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Ken Blaker
I moved to SORO in 2006. I was born in Philadelphia (where I was civically involved even as a teenager - the city’s school district chose me to represent all Philadelphia students at a wide variety of events, and on television, including a series of interviews with the Governor that were aired on Public TV throughout Pennsylvania). I have lived in about a dozen other locations throughout the country – and I love living in SORO. I am married with 2 pre-schoolers. I have my own business here in SORO. My wife and I own a condo in SORO, and we have both served as Presidents of the condo Home Owners Association. I am the President of the the that HOA currently. We are active with the parent council of our children’s school. We are people who get involved.

As a member of the council I will focus on people oriented activities to promote neighborhood beautification, along with promoting social interactions to solidify community-wide acceptance and respect for all members of our diverse community.

I also feel compelled to focus on supporting a positive business environment. Our business community is largely comprised of small businesses. We don't have any big-box stores here. We have few chain restaurants and few chain supermarkets. We have a lot of single location businesses and services. And we have a growing number of empty commercial properties. As much as the Council already does, I believe there is more that can be done to support our business community, and the people who depend on those businesses.

Please support my candidacy.

Ken Blaker

Tiffany Miller Cohen

My husband and I are thrilled to be moving our family into a house on 24th street. As residents of Soro for over 5 years, we were very excited when our hopes of owning a home in the neighborhood became a reality. As my husband and I are nonprofit professionals, we strongly believe in community. I welcome an opportunity to give back to my community and to help create a neighborhood in which my daughter can thrive.

In my current job in South Los Angeles, I am very involved with community, economic and educational development and would be happy to put my skills to use in my own community.
Pieter Severynen

20+ year career with US Department of Housing and Urban Development as Landscape Architect and Community Planning and Development Representative.

Long involvement with neighborhood organizations funding and set up.

Extensive involvement with LA City and County bureaucracies.

Very long time neighborhood resident; familiar with neighborhood issues, especially at outdoor, planning, and tree level.

Want to stimulate more outdoor water saving measures; have necessary expertise.

Meryl Chambers

I am an attorney and I've lived in this neighborhood ever since moving to Los Angeles after college. My parents live in the Beverlywood neighborhood. I love this community and can't imagine living in any other part of the city. I'm so excited about the direction this neighborhood is moving, with modern Kosher restaurants as an example, and would love to be a part of that progress.

Robyn Braun

I have served on the SORO NC Board since 2006 as the Zone 4 representative. Although great strides have been made to improve the quality of life in La Cienega Heights, there is so much more to do here and throughout the SORO boundaries. I would like to be considered for the At Large Representative Seat to continue supporting the goals of our NC and community as well as stakeholder concerns. I am continuing membership on the Public Safety Committee. I look forward to working with the new esteemed SORO NC.

Thank you for your consideration.

Robyn Braun

Rich Bloom

I am very active in the Pico-Robertson community and am very invested in its welfare. I am a member of the Los Angeles Intercommunity Kollel (LINK ) at 1453 S. Robertson Blvd. as well as the Happy Minyan at 9218 Pico Blvd. and the Chevra. Nearly every Jewish sabbath, I walk back and forth between my home in Laurel Canyon and Pico-Robertson (5.7 miles each way). In addition, I patronize establishments, regularly shopping as well as eating at restaurants in the Pico-Robertson area. Many vitally important issues to the Pico-Robertson area are important to me, including safety, beautification, home expansion/mansionization, and interpersonal relations (person-to-person and resident-to-business). It would be an honor for me to serve as an at-large representative on the Pico-Robertson neighborhood council. Thank you for your consideration.
Michael Friedman

I am a Civil Litigation attorney at a boutique Century City firm. I grew up in this neighborhood and have a history of working to give back and strengthen our community.

I volunteer as an Advocate for Public Counsel’s Homelessness Project, helping those who are unable to help themselves, and building a stronger community. I am also invested in the Soro Community. During my time as the Director of an Israeli Prime Minister’s Special Initiative I managed a $200,000 budget, focusing my efforts on local programming and community engagement.

I also have leadership experience. During my time in law school, where I was a merit scholar, I served as the President of the Student Government where I revitalized student life.

I plan to take these skill to help connect the SORONC to its members. To incorporate what our residents want into a larger picture of Los Angeles and to work with our government representatives to make sure the interests of SORO are made a priority.

Krystal Návar

Dear Members of the SORO NC Board,

I have been a resident of the neighborhood for 7 years, and have been working in this neighborhood for the same amount of time. My husband owns an architecture and construction firm where I am a designer and project manager. We have built in this neighborhood and feel compelled to build more here, as it is our home. I am also a mother of a 2-year-old daughter and a 7-year-old doggy.

I would bring a thoughtful, fresh, design-minded perspective to the board and hope to be considered for the open position.

Thank you for your consideration,

Krystal Návar

Melissande Colton

I am an energetic, motivated and full of positive ideas to help this community grow and prosper. I am a native Angeleno, love this city and am happy to do whatever it takes to move it forward in a positive direction.
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Barry Levine

I served on the Board of the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council for about eight years and currently chair the Education Committee.

We created the SCATCH program which tutors Shenandoah Street Elementary School children with one-on-one tutors for about twenty third, fourth and fifth graders. We partnered with YULA girls High School, involving about twenty High School students with peer to peer tutoring.

We also instituted a Fresh Fruit on Fridays program that supplies a piece of fresh produce, a geography lesson, a health lesson a biology lesson all centered on the produce provided. This last year funding shifted to the SORO Foundation but they have requested matching funds for future years.

We also organized a candidate forum for the LAUSD District One seat this current year.

I am most proud of the position we at the Education Committee moved through the Neighborhood Council board, the City Council of Los Angeles (by unanimous vote), and eventually the voters of Los Angeles: in November of 2013, a 74% majority approved a city ballot measure calling on our elected officials to support a US Constitutional Amendment stating 1) corporations are not people and shouldn't have constitutional rights, and 2) money is not free speech. This advisory resolution has passed both the State Senate and the State Assembly is now on the Governor’s desk awaiting his signature to place the issue on the November 2014 state ballot.

I am actively pursuing a computer code-writing program for third graders to begin this next school year. My work continues even though I am no longer on the Board and would appreciate being reinstated by appointment to the Board.

Dan Berkovitz

I am involved in the community and desire to be more involved in the community. I am a person who takes action. I lost the council election by 4 votes but that doesn't stop me, I'm still applying to be on the council. I want to do good.

Mark Hecht

My whole life takes place in the area that is governed by the soro community council and it is extremely important to me to take an active role in lending my thoughts and ideas to improve all aspects of this great neighborhood. I also have meaningful relationships with many people in the neighborhood that I can leverage to bring awareness, participation and excitement to the council. I am an excellent candidate and I feel I would be a tremendous asset to the council.
Motion to establish a LGBT Committee for the SORO Community

Agenda Item: GB071714-26
Date: 17 July 2014
Proposed By: Leo Portal

Full Proposal

Board support requested for a new LGBT Committee with intent and purpose to work with the LGBT Community and City Officials to better provide services to the LGBT Community within SORO jurisdiction.

Currently there are no LGBT facilities such as a Community Center within SORO boundaries. The closest LGBT Center for SORO Residents is currently at 1625 Schrader Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90028. The approximate distance to this LGBT Center is 7.2 miles walking distance and 7.3 miles by car or bus from Hamilton High School. It is believed that our LGBT Community should be given more facility to seek out support groups that are closer to their residences. The aim of the Committee will be to work closely with Hamilton H.S. by establishing a LGBT Club for students and to work in partnership with the Los Angeles LGBT Center and City Officials to establish a secondary/satellite LGBT Center in the area around the Robertson Blvd Corridor, ideally within close proximity to Hamilton High School.

Proposed Motion

The South of Robertson Neighborhood Council maintains the need for a LGBT Committee which seeks out opportunities to address the needs of the SORO LGBT Community. And is therefore supportive of the LGBT Committee to be created with the underlying purpose to work with LGBT youth at Hamilton H.S and to seek out a satellite LGBT Community Center within SORO jurisdiction to be funded by the City of Los Angeles.

Considerations

Committee review: (highly recommended) Votes For: 0 Against:

Amount previously allocated in Committee's working budget: $ (applies to funding motions only)

Arguments for:

Residents in SORONC do not have a LGBT Center which is funded nor supported by the City of Los Angeles. Having the support of City Organization to promote and establish a place where young people can congregate is essential for people that have been historically marginalized and or continue to be marginalized.

Arguments against:

There are no official number quantifying the number LGBT residents within SORONC and/or the specific needs requested; therefore SORO LGBT Committee may have difficulty in adequately addressing their potential needs.
To empower people to lead full and rewarding lives without limits based on sexual orientation and gender identity, by providing cultural, and wellness programs to residents of SORONC;

Advocate full access and equality for all people regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, by promoting our communities' needs at a local level.

The Hollywood LGBT center on 1625 Schrader Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90028 is close enough for all residents in SORONC.

Diverting additional funds from Los Angeles General fund to establish a satellite LGBT Center within SORO may reduce funding to other City services.
Letter of support for Peace Picnic

Agenda Item: GB071714-27
Date: 07/17/14
Proposed By: Marjan Safinia

Full Proposal

2014 will mark the occasion of the 9th Annual Peace Picnic, held each year in SORO close to the United Nations International Day of Peace. This year’s picnic falls on September 21st. The event is a non-denominational family event to bring together the diverse segments of SORO’s community, thereby promoting better and more harmonious relations within our neighborhood.

For several years, SORO NC has provided Peace Picnic organizers with a letter of support to help them in their efforts to fundraise for the event in the community. Since we began this, the Peace Picnic organizers have found considerable success in fundraising for the event so that it is becoming a sustainable annual fixture.

The last time the board wrote such a letter was 2 years ago. It would be helpful to have an up-to-date vote of confidence from the board.

Proposed Motion

I. That SORO NC approve the attached letter in support of the Peace Picnic

Considerations

Committee review: Votes For: 7 Against: 0

Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget: 0

Arguments for: Arguments against:

The Peace Picnic is an important event on the community calendar We do not write letters of support for every proposed community event

The event is a good outreach opportunity for SORO NC I literally can’t think of another argument against doing this
17 July 2014

To Whom It May Concern

9th Annual Peace Picnic

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council has been very privileged to be closely associated with the Peace Picnic since its inception, and has been proud to support this fantastic annual event within our boundaries for most of the last decade.

2014 marks the ninth annual Peace Picnic, celebrating the values instituted by the United Nations International Day of Peace. Each year, this non-denominational, community and family event has brought together diverse pieces of the South Robertson community in a day of shared laughter, music, food, collaboration and celebration. The event embodies the spirit of International Peace Day, a global opportunity for individuals, communities and nations to create practical acts of peace on a shared date. By bringing together multiple faiths and ethnic groups in one community event, the Peace Picnic allows South Robertson residents to foster powerful ties of shared experience across perceived differences, and to coalesce under the idea of one connected community.

Each year, the event has been growing in reach, and it is anticipated that this year’s event will draw upwards of 500 people. The event organizers work tirelessly each year to ensure that the event comes together, and offer community members and leaders yet another opportunity to uphold the ideals of peace by donating to the event.

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council is a proud long-time supporter of the Peace Picnic, and strongly encourages other community organizations, merchants and individuals to do the same.

We look forward to yet another successful event this year!

Sincerely,

President, South Robertson Neighborhoods Council

South Robertson Neighborhoods Council
PO Box 35836
Los Angeles, CA 90035

P: (310) 295-9920
F: (310) 295-9906
E: info@soronc.org
soronc.org

City of Los Angeles Certified Neighborhood Council
Motion to support a living wage ordinance for hotel workers

Agenda Item: GB071714-28  
Date: 17 July 2014  
Proposed By: Doug Fitzsimmons

Full Proposal

The City of Los Angeles is currently considering an ordinance that would raise the minimum wage for most hotel employees to $15.37/hour.

The proposal phases-in the increase over time. As now drafted, hotels with over 300 rooms would have until July 1, 2015; hotels with over 125 would have an additional year. Hotels facing financial hardships would be able to file for some level of exemption.

The benefits of the living wage ordinance are clear. Non-unionized hotel employees are among the lowest paid workers in the City. For struggling housekeepers, busboys and maintenance workers at large hotels, it provides a chance to escape poverty and, as Mayor Garcetti says, “build pathways to the middle class.” The City’s economy stands to benefit from their increased purchasing power, too, although to what degree is a matter of debate.

Which is not to say that the ordinance as written is perfect. A serious local concern is that hotels that closely border communities without a comparable living wage ordinance (such as Beverly Hills and Culver City) would be at a competitive disadvantage: unable to raise room rates above those set by over-the-border competitors, but still required to increase salaries. In a price-sensitive market, this would be felt most acutely in small to mid-sized hotels that don’t enjoy the economies of scale that larger (200+ rooms) hotels enjoy (a situation that could lead to development of increasingly large hotels).

Proposed Motion

I. To support the passage of a City ordinance that phases in an increase to the minimum living wage of non-union hotel employees to $15.37/hour;

II. As a community bordered by two cities, SORONC further urges the City Council to incorporate appropriate protections for hotels under 200 rooms, particularly those within one mile of a bordering city that has not yet passed a comparable living wage ordinance;

III. To authorize SORONC to file a Community Impact Statement to that effect.

Considerations

Committee review: (highly recommended)  
Votes For: 0  
Against:

Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget: $
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The living wage ordinance could have a dramatic positive for thousands of hotel employees City-wide.</td>
<td>The overall economic impact involves serious trade-offs that may result in lost jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger chain hotels and hotels that don’t directly compete with hotels in other cities are more likely able to absorb the wage increases without laying off employees.</td>
<td>The goal should be to provide a living wage to the largest number of people possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Impact Statement
As adopted by vote of the full SORO NC governing board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes:</th>
<th>No:</th>
<th>Abstain:</th>
<th>Recuse:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date of vote: 17 July 2014

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports the passage of a Living Wage ordinance for hotel employees. As a community bordered by two cities, however, SORO NC strongly urges the City Council to amend the proposed ordinance to incorporate appropriate protections for hotels under 200 rooms, particularly those within one mile of a bordering city that has not yet passed a comparable living wage ordinance.

Submitted by: Name of approved SORO NC CIS submitter:
Doug Fitzsimmons
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REPORT relative to a proposed living wage for hotel workers in the City of Los Angeles.

Recommendations for Council action:

1. REQUEST the City Attorney to prepare and present a hotel living wage ordinance that includes:
   a. An effective date of July 1, 2015 for hotels with 300 or more rooms
   b. An effective date of July 1, 2016 for hotels with 125 or more rooms.
   c. A hardship exemption for hotels that have financial hardships, including benchmarks for determining what the exemption would be.
   d. A service charge protection clause.

2. INSTRUCT the City Administrative Officer's (CAO) Office of Economic Analysis and the Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA) to:
   a. Report with a comprehensive economic analysis of the proposed hotel living wage.
   b. Include in the report a review of the impact of the Long Beach Ordinance (Long Beach Measure N), the impact of the LAX Ordinance (Airport Hospitality Enhancement Zone, Los Angeles Municipal Code Article 4, Section 104), and any other precedents in which there has been a specific minimum wage within the hotel industry.
   c. Assess the hotel living wage Ordinances/precedents mentioned in Recommendation No. 2b above relative to the impacts on: job loss, investment in renovation to hotels, services provided by hotels, and reductions to hotel employee hours.
   d. Include in the economic analysis the appropriate size of the small hotel exemption.

Fiscal Impact Statement: The CLA/CAO reports there is no impact on the City General Fund associated with the action of requesting the City Attorney to prepare the ordinance.

Community Impact Statement: None submitted.

SUMMARY

At a regular meeting held on June 10, 2014, the Economic Development Committee considered joint reports from the CLA and CAO dated June 3, 2014 and June 6, 2014 relative to the impact of a proposed living wage for hotel employees at hotels with more than 100 rooms within the City of Los Angeles, as initiated by Motion (Bonin - Martinez - Price - Koretz - LaBonge). The Committee Chair opened the meeting by noting that poverty, unemployment and income
disparity continue to be roadblock to economic development, however a living wage for hotel workers would be a step towards solving these issues.

A representative of the CLA addressed the Committee and reported that at its meeting of February 25, 2014, the Committee requested that the public submit input on this issue, and that the CLA/CAO seek a consultant to evaluate the material and report back in 45 days. The CAO's Office of Economic Analysis selected Blue Sky Consulting Group (Consultant) through a competitive bid process to conduct the review. The Office of the CLA received three reports and seven comment letters from the public which the Consultant reviewed, along with other material on living wages provided by the CLA. The CLA/CAO report dated June 3, 2014 transmitted the Consultant's report.

A representative of the Consultant provided a brief overview of its report which basically concluded the following effects could result from adoption and implementation of an ordinance mandating a hotel living wage: 1) hotel workers would receive a wage increase raising their standard of living, 2) those hotel workers will spend more funds in the local economy benefitting local businesses and possibly local hiring, 3) some workers in the hotel industry will probably lose their their jobs since there are few ways for hotel owners to accommodate the wage increase without cutting staffing, 4) some hotels owners will look for other cost cutting measures thereby investing less in other things they would purchase in the local economy and deferring capital upgrades, 5) profits would be reduced for some hotels possibly leading to bankruptcy or other restructuring, and 6) downward pressure on future hotel development. The Consultant ultimately concluded that it is a tradeoff: hotel workers would benefit, but at a cost to other hotel workers and a reduction in hotel owner profits.

During extensive public comment, several owners of small hotels expressed their concerns about the proposed ordinance. They stated that many hotels in the 100-room range are family-owned that lack the economies of scale of the larger hotels and would be disproportionately affected by the proposed ordinance. Some hotel owners stated they would have to postpone planned renovations, or be forced to cut staff. A representative of a hotel trade group noted that hotels in the 100-room range would be at a competitive disadvantage to those hotels with less than 100 rooms that would not be affected by the proposed ordinance.

After public comment and further discussion, the Committee Chair acknowledged the concerns raised and that as a compromise to allow the proposed living wage for hotel employees to move forward, a phase-in policy would be incorporated to provide time for hotel owners to adjust to the new rules and regulations, as well as a provision for hotels facing financial hardship to seek relief from the ordinance. The Committee Chair moved to amend the recommendation in the CLA/CAO joint report to request the City Attorney to: prepare and present an ordinance to implement the hotel living wage in phases beginning July 1, 2015 for hotels with 300 or more rooms, and on July 1, 2016 for hotels with 125 or more rooms; to add a hardship waiver for hotels that have financial difficulties as well as benchmarks for determining what the exemption for this ordinance would be (similar to what was done in the LAX Ordinance); and, to include service charge protection.

The Committee Vice Chair noted that it would be prudent for an economic analysis to be performed to address the questions raised during the meeting regarding the proposed hotel living wage and requested that the CAO/CLA report with a comprehensive economic analysis of
the impacts of the Long Beach Beach Ordinance (Long Beach's 2012 Ballot Measure N), the LAX Ordinance (Airport Hospitality Enhancement Zone, Los Angeles Municipal Code Article 4, Section 104), the New York Ordinance (New York Hospitality Wage Order), and other precedents in which there has been a specific minimum wage within the hotel industry; and that these Ordinances/precedents be assessed as to impacts on hotels relative to investment in renovations, services provided, reductions to employee hours, and job loss.

The Committee then approved the recommendation in the CLA/CAO report to request the City Attorney to prepare and present an ordinance to implement a living wage for hotel workers as amended to also include a phased-in approach for the ordinance’s effective date based on hotel size, a hardship exemption for hotels, and service charge protection; and as amended to instruct the CAO/CLA to report back with an economic analysis of other similar ordinances. This matter is now forwarded to the Council for its consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRICE:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KREKORIAN:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUIZAR:</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDILLO:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTINEZ:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REW
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-NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL COUNCIL ACTS-
Motion for a Neighborhood Purposes Grant of $2000 for Castle Heights playground equipment

Agenda Item: GB071714-29
Date: July 17, 2014
Proposed By: Doug Fitzsimmons / Barry E. Levine

Full Proposal

As budgets are cut, funding for playground equipment has fallen to the bottom of the list and Castle Heights is struggling with the lack of playground equipment for our children. This proposal will fund playground equipment as detailed in the attached equipment list. Balls get lost over fences, punctured or become otherwise unusable. Playground equipment is essential to the well being of our children. It reduces stress, promotes physical activity, reduces obesity and in general makes our children healthier.

Proposed Motion

South Robertson Neighborhoods Council will fund $2000 in a Neighborhood Purpose Grant for the purchase of playground equipment for Castle Heights Elementary School.

Considerations

Committee review: Budget Committee
Voted For: 7
Against: 0
(highly recommended)

Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget:
$3669.30
(applies to funding motions only)

Arguments for:

This grant will improve the health of our most at risk community, children who are economically challenged

This grant will provide outreach to a large segment of our community.

Arguments against:

It uses money that could be used elsewhere and for other good causes

It only serves one group within SORONC
Neighborhood Council Funding Program
APPLICATION for Neighborhood Purposes Grant (NPG)

This form is to be completed by the applicant seeking the Neighborhood Purposes Grant and submitted to the Neighborhood Council from whom the grant is being sought. All applications for grants must be reviewed and approved in a public meeting. The Neighborhood Council, upon approval of the application, shall submit the approved application along with all required documentation to the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment.

Name of Neighborhood Council you are seeking the grant from: South Robertson Neighborhood Council

SECTION I - APPLICANT VERIFICATION INFORMATION

Friends of Castle Heights 95-3972768 CA 7-25-86

1A) Organization Name

Federal I.D. # (EIN#) State of Incorporation

1B) Organization Mailing Address

City State Zip Code

1C) Business Address (if different)

City State Zip Code

1D) Address of Affiliated Organization (if applicable)

Name and address of person designated to receive official/legal notices: Molly Kaplan

Name:

City State Zip Code

2) 3145 Shelby Drive

Street

City

State Zip Code

3) Type of Organization- Please select one: (Organizations must be located within the City of Los Angeles)

☐ Public School (not to include private schools) or ☑ 501(c)(3) Non-profits (other than religious institutions)

Attach Letterhead

Attach IRS Determination Letter

SECTION II - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

4) Please describe the Neighborhood Improvement Project for which the grant is intended.

Friends of Castle Heights would like to purchase playground equipment for Castle Heights School. New playground equipment has not been purchased for several years and with 560 kindergarten to 5th grade students using the same equipment it becomes worn out quickly.

5) How will this grant be used to primarily support or serve a non-discriminatory, public purpose and benefit the public at-large.

The playground equipment be used on campus only to serve all 560 students under the supervision of teachers and/or playground moderators.
SECTION II - PROJECT BUDGET OUTLINE: Please outline the project budget below.

6A) Personnel Related Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested of NC</th>
<th>Total Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6B) Non-Personnel Related Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested of NC</th>
<th>Total Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Is the implementation of this specific program or purpose described in box 4 above contingent on any other factors or sources of funding?  □ Yes, please describe below  ☒ No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Total Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) What is the TOTAL amount of the grant funding requested with this application?  $2,000 3%

9) What is the expected completion date?  8/28/2014 (mm/dd/yyyy) (required) (See attached)

SECTION IV - PROJECT PRIMARY AND SECONDARY CONTACT INFORMATION

Provide the name, telephone number, fax and e-mail address (if applicable) of the person(s) responsible for the funds and program(s) listed in Section II of this application.

10A) First Name                  Last Name
     Cassie Shaw                   M
     Telephone Number              Fax Number
     310-283-1120                  Email

10B) First Name                  Last Name
     Molly Kaplan                  M
     Telephone Number              Fax Number
     310-384-5082                  Email
     mdeitenkaplan@gmail.com

SECTION V - AFFILIATIONS

11) Is there a former or existing relationship between your organization and a NC board member?  □ Yes  ☒ No

11A) If yes, did you and/or the board member consult the Office of the City Attorney?  □ Yes  ☒ No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Relationship</th>
<th>Board Member Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: Former board member</td>
<td>So Conflicted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION VI - DECLARATION AND SIGNATURE

I hereby affirm that, to the best of my knowledge, the information provided herein and communicated otherwise is truly and accurately stated. I further affirm that I have read Appendix A, "What is a Public Benefit," and Appendix B "Conflicts of Interest" of this application and affirm that the proposed project(s) and/or program(s) fall within the criteria of a public benefit project/program and that no conflict of interest exist that would prevent the awarding of

Two signatures required

12A) Executive Director of Non-Profit Corporation or School Principal

Molly Kaplan
PRINT First Name/ Last Name
President
Title
Signature
Date

12B) Secretary of Non-Profit Corporation or Assistant School Principal

Anne Caputo
PRINT First Name/ Last Name
Secretary
Title
Signature
Date

SECTION VII - FOR DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD EMPOWERMENT USE ONLY

Date Received

Reviewer Name
Date Reviewed

Application: [ ] Complete [ ] Incomplete

REVIEWER'S NOTES

Date submitted to Funding Unit
Method: [ ] In-person [ ] E-mail [ ] Fax [ ] Inter-departmental mail

NPG #
Application: [ ] Complete [ ] Incomplete

Funding Unit Notes:

DONE Date Stamp Receipt
## CASTLE HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
### LAUSD K-5 Equipment List

**LAUSD Vendor ID:** Castle Heights ES  
**Date:** 4/21/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>089124-201</td>
<td>SOCCER BALL FOAM COATED</td>
<td>$ 4.99</td>
<td>$ 29.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Bean Bag</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sel/12</td>
<td>1295642-201</td>
<td>BEANBAGS VEGGIE TOSS AND FRUIT SALAD</td>
<td>$ 16.00</td>
<td>$ 48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>011307-201</td>
<td>BIN STORAGE BRUTE CONTAINER 44 GALLON</td>
<td>$ 45.77</td>
<td>$ 91.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Cone</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>008758-201</td>
<td>CONE YEL/LE RED/cone 12 inch</td>
<td>$ 4.16</td>
<td>$ 99.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Flying Disc</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sel/6</td>
<td>007386-201</td>
<td>FLYING DISC FOAM GRADESTUFF</td>
<td>$ 10.34</td>
<td>$ 51.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Hoops</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sel/12</td>
<td>026832-201</td>
<td>HOOPS DUR-O-HOOPS ASSORTED COLORS</td>
<td>$ 43.40</td>
<td>$ 130.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Whistle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>067923-201</td>
<td>WHISTLE METAL 1.75&quot; PACK OF 12</td>
<td>$ 3.28</td>
<td>$ 3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Fluffball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sel/36</td>
<td>016451-201</td>
<td>KIT FLUFFBALLS 50MM</td>
<td>$ 4.16</td>
<td>$ 4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>013330-201</td>
<td>MAT FOAM SUPER EXPAND-O 6 X 12 X 2 PANEL V2</td>
<td>$ 305.88</td>
<td>$ 611.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>012159-201</td>
<td>MAT FOAM SUPER EXPAND-O 4 X 8 X 2 PANEL V2</td>
<td>$ 120.00</td>
<td>$ 120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inflating Needles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Set/12</td>
<td>067922-201</td>
<td>INFLATING NEEDLES STD</td>
<td>$ 0.93</td>
<td>$ 0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kin Ball</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>027138-201</td>
<td>BALL ULTRA BALL 48&quot;</td>
<td>$ 52.52</td>
<td>$ 105.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kin Ball Inflator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>025191-201</td>
<td>Omninkin Inflator</td>
<td>$ 138.99</td>
<td>$ 138.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sel/6</td>
<td>016109-201</td>
<td>BALL BASKETBALL MEN'S CELLULAR RUBBER</td>
<td>$ 37.55</td>
<td>$ 112.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shuttlecock</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sel/6</td>
<td>1321596-201</td>
<td>SHUTTLECOCK CHAMPIONSHIP NYLON YELLOW</td>
<td>$ 7.64</td>
<td>$ 38.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport for All</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Set/48</td>
<td>1279643-201</td>
<td>CARDS SPORTPLAY</td>
<td>$ 8.03</td>
<td>$ 24.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport for All</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Set/48</td>
<td>1279644-201</td>
<td>CARDS SPORTSKILL BASIC</td>
<td>$ 8.03</td>
<td>$ 24.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stopwatch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Set/6</td>
<td>1012575-201</td>
<td>STOPWATCH TIMETRACKER BASIC</td>
<td>$ 13.86</td>
<td>$ 13.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>090025-201</td>
<td>NET VOLLEYBALL COMPETITION</td>
<td>$ 14.90</td>
<td>$ 44.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>021758-201</td>
<td>BALL VOLLEYBALL EZ STRIKER</td>
<td>$ 10.26</td>
<td>$ 102.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SHIPPING & HANDLING**

- **CONTINUOUS 48 STATES**
  - Parcel only shipping (7 & 9 prefix items)
  - With orders greater than $50 freight is included.
  - With orders under $50, freight is 15% of the order or $7.95 minimum, whichever is greater
- **HI, AK, & US TERRITORIES**
  - Parcel only shipping (7 & 9 prefix items)
  - 20% or $15 minimum charge, whichever is greater
- **Truck shipping (6 & 8 prefix items)**
  - Contact Program Consultant for quote
- **Special Delivery requests**
  - Contact Program Consultant for quote
- **Inside Delivery $45; Lift gate delivery $69**

**S & H**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAX</th>
<th>$ 160.94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 2,000.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Form W-9**

**Request for Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Give form to the requester. Do not send to the IRS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Part I**

**Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN)**

Enter your TIN in the appropriate box. The TIN provided must match the name given on Line 1 to avoid backup withholding. For individuals, this is your social security number (SSN). However, for a resident alien, sole proprietor, or disregarded entity, see the Part I instructions on page 3. For other entities, it is your employer identification number (EIN). If you do not have a number, see How to get a TIN on page 3.

**Note.** If the account is in more than one name, see the chart on page 4 for guidelines on whose number to enter.

**Part II**

**Certification**

Under penalties of perjury, I certify that:

1. The number shown on this form is my correct taxpayer identification number (or I am waiting for a number to be issued to me), and
2. I am not subject to backup withholding because: (a) I am exempt from backup withholding, or (b) I have not been notified by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) that I am subject to backup withholding as a result of a failure to report all interest or dividends, or (c) the IRS has notified me that I am no longer subject to backup withholding, and
3. I am a U.S. citizen or other U.S. person defined below.

**Certification Instructions.** You must cross out item 2 above if you have been notified by the IRS that you are currently subject to backup withholding because you have failed to report all interest and dividends on your tax return. For real estate transactions, item 2 does not apply. For mortgage interest paid, acquisition or abandonment of secured property, cancellation of debt, contributions to an individual retirement arrangement (IRA), and generally, payments other than interest and dividends, you are not required to sign the Certification, but you may provide your correct TIN. See the instructions on page 4.

**Sign Here**

Signature of U.S. person

Date

**General Instructions**

Section references are to the Internal Revenue Code unless otherwise noted.

**Purpose of Form**

A person who is required to file an information return with the IRS must obtain your correct taxpayer identification number (TIN) to report, for example, income paid to you, real estate transactions, mortgage interest you paid, acquisition or abandonment of secured property, cancellation of debt, or contributions you made to an IRA.

Use Form W-9 only if you are a U.S. person (including a resident alien), to provide your correct TIN to the person requesting it (the requester) and, when applicable, to:

1. Certify that the TIN you are giving is correct (or you are waiting for a number to be issued).
2. Certify that you are not subject to backup withholding.
3. Claim exemption from backup withholding if you are a U.S. exempt payee. If applicable, you are also certifying that as a U.S. person, your allocable share of any partnership income from a U.S. trade or business is not subject to the withholding tax on foreign partners' share of effectively connected income.

**Note.** If a requester gives you a form other than Form W-9 to request your TIN, you must use the requester's form if it is substantially similar to this Form W-9.

**Definition of a U.S. person.** For federal tax purposes, you are considered a U.S. person if you are:

- An individual who is a U.S. citizen or a U.S. resident alien,
- A partnership, corporation, company, or association created or organized in the United States or under the laws of the United States,
- An estate (other than a foreign estate), or
- A domestic trust (as defined in Regulations section 301.7701-7).

**Special rules for partnerships.** Partnerships that conduct a trade or business in the United States are generally required to pay a withholding tax on any foreign partners' share of income from such business. Further, in certain cases where a Form W-9 has not been received, a partnership is required to presume that a partner is a foreign person, and pay the withholding tax. Therefore, if you are a U.S. person that is a partner in a partnership conducting a trade or business in the United States, provide Form W-9 to the partnership to establish your U.S. status and avoid withholding on your share of partnership income.

The person who gives Form W-9 to the partnership for purposes of establishing its U.S. status and avoiding withholding on its allocable share of net income from the partnership conducting a trade or business in the United States is in the following cases:

- The U.S. owner of a disregarded entity and not the entity,
Internal Revenue Service
District Director
P O Box 486
LOS ANGELES, CA 90053-0486

Date: DEC. 16, 1987

FRIENDS OF CASTLE HEIGHTS
3755 CATTARAUGUS AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90034-0000

Employer Identification Numbers:
95-3972768
Case Number:
357256008
Contact Person:
MAI QUACH
Contact Telephone Number:
(213) 894-4170

Our Letter Dated:
July 25, 1986
Caveat Applies:
No

Dear Applicant:

This modifies our letter of the above date in which we stated that you would be treated as an organization which is not a private foundation until the expiration of your advance ruling period.

Based on the information you submitted, we have determined that you are not a private foundation within the meaning of section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, because you are an organization of the type described in section 501(c)(3) of the code is still in effect.

Grantees and contributors may rely on this determination until the Internal Revenue Service publishes notice to the contrary. However, a grantor or a contributor may not rely on this determination if he or she was in any way responsible for, or was aware of, the act of failure to act that resulted in your loss of section 501(c)(3) status, or acquired knowledge that the Internal Revenue Service had given notice that you would be removed from classification as a section 501(c)(3) organization.

Because this letter could help resolve any questions about your private foundation status, please keep it in your permanent records.

If the heading of this letter indicates that a caveat applies, the caveat below or on the enclosure is an integral part of this letter.

If you have any questions, please contact the person whose name and telephone number are shown above.

Sincerely yours,

Frederick C. Nielsen
District Director
Exemption Approval Notice

Based on the documents submitted by your organization, it appears the following business activity (ies) is exempt from payment of the business tax:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund/Class</th>
<th>Fund/Class Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L049</td>
<td>Professions/Occupations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the business activity(ies), purpose, or method of operation has changed, you are required to report any such changes immediately to the Office of Finance.

Furthermore, if the organization engages in other activity(ies) not listed above, the organization may be subject to a business tax under other sections of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. Also, be advised that this exemption does not cover police and/or fire permit(s) that may be required.

If you have any questions regarding this notice, please call 213-473-5901. For general business tax information visit our web site at finance.lacity.org.

Sincerely,
Office of Finance
Motion to support the addition of On-Site Instructional Tastings of Alcoholic Beverages via an ABC Type #86 License at 9616 W Pico BL Los Angeles, CA 90035

Agenda Item: GB071714-30  
Date: July 17, 2014  
Proposed By: Terrence Gomes

Full Proposal

To permit the addition of On-Site Instructional Tastings of Alcoholic Beverages via an ABC Type #86 License to an operating Ralphs Supermarket at 9616 W Pico BL Los Angeles, CA 90035 which is also permitted to sell a Full-Line of Alcohol via an ABC Type #21 License. Hours of instructional tastings will be limited to 10am to 9pm daily. Hours of operation and alcohol sales for the Supermarket will remain 6am to 1am daily.

The application was originally a new CUB, but City Planning allowed it to be filed as a Plan Approval. Similar process, however the noticing requirements are much different. A new CUB requires the full 500 foot noticing, whereas the Plan Approval only requires abutting properties. A copy of the abutting list is attached. The LUED Committee requested the applicant to follow the CUB requirements for community notification and to send a letter of proposal to the 500 foot radius.

The LUED Chair has also sent a letter via email to the ZA requesting that the hearing be continued for 30 days so that the LUED Committee can make a determination that no negative response were received from the community during the comment period.

Proposed Motion

I. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council support the ABC Type #86 License for Ralph’s at 9616 W Pico BL Los Angeles, CA 90035 with the following conditions:
   a. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council authorizes the LUED Committee at their August committee meeting to write a letter of support after review of the comments received after the close of the comment period if the comments received are favorable to the project. If a negative comment(s) is received during the comment period, the LUED committee will review the project based upon the negative comment(s) and forward those findings to the General Board for a review of the support for the project by the Board. The Board at that time will take a new vote to support/ not support the project based on the recommendations of the LUED committee.

Considerations

Committee review: (highly recommended)  
Votes For: 6  
Against: 1

Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget: n/a  
(appplies to funding motions only)
APPLICATION TO THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR FOR PLAN APPROVAL – ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

APPLICANT: RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY

PROPERTY: 9616 PICO BLVD.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90035

REFERENCE: PER LAMC 12.24-M, PLAN APPROVAL TO ADD ON-SITE INSTRUCTIONAL TASTINGS OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES (VIA AN ABC TYPE #86 LICENSE) IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE OPERATION OF AN EXISTING RALPHS SUPERMARKET. MARKET IS CURRENTLY LICENSED TO SELL A FULL-LINE OF ALCOHOL FOR OFF-SITE CONSUMPTION.

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

a. General Conditional Use

i. That the project will enhance the built environment in the surrounding neighborhood or will perform a function or provide a service that is essential or beneficial to the community, city, or region.

The proposed instructional tastings will occur within the long established Ralphs Supermarket. The on-site instructional tastings are not intended to be an event in itself, but an ancillary use to those patrons already frequenting the store for other purchases. The supermarket will continue to offer a large selection of meat, produce, dairy, beverages, etc. to their patrons.

ii. That the project’s location, size, height, operations and other significant features will be compatible with and will not adversely affect or further degrade the adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the public health, welfare, and safety.

The operating Ralphs Supermarket occupies an existing commercial building, and the physical components of the building (size, height, operation) blend with the nature of the area as the center offers goods and services to the surrounding neighborhood. The center itself is located on a commercially zoned parcel (C4-1VL-O) and designated Neighborhood Commercial under the General Plan Land Use designations. Should this application be granted, Ralphs will continue to coexist with the other uses in the vicinity. As such, the supermarket will not adversely affect or further degrade the adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the public health, welfare and safety.

iii. That the project substantially conforms with the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan, the applicable community plan, and any applicable specific plan.

The operating Ralphs supermarket substantially conforms to the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan. The General Plan promotes the provision of
services throughout the city in locations that are convenient to the public yet do not impact neighboring properties. The property is zoned for commercial use, C4-1VL-O and General Plan Land Use designated states it to be used for Neighborhood Commercial. A full-service supermarket is the type of use that offers a variety of services and goods to those residing, working and visiting the neighborhood. The addition of on-site instructional tastings will enhance the current operation, offering a more complete service to its patrons, while still conforming to the intent of the General plan.

b. Additional Findings

i. Explain how the approval of the application will not result in, or contribute to an undue concentration of such establishments.

The Ralphs supermarket currently holds a Type #21 ABC License. They are requesting the addition of a newly developed Type #86 License, which is strictly for on-site instructional tastings at established off-site retailers. The Type #86 License cannot be held on its own, but is only available to those establishments that currently hold off-site licenses. As such, the introduction of a new Type #86 license, will not detrimentally affect the area by contributing to the undue concentration of such establishments, as the main focus of the supermarkets alcohol sales will remain unchanged from the current operation.

Should this application be granted, Ralphs will continue to operate in a responsible and professional fashion and remain within the operating guidelines set by the Office of Zoning Administration and the Department of ABC.

iii. Explain how the approval of the application will not detrimentally affect nearby residential zones or uses.

A supermarket with alcohol sales has been operating in this location since at least 1979, and the proposed addition of on-site instructional tasting will not detrimentally affect the current arrangements. The facility directs a majority of operations towards Pico Blvd. and away from nearby residential properties. This was done in an effort to limit noise and disruptions that would normally affect those residents. Nonetheless, Ralphs will be operated in a professional manner and abide by all guidelines placed on it by the Office of Zoning Administration and the Department of ABC.

QUESTIONS REGARDING THE PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE

a. What is the total square footage of the building or center the establishment is located in?

The square footage of the buildings on-site is 82,959 s.f.

b. What is the total square footage of the space the establishment will occupy?
The establishment will be 44,996 s.f.

c. What is the total occupancy load of the space as determined by the Fire Department?

Exact occupancy load has not yet been determined.

d. What is the total number of seats that will be provided indoors? Outdoors?

There are a limited number of seats (both indoors and on the patio) on-site. However instructional tastings are the only on-site alcohol consumption proposed.

e. If there is an outdoor area, will there be an option to consume alcoholic outdoors.

There is an outdoor area, however no alcohol service or consumption is available there.

f. If there is an outdoor area, is it on private property or the public light of way, or both?

On private property.

i. If any outdoor area is on public right-of-way, has a revocable permit has been obtained?

N/A

g. Are you adding floor area?

No, no floor area is being added.

h. Parking

ii. How many parking spaces are available on the site?

There are 303 parking spaces on-site.

iii. Are they shared or designated for the subject use?

The parking spaces are for the use of the commercial center's tenants, the largest tenant being Ralphs.

iv. If you are adding floor area, what is the parking requirement as determined by the Department of Building & Safety?

N/A, no floor area is being added.

v. Have any arrangements been made to provide parking off-site?

No, off-site parking is not required.
1. If yes, is the parking secured via a private lease or a covenant/affidavit approved by the Department of Building & Safety?

N/A

2. Please provide a map showing the location of the off-site parking and the distance, in feet, for pedestrian travel between the parking area the use it is to serve.

N/A

3. Will valet service be available? Will the service be for a charge?

Valet service will not be offered.

i. Is the site within 1,000 feet of any schools (public private or nursery), churches, or parks?

There are seven sensitive uses within 600 feet of the project location:

- Mikvah Society of LA; 9548 W. Pico Blvd.
- Music Education Center; 9555 W. Pico Blvd.
- Young Shepardic Community Center; 9581 W. Pico Blvd.
- Sylvan Learning Center; 9618 W. Pico Blvd.
- Congregation Mogen David Synagogue; 9717 W. Pico Blvd.
- Congregation Mogen Religious School; 9717 1/2 W. Pico Blvd.
- Adas Torah; 1135 S. Beverly Blvd.

There is one sensitive use between 600 and 1,000 feet of the project location.
- Yeshiva of LA University High School; 9760 Pico Blvd.

j. For massage parlors and sexual encounter establishments, is the site within 1,000 feet of any other Adult Establishment as defined as LAMC 12.70 B17?

N/A.

QUESTIONS REGARDING THE OPERATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT

a. What are the proposed hours of operation and which days of the week will the establishment be open?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sa</th>
<th>Su</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Hours of Operation</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Hours of Alcohol Sales</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
<td>6am to 1am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Will there be entertainment such as a piano bar, dancing, live entertainment, movies, karaoke, video games machines, and etc.?

No entertainment is proposed.

c. Will there be minimum age requirements for entry? If yes, what is the minimum age requirement and how will it be enforced?

There is no minimum age requirement to enter the premises. However, all patrons who purchase alcohol must be at least 21 years old. Any patrons who look under the age of 30 will be asked to show valid identification upon purchase of any alcoholic beverages.

d. Will there be any accessory retail uses on the site?

There are retail uses on-site.

e. Security

i. How many employees will you have on the site at any given time?

There will be 5-20 employees on site at any given moment. Number of employees on site will be influenced in part by time of day, season and anticipated foot traffic.

ii. Will security guards be provided on-site? No private security guards will be provided.

iii. Has LAPD issued any citations or violations? No, the LAPD has not issued any citations.

f. Alcohol

i. Will there be beer & wine only, or a full-line of alcoholic beverages available?

A full-line of alcohol will be available.

ii. Will “fortified” wine (greater than 16% alcohol) be sold?

Specialty wines and beverages with greater than 16% alcohol may be sold. However cheap, fortified wines such as “Thunderbird” will not be sold.

iii. Will alcohol be consumed on any adjacent property under the control of the applicant?

Alcohol will not be consumed on any adjacent property.

iv. Will there be signs visible from the exterior -that advertise the availability of alcohol?
Some signage may be placed on the building advertising a particular special. However no neon signage advertising alcoholic beverages will be placed in the windows of the restaurant. The restaurant operator will abide by all regulations established by the Dept. of ABC, and the Office of Zoning Administration.

v. Food

1. Will there be a kitchen on the site?

A kitchen is located on-site.

2. Will alcohol be sold without a food order?

Yes, alcohol will be sold without the sale of food.

3. Will the sale of alcohol exceed the sale of food items on a quarterly basis?

Under the proposed business plan the sale of alcohol will not exceed the sale of food items on a quarterly basis.

4. Provide a copy of the menu if food is to be served.

N/A.

vi. On-Site

1. Will a bar or cocktail lounge be maintained incidental to a restaurant?

No. The only on-site consumption will be instructional tastings.

2. Will off-site sales of alcohol be provided accessory to on-site sales ("Take Out")?

The store is currently granted the right to off-site sales, which will be continued.

3. Will discounted alcoholic drinks ("Happy Hour") be offered at any time?

No happy hour with discounted drinks is being requested.

vii. Off-Site

1. Will cups, glasses or other containers be sold which might be used for the consumption of alcohol on the premises?

No containers will be sold for the purpose of consumption of alcohol on an adjacent property.
2. Will beer or wine coolers be sold in single cans, or will wine be sold in containers less than 1 liter (750 ml)?

Instructional tastings will occur in single servings as pre-determined by the ABC Type #86 License.

viii. Contact the CA Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) regarding its requirements – http://abc.ca.gov

5. Caldera Bill (CA Business and Professions Code Section 23958 and 23958.4)

a. Is this application a request for on-site or off-site sales of alcoholic beverages?

This request is for on-site instructional tastings of alcoholic beverages.

i. If yes, is the establishment a bona-fide eating place (restaurant) or hotel/motel?

No.

1. If no, contact the CA Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) to determine whether the proposed site is located in an area whereby:

a. Issuance of a license to serve alcohol on-site or off-site would tend to create a law enforcement problem, or

b. If issuance would result in, or add to an undue concentration of licenses.
Motion to fund up $900 for SORO NC business cards

Agenda Item: GB071714-31  
Date: 17 July 2014  
Proposed By: Doug Fitzsimmons

Full Proposal

LA City business cards help identify us as official City representatives. In this proposal, all new Board members, returning Board members who are running low or whose card is out of date would receive a set of 200. The paper is recycled. Last time we ordered, each set was $33.50; the proposal would fund 25 sets of cards ($837.50, assuming the price hasn't increased). The motion also includes a small contingency for unforeseen press costs, tax, etc.—although since it is up to $900, we are not committed to spend the full amount.

The cards themselves will include the SORO NC logo in green. The cards also include the member's contact info, seat, and major SORO office/chair held.

While we may be able to find cheaper alternatives, cards printed by the City's General Services Department have the advantage of an engraved and embossed City seal and union label (and streamlined inter-departmental billing): this is clearly an official City of LA card.

On the other hand, if we go with an outside vendor and skipped the engraving and embossing (using, say, morningprint.com), we could design the card any way we want, have a full-color back with our logo, and still be $10 cheaper per set.

Since it's helpful for committee chairs to have identifying cards, the order will be placed once the new chairs are appointed.

Proposed Motion

I. To approve up to $900 for the printing of business cards for SORO NC Board members.

Considerations

Committee review: (highly recommended)  
Votes For: 0  
Against: 0

Amount previously allocated in Committee's working budget: $0  
(appplies to funding motions only)

Arguments for:  
Helps Board members identify themselves to the community and reinforces that the NC is an official City entity.

Arguments against:  
Cost. And it is $150 more than budgeted.
Motion to approve an interim 2014 strategic plan and outreach survey for the NC budget approval process

Agenda Item: GB071714-32
Date: 17 July 2014
Proposed By: Doug Fitzsimmons

Full Proposal
The Department of Neighborhood Empowerment (DONE) requires that each NC submit a strategic plan and complete an outreach survey as part of the budget approval process.

Proposed Motion
I. To approve the attached NC strategic plan to complete our fiscal year 2014-15 budget packet.

II. To approve the attached Outreach Survey for the same purpose.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review:</th>
<th>Votes For: 3</th>
<th>Against: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(highly recommended)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget:</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(applies to funding motions only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arguments for: Arguments against:

It is unlikely that we’d be able to schedule a retreat before the budget deadline. The strategic plan should be the result of considered discussion at a Board retreat.

This is for budget approval purposes. We can always develop a full strategic plan at a later date. This is not ideal.
Neighborhood Council Strategic Plan for Fiscal Year 2014-2015

Neighborhood Council Name: South Robertson Neighborhoods Council

The BIG Vision: A clear statement of what you will do to fulfill your mission in the upcoming year. Imagine a year from now, when the headline in your local paper when the headline in your local paper announces your success, what do you want the headline to say? Vision should be consistent with the City Charter mandate “To promote more citizen participation in government and make government more responsive to local needs.”

Example: The XXNC wins the EmpowerLA Aware for Outreach! Or Neighborhood Council draws more voters than Citywide Municipal race!

The BIG Goals: Break the Vision down into achievable goals that are steps in fulfilling your vision. New for this year – Two of your BIG Goals must include how your Neighborhood Council will outreach to your stakeholders.

Example:
1) Develop and Implement a digital presence that includes upgrading the website, incorporating an online calendar, complementing it with a social media strategy, and supporting it all with an email newsletter.
2) Development and Distribute print materials, including business cards, brochures, and resource guides, that promote the Neighborhood Council and connect with stakeholders.
3) Survey the community and establish partnerships with other community organizations such as service providers, volunteer groups, and neighborhood watches, in order to share networks.
4) Participate in public events, implementing a booth strategy that engages stakeholders.

The BIG Solutions: Anticipate the challenges or obstacles that you will encounter and incorporate the solutions in your plan.

Example:
1) We’re not tech savvy so where do we go? Solution - Survey the surrounding Neighborhood Councils and share strategies with other successful councils.
2) We don’t know the other organizations and groups. Solution - Find the people that do and enlist their support (real estate agents, non-profits, Council office, local principal, etc.)
3) Look at the tools in our Outreach Plan template. What tools do you have and what would like to have?
4) These things cost money! Solution - Break it down and budget for your goals. Budget for the outreach materials that are part of your booth strategy and also the tools for public events (canopy, table, outreach materials, etc.)

The BIG Budget: Use the Neighborhood Council Budget template to help you categorize your expenditures based on your vision, goal and solutions.

1) Outreach $14,115
2) Operations $3,030 (excluding recurring expenses)
3) Neighborhood Purpose Grants (NPGs) $7,500
4) Neighborhood Improvements $7,500
5) Recurring Monthly Expenditures $4,885
6) Selection $ (add this in if your Neighborhood Council is having a selection this year)
The Neighborhood Council yearly allocation for Fiscal Year 2014/2015 is $37,000. While there are no set criteria for how much a Neighborhood Council should spend in each area, remember that the mission for Neighborhood Councils: “increase citizen participation and make government more responsible to local needs.” Are your funding expenditures doing that? While you can give NPGs out to the community, don’t forget to set aside funds to increase community awareness of what is going on with City electeds and departments so you can bring community members’ concerns back to the City government.

Remember - Budgets can always be adjusted during the year with a Board vote so changes are easily made if necessary. Also, unless you’ve planned a big project, don’t wait until the last month of the fiscal year to frantically spend down the funds. The strategic plan is to help your Neighborhood Council see when and where funds should be spent the entire year.

The BIG Score: Measure your progress and your final performance with these performance metrics. Evaluate your journey based on results that are specific, measurable and meaningful!

Example:
1) Website - measure traffic and set a specific goal number to increase traffic to your website
2) Contacts - count the # of people on your email distribution and set a specific goal number to increase your contacts
3) Meetings - look at the crowd and count your stakeholders and set a specific goal number to increase the crowd
4) Public Events - how many do you do and what is the result. Set a special goal number to increase your public events
5) Partners - make a list of organizations in your network and set a specific goal number to increase your partners

New for the Big Score for Fiscal Year 2014-2015 – include these citywide performance metrics measures for Neighborhood Councils so we can see Neighborhood Councils Big Impact on Los Angeles! Remember set specific, measurable and meaningful goals.

1) Community Impact Statements – Our Neighborhood Council will file _5_ (insert a number) Community Impact Statements this year.
2) Requests for Action – Our Neighborhood Council will file _6_ (insert a number) Request for Action to our elected and City departments this year. This number should not include Community Impact Statements.
3) Meetings – Our Neighborhood Council will conduct _12-14_ (insert a number) general board meetings and _75+_ committee meetings this year. You can specify the type of committee meetings, too!
4) Collaborations – Our Neighborhood Council will collaborate on _3_ (insert a number) events with _2_ Electeds, _3_ City Departments, _3_ Community Organizations or Non-profits and _4_ Schools. You can be more specific and name the collaborators, too!
5) Stakeholders – Our Neighborhood Council will increase our stakeholder database from _500_ to _600_ this year.
6) Communication – Our Neighborhood Councils will contact our stakeholders □ _4_ times every □ month □ year about what’s going on with the Neighborhood Council and the City.

A year from now, ask the same questions and count the same measurables and evaluate your success. We’ll be following up, too, to see how you did.

The BIG Reminder: Align your behavior with your Vision. Everything you do should be advancing you toward your Vision. If something you are doing is not aligned, it is a potential obstacle or challenge that will interfere with your goals.

At every turn, ask “Does this promote more citizen participation in government and make government more responsive to local needs.” If the answer is yes, then you are bringing your Vision to life!
Strategic Plan 2014-15

The Big Vision
To build SORO into a neighborhood recognized for its strong and inclusive community spirit; safe, walkable, tree-lined streets; and vibrant business districts.

The Big Goals
1) To constantly improve our ability to reach stakeholders
2) To reinforce SORO identity via permanent SORO NC street medallions.
3) To increase our policy advocacy and presence in City Hall.
4) To develop and seek additional funds for a transportation plan for our arterial streets to channel traffic flow and maximize walkability and commercial attractiveness.
5) To foster a healthy, co-operative business community and encourage new businesses.
6) To provide increased services and guidance to the SORO LGBT community.
7) To guide the redevelopment process at Robertson Recreation Center.
8) To plant additional trees in the neighborhood.
9) To establish a shared neighborhood garden to complement the Hamilton Teaching Garden.
10) To increase overall safety within SORO.
11) To better educate our residents on first aid and emergency response procedures.
12) To support our schools via healthy food initiatives, policy advocacy, and mentorship programs.

The Big Solutions
1) Outreach:
   a. Complete planned upgrades to the SORO NC website to make it easier to use and mobile-friendly.
   b. Better distribute communication/publishing duties to increase our ability to share information with the public.
   c. Increase our Facebook ad spend to reach stakeholders who are unaware of the NC.
   d. Secure additional funding from the Council offices for the medallion program.
   e. Expand outreach efforts for community events, including the annual SoRo Festival
2) Transportation planning:
   a. Work with the Council offices and City departments to find additional funds for traffic projects.
   b. Participate in early planning of 10 Freeway ramp reconfiguration.
3) Business development:
   a. Revitalize the SOROCARD program. Spin off website?
   b. Hold gatherings of local business leaders.
   c. Research and find funding for improved trash cans on major streets.
   d. Research and find funding for lighting trees along Robertson.
4) Green team:
   a. Find partner to help with tree procurement/planning.
   b. Find location and funding for the neighborhood garden
5) Public Safety:
   a. Expand neighborhood watch programs.
   b. Help Neighborhood Associations to offer group security services.
   c. Sponsor training courses in first aid and emergency preparedness.
   d. Work with LAPD to better communicate community concerns and LAPD efforts.
6) Community services:
   a. Work to establish an LGBT Community Center within SORO.
   b. Participate in Robertson Rec Center planning and help establish a private development fund.

The Big Score
1) Website: increase overall traffic by 10% with the majority of new visitors coming via mobile.
2) Contacts: increase the number of contacts on Facebook by 25% and in our email database by 20%
3) Meetings: increase attendance at meetings by 10%
4) Public Events: increase attendance at the SoRo Festival by 5%; Movies In the Park by 10%; Peace Picnic by 5%
Neighborhood Council Outreach Survey for Fiscal Year 2014-2015

Neighborhood Council Name: South Robertson Neighborhoods Council

☐ No changes from Fiscal Year 2013-2014 ☑ Yes, see changes below.

Name and contact for your Outreach Committee Chair: Marjan Safinia and Beth Ryan

Email outreachchair@soronc.org Phone 310-295-9920

Digital Tools:

Does your Council have: a website? ☑ yes ☐ no
If yes, please give us your website address: http://soronc.org
if so, does it link to EmpowerLA? ☑ yes ☐ no

Does your Council have: a Facebook Account? ☑ yes ☐ no
If yes, please give us your Facebook url: http://facebook.com/soronc
if so, do you utilize the events feature? ☑ yes ☐ no

Does your Council have: a Twitter Account? ☑ yes ☐ no
If yes, please give us your Twitter url: http://twitter.com/soronc
Do you utilize hashtags with Twitter? ☑ yes ☐ no
If yes, what hashtags does your Council use for Twitter? #sorosafety, #soroplans, #soroevents, #soromoves, etc.

Does your Council have: a YouTube Account? ☑ yes ☐ no
If yes, please give us your YouTube URL: http://youtube.com/soronc
if so, do you create Council videos? ☑ yes ☐ no

Does your Council have: a database of Stakeholders? ☑ yes ☐ no
an email newsletter campaign? ☑ yes ☐ no
an email newsletter service? ☑ yes ☐ no
if so, what company? MailChimp

Does your Council have: a virtual phone line? ☑ yes ☐ no
if so, what company? Vonage

Does your Council have: a virtual fax line? ☑ yes ☐ no
if so, what company? eFax
Neighborhood Council Outreach Survey

Print Materials:

Does your Council have: business cards for Boardmembers?\(\text{yes}\)/\(\text{no}\)
 business cards with general information? yes / no
 a print newsletter campaign? yes / no
 a brochure? yes / no

Does your Council have: letterhead? yes / no
templates for newsletters, brochures, flyers? yes / no
branded materials (frig magnets, bookmarks,...) yes / no
If Yes, please list branded materials: pens, pocket flashlights, reusable shopping bags, license plate holders

Calendar:

Does your Council use: an online Calendar? yes / no
If yes, what Calendar service do you use? developed in-house (Drupal platform)

Does your Council use: Community Bulletin Boards? yes / no

Partners:

Does your Council maintain working relationships with other organizations? (CPAB, Homeowners and Residential Associations, Chambers of Commerce, Library, Local Parent/Teacher Associations, Cultural Organizations, Community Theatre, Churches/Synagogues, Social Services/Food Banks, Historical Associations,...) yes / no
If so, what are the organizations? All of the above except Chambers of Commerce and Historical Associations

Media:

Does your Council have: Local Media Contacts? yes / no
 Press Release Templates? yes / no
 a media strategy? yes / no
Contacts with local print media? yes / no
Contacts with local digital media? yes / no
a local media advertising strategy? yes / no

Street Presence:

Does your Council advertise: Bus Stop Shelters yes / no
Bus Benches yes / no
Street Light Banners yes / no
Sanitation Trucks yes / no
A-Frames yes / no
Yard Signs yes / no

What is your Council’s most effective tool for engaging the public and keeping them informed?
Targeted Facebook ads, Facebook posts, Email, Yard signs, Community events

What is your Council’s greatest opportunity for improving its outreach and for reaching the public and engaging them in the Neighborhood Council’s activities?
Increasing our Facebook ad spend
Support of AB 2222 to replace SB 1818 Bonus Density Law

**Agenda Item:** GB071714-33
**Date:** July 17, 2014
**Proposed By:** Terrence Gomes

AB 2222 would change the current law under SB 1818 to maintain adequate and affordable housing in the SORO community.

**Full Proposal**

South Robertson Neighborhoods Council to write a letter of support to our State of California Representatives to support AB 2222.

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports AB 2222 that would change the current law under SB 1818. Adequate and affordable housing is an issue of statewide concern. Yet, the change made to the density bonus law by SB 1818 had the reverse effect and has resulted in fewer affordable units that were built pre-SB 1818 that were proposed to be demolished and replaced may now qualify for a density bonus under the new SB 1818 structure. SB 1818 inadvertently created a loophole whereby developers that proposed to demolish pre-SB 1818 buildings are not required to begin the new project with the same number of affordable units. As a result, a new project may result in less affordable units than previously existed on the parcel. This bill addresses the loophole created by SB 1818 and ensures that affordable units are preserved when a development proposes to demolish a site and the new proposal is to replace the outdated structure with a new residential structure by ensuring that the project begins with the same number of affordable units. Additionally, this bill increases the classification of affordability from 30 years to 55 years. This change is consistent with other state and local programs and ensures that affordable units remain affordable. AB 2222 will preserve and promote the supply of affordable units for years to come. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council requests for your support on behalf of AB 2222 to improve quality of life and to close the loophole created by SB 1818.

- http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/13-14/bill/asm/ab_2201-2250/ab_2222_cfa_20140506_131240_asm_comm.html

**Proposed Motion**

I. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council moves to support AB 2222

II. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council moves to submit letters for the support of AB 2222.

**Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increases the amount of affordable housing in the State of California.</td>
<td>May increase costs to developers to comply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for a diverse community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

South Robertson Neighborhoods Council
PO Box 35836
Los Angeles, CA 90035

P: (310) 295-9920
F: (310) 295-9906
E: info@soronc.org

soronc.org
Council President Herb Wesson  
200 North Spring Street  
Room 430  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  

July 17, 2014  

Council President Wesson,  

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports AB 2222 that would change the current law under SB 1818. Adequate and affordable housing is an issue of statewide concern. Yet, the change made to the density bonus law by SB 1818 had the reverse effect and has resulted in fewer affordable units that were built pre-SB 1818 that were proposed to be demolished and replaced may now qualify for a density bonus under the new SB 1818 structure. SB 1818 inadvertently created a loophole whereby developers that proposed to demolish pre-SB 1818 buildings are not required to begin the new project with the same number of affordable units. As a result, a new project may result in less affordable units than previously existed on the parcel. This bill addresses the loophole created by SB 1818 and ensures that affordable units are preserved when a development proposes to demolish a site and the new proposal is to replace the outdated structure with a new residential structure by ensuring that the project begins with the same number of affordable units. Additionally, this bill increases the classification of affordability from 30 years to 55 years. This change is consistent with other state and local programs and ensures that affordable units remain affordable. AB 2222 will preserve and promote the supply of affordable units for years to come. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council requests for your support on behalf of AB 2222 to improve quality of life and to close the loophole created by SB 1818.  

Sincerely,  

Terrence Gomes  
Land Use Chair  
City of Los Angeles  
South Robertson Neighborhoods Council
Support of CF 13-1478 Small Lot Subdivision ordinance

Agenda Item: GB071714-34
Date: July 17, 2014
Proposed By: Terrence Gomes

CF 13-1478 requires the Department of City Planning and City Attorney to evaluate the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance and to revise the Ordinance to ensure that future Small Lot Subdivisions are compatible with the neighborhood.

Full Proposal

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports the CF 13-1478 Motion (LaBonge - Krekorian) relative to the Department of City Planning and City Attorney to evaluate the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance and to revise the Ordinance to ensure that future Small Lot Subdivisions are compatible with the neighborhood. We request the following items to be addressed to improve the quality of life in the community affected:

1. requiring front setbacks on all projects
2. restricting the height in relation to the surrounding properties
3. requiring private trash collection
4. no roof top decks because of noise and privacy concerns
5. making front setbacks mandatory
6. applying the same rules for apartment buildings including increased setbacks with increased height, mandatory open space, guest parking, common trash collection, and common area upkeep.
7. turning the guidelines into an enforceable ordinance
8. requiring maintenance agreements for the common areas including driveways, walkways, and landscape.

Proposed Motion

I. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council moves to support CF 13-1478

II. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council moves to submit a CIS for the support of CF 14-1478.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This will allow Small Lot Subdivisions to fit the character of the neighborhood.</td>
<td>May increase costs to developers to comply.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will cause the guidelines to become an ordinance.

Board Notes

Votes For: Against: Abstain:
Community Impact Statement- CF 13-1478

On July 17, 2014 at a Brown Act compliant meet, the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council voted to support CF 13-1478

Yes  No  Abstention

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports the CF 13-1478 Motion (LaBonge - Krekorian) relative to the Department of City Planning and City Attorney to evaluate the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance and to revise the Ordinance to ensure that future Small Lot Subdivisions are compatible with the neighborhood. We request the following items to be addressed to improve the quality of life in the community affected:

1. - requiring front setbacks on all projects
2. - restricting the height in relation to the surrounding properties
3. - requiring private trash collection
4. - no roof top decks because of noise and privacy concerns
5. - making front setbacks mandatory
6. - applying the same rules for apartment buildings including increased setbacks with increased height, mandatory open space, guest parking, common trash collection, and common area upkeep.
7. - turning the guidelines into an enforceable ordinance
8. - requiring maintenance agreements for the common areas including driveways, walkways, and landscape.

Doug Fitzsimmons
President
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Vice-President
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Secretary
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