting the Tuesday before last, and that each neighborhood council was charged with nominating or electing a Resilience LA rep. He said he would like to be nominated, and explained that the Resilience LA Rep was essentially an emergency preparedness rep. At the meeting they had broke into four large groups and discussed what they thought was necessary for their group, for example, having bins with emergency gear in neighborhoods. One discussion was what they should stock those bins with. He came up with a number of suggestions, so he was asked for bin input for bins around the city. He added that they didn’t have to just send one Resilience rep, and requested that WLASNC vote for or appoint representatives. Keeton appointed Migdal and new board member Wright as Resilience LA representatives.

IX. Discussion and possible motion re: inventory report
Handal moved agenda items IX, XI, XII, and XIII for approval. He explained each motion in turn, and that they had already passed the motion that PLUM is required to videotape their meetings, as it was voted on in a consent item. Ross added that he had discussed points for all of them.

Chair Keeton began with item IX, and asked if everyone had read the inventory report. Ross added that it was in the packet. He emphasized that everyone needed to look at the report and see if something in it didn’t belong to WLASNC. There were a few things at the band shell that were unclaimed, so he put those in there. He then asked DONE representative Jasmine Elbarbary where they should be storing all of their stuff, since the band shell is a little unhygienic. Elbarbary said that she has recommended multiple times that the board get an independent storage facility unit as most neighborhood councils do, which she thinks would resolve a lot of ongoing issues, including access at any time without a third party.

Ross asked what she meant by “independent”, and Elbarbary clarified that she meant a public storage location specifically under WLASNC control, that only they have access to. Migdal suggested that there were storage facilities on Exposition and Sawtelle. Elbarbary added that they would need to set rules about access, especially for holidays.

Handal clarified that everything is in a city facility now, the issue is the courtroom where they used to hold our hearings; they have access but it is shared by CD11 allowing the coalition to come in and use it. The band shell area is used by the farmer’s market and by WLASNC to store tables and chairs because they were shared by the farmer’s market. So getting public storage for that is bad advice when they have to rent a truck to transport everything. Elbarbary recommended they come up with a system to clearly distinguish who owns what inside the band shell. Handal said that their logo is over a bunch of them, the chairs and a white plastic table aren’t WLASNC’s.

Philadelphia added that the last time when they did outreach, she had been trying to find stuff in the courtroom area and also spoke to the woman who runs the farmer’s market. She believes it seems like what’s needed are storage cabinets in that room that are specifically WLASNC’s so they can put stuff like the banners or extra stickers there within that back room, so they know these are their cabinets and they know where to look. Chair Keeton added that she thought it would be a good idea to look online for good cabinets, then make it an agenda item to buy those cabinets and install them.

Keeton added that Handal explained to her the audio equivalent is movie Mike’s, not theirs. She thought they should maybe consider buying a cabinet large enough to store that stuff.

Migdal asked, in response to Handal’s assertion that everything they owned was here, whether the events they use their equipment for are here too. Handal confirmed this, and added that the movie stuff is all Stoner Park’s.

Nakamura asserted that they should find a way to use their facilities right here, and questioned whether they needed to spend $2,000 on a mic and speaker (as per agenda item IV.d.). Handal said that he had a government mic in his car if the council wanted to purchase it from him. Keeton explained that she had put up to $2,000 on the agenda because she did not know how much mics cost.

Ross asked Handal to cross out items on the inventory that weren’t theirs, and Handal agreed to do so to the best of his knowledge.

Philadelphia suggested that a wireless mic system would be ideal. Elbarbary added that they have to have sound at meetings however it happens, and that their current set up could not continue. She further clarified that neighborhood councils could not accept donations, so however they resolve it is up to them but cannot involve donations. She recommended they resolve the issue before next meeting. She recommended wireless mics for ADA compliance, expressing concern that the wires could trip people. Ross volunteered to be in charge of procuring the wireless microphones. Migdal offered to meet with Handal at the office and figure out what they need. Handal suggested postponing the inventory approval, and Elbarbary replied that they couldn’t.

Handal then moved to accept the inventory as revised. Migdal seconded.

Motion to approve the inventory report as revised. 9 Yes (Keeton, Ross, Ghorbani, Nakamura, Kageyama, Torro, Migdal, Philadelphia, and Handal). 0 No. 0 Abstain. Motion passes.

Ross added that he will try to get a key, and if not, will put items in the courtroom.

XI. Discussion and reminder for all PLUM committee meetings to be video recorded per previous board motion
Chair Keeton pointed out for discussion and reminder that there had been conflicting recollections about whether or not there was a motion to that effect in a previous meeting. She explained that Ross said that they did not get to it, while
Nakamura and Handal remember it as a bundle item in a consent calendar, and Kageyama cannot find it. They will postpone until the motion can be found.

XII. Discussion and possible motion regarding posting recorded meetings (BOD and Committee, past and future) to YouTube

Chair Keeton explained that there had been discussion of posting recorded meetings to Youtube, and that the last time she had spoken with Nakamura about it, he said it was an uploading issue based on the size of the files and would tie up any computer all night. Kageyama agreed, noting that it would be a huge pain and that even bringing in the necessary equipment is tough. Nakamura said that he does not want to be in charge of recording anymore, so someone else will have to record if the motion passes.

Philadelphia asked if the recording was for absent community members, and Keeton confirmed that it was for them and for transparency should people misremember events. She said the issue was the file size was huge, and Nakamura added that even FTP servers are slow, since these are gigabyte-sized files. Ross added that he thinks they can trust their notes. Philadelphia suggested they could use a platform like Facebook Live, but there was debate as to whether it would actually record the meeting.

Ross motioned that they do not film meetings. Handal clarified that that would be asking for a motion for consideration, and it was too late for that. Keeton said she could put it on the agenda for the September meeting.

XXVI. Adjournment

Migdal motioned to adjourn. Keeton adjourned the meeting at 9:57 PM.

The note-taker for this meeting was John P. of Apple One, a City approved vendor. The minutes are reviewed and presented by Naomi Kageyama, Secretary of the WLA Sawtelle Neighborhood Council. 9/26/18