Motion to Recommend a Redesigned Website for the Office of Sustainability to Increase Accountability and Usefulness.

Agenda Item: GB112014-2
Date: November 20, 2014
Proposed By: Green Team

Full Proposal

Matt Petersen, Mayor Eric Garcetti’s Chief Sustainability Officer has asked Los Angeles stakeholders for input on how to develop environmental initiatives to create a healthier city with cleaner water, air, and strategies to combat climate change.

Petersen is former CEO of Global Green and his Deputy, Ted Bardacke is a former Prof. at UCLA’s Luskin School of Urban Planning. Between them, they have the expertise, contacts, and the experience to develop an intelligent, well-researched, realistic plan which they promise to present by the end of 2014. They also stated publicly that the plan will include measurable goals and targets, and innovative programs with realistic funding.

What has been left out of their public discussion is the importance of communicating the Sustainability Plan to the public via their website, and how and when and by whom and if, their progress will be monitored.

The current website for the City of LA Office of Sustainability is a disorganized, confusing mix of past, current, and projected programs, permitting offices, and recommendations to LA residents on best environmental practices. It did not publish the last mayor’s “Sustainability Plan,” nor did it publish its final Report Card.

http://environmentla.org/ead_sustainability.htm

By comparison, the website for the City of Santa Monica’s Office of Sustainability publishes current and past Sustainability Plans, Progress Reports, and Final Report Cards with easily understandable grades (A, B, C). It has clear divisions covered in The Plan (Education, Energy, Green Building, Hazardous Materials) and which city departments are involved.

http://www.smgov.net/departments/ose/categories/sustainability.aspx

A second website deals with stakeholder best practices, and what’s going on in the community. A resident can find directions to hazardous waste drop off centers or advice on how to plant a drought tolerant garden with liberally illustrated options and links to more ideas.

http://www.smgov.net/departments/ose/

Important: save as a Word .doc file (not PDF) and email it to the NC President. By the way, the stuff at the bottom is in a table. It’s easier to use if you turn on Gridlines (under the Table menu).
If you're asking for the Board to send a letter, you should also include the actual letter language in the proposal or as a separate attachment.

**Proposed Motion**

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council has confidence that the new appointees to the Los Angeles Office of Sustainability, Matt Petersen and his Deputy, Ted Bardacke, will develop an intelligent, well-researched, realistic Sustainability Plan by the end of 2014 and that this Plan will contain measurable goals and targets by which to assess progress, and innovative programs with realistic funding.

It is our wish that the Office of Sustainability redesign its website. The website should include the current and past Sustainability Plans for Los Angeles, yearly Progress Reports and current and past Final Report Cards. Progress Reports and Final Report Cards should be assessed by independent, outside experts selected by The Board of Public Works Commission. The Final Report Card should be published with easily understandable grades, prior to the mayor’s last 4 months in office,

For clarity and ease of access to information, the redesigned website should clearly separate the City of Los Angeles’ Plans and Report Cards, from the services and information which the City provides to stakeholders interested in how they can do their part to move the city toward its environmental goals.

---

**Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review:</th>
<th>Votes For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(highly recommended)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability keeps departments focused on achieving goals</td>
<td>Independent outside experts cost money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a website with past and current Sustainability Plans becomes a good reference for successive administrations</td>
<td>Inflexible goals do not always adapt to changing conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a stakeholder-friendly website with information on environmental practices will help LA reach its sustainable goals</td>
<td>There is the possibility that independent bodies have a political agenda which can influence report cards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent bodies add another layer of bureaucracy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Los Angeles Board of Public Works Commissioners  
c/o Kevin James  
200 North Spring Street, Rm. 361  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-4801  
Mail Stop 464  

20 November 2014  

Dear Mr. James,

The Board of the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council has confidence that the new appointees to the Los Angeles Office of Sustainability, Matt Petersen and his Deputy, Ted Bardacke, will develop an intelligent, well-researched, realistic Sustainability Plan by the end of 2014 and that this Plan will contain measurable goals and targets by which to assess progress, and innovative programs with realistic funding.

It is our wish that the Office of Sustainability redesign its website. The website should include the current and past Sustainability Plans for Los Angeles, yearly Progress Reports and current and past Final Report Cards. Progress Reports and Final Report Cards should be assessed by independent, outside experts selected by The Board of Public Works Commission. The Final Report Card should be published with easily understandable grades, prior to the mayor’s last four months in office.

For clarity and ease of access to information, the redesigned website should clearly separate the City of Los Angeles’ Plans and Report Cards, from the services and information which the City provides to stakeholders interested in how they can do their part to move the city toward its environmental goals. We cite two websites for the City of Santa Monica, either one as a more appropriate, user-friendly model:

- [http://www.smgov.net/departments/ose/](http://www.smgov.net/departments/ose/) (Preferred, but instead of a menu heading of “Documents” it should read “Report Cards.”)
- [http://www.smgov.net/departments/ose/categories/sustainability.aspx](http://www.smgov.net/departments/ose/categories/sustainability.aspx)

Yours truly,

Doug Fitzsimmons  
President, South Robertson Neighborhoods Council

cc: Matt Petersen, Chief Sustainability Officer, Office of Sustainability  
Ted Bardacke, Deputy Director, Office of Sustainability

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
Motion to Support a Comprehensive Transit/Transportation Link to LAX

Agenda Item: GB112014-3
Date: 20 November 2014
Proposed By: Jon Liberman

Full Proposal

CD11 Transportation Advisory Committee is a group of Regional Westside Neighborhood Councils. They have asked Soro NC to consider this motion and support it if possible. The Soro NC Transportation Committee met on September 23 and unanimously voted to forward the motion to the Soro Board with a favorable recommendation.

A draft of the letter of support will be provided prior to our Board meeting.

Proposed Motion

Whereas, the LAX City Bus Center must be relocated due to the construction of the Intermodal Transit Facility, the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports a remote access plan to best connect LAX to the City of Los Angeles, the County of Los Angeles and the Southern California region, which:

I. Relocates an upgraded LAX City Bus Center to either the future Intermodal Transit Facility at 96th/Airport or the future Metro Rail station at 96th/Aviation to best accommodate Westside and San Fernando Valley commuters, and

II. Explores, prioritizes and funds a South Bay Green Line Extension, and

III. Funds two Major Investment Studies for Green Line Extensions to both the Westside and the Norwalk Metrolink Stations.

Considerations

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

Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget: $0-
(applies to funding motions only)

Arguments for:

First argument in favor. We have been asked to provide our input on extending the Metro Light Rail System to provide easy access to and from the airport.

Second argument in favor. A comprehensive Light Rail system would take traffic off of our roads.

Arguments against:

First argument against the motion. Cost
Support for Two Metro Stations at LAX

Agenda Item: GB112014-4
Date: 20 November 2014
Proposed By: Jon Liberman

Full Proposal
CD11 Transportation Advisory Committee is a group of Regional Westside Neighborhood Councils. They have asked Soro NC to consider this motion and support it if possible. The Soro NC Transportation Committee met on September 23 and unanimously voted to forward the motion to the Soro Board with a favorable recommendation.

A draft of the letter of support will be provided prior to our Board meeting.

Proposed Motion
Support of Century/Aviation and 96th/Aviation Metro Station Alternatives

South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports the CD 11 Traffic Advisory Committee Motion regarding the location of Metro Stations adjacent to Los Angeles World Airport. The CD11 motion adapted for Soro NC reads as follows:

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports the Metro Board-approved plan to have two airport-adjacent rail stations at both Century/Aviation and 96th/Aviation streets:

1) To fulfill the transportation, mobility and economic needs of the Century Blvd. corridor, and

2) To provide optimal future access via a LA World Airports People Mover rail line to connect to both the Consolidated Rental Car Facility and the Central Airport Terminals.

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

Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget: $0

Arguments for: Arguments against:
First argument in favor. We have been asked to provide our input on a transportation facility that will impact West Los Angeles traffic. First argument against the motion. Two stations would increase the cost of the project.

Second argument in favor. Soro residents would benefit from a strategic addition to Los Angeles Light Rail system.
Support for a Pedestrian Friendly People Mover/Central Airport Terminal Link

Agenda Item: GB112014-5
Date: 20 November 2014
Proposed By: Jon Liberman

Full Proposal

CD11 Transportation Advisory Committee is a group of Regional Westside Neighborhood Councils. They have asked Soro NC to consider this motion and support it if possible. The Soro NC Transportation Committee met on September 23 and unanimously voted to forward the motion to the Soro Board with a favorable recommendation.

A draft of the letter of support will be provided prior to our Board meeting.

Proposed Motion

South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports the CD 11 Traffic Advisory Committee Motion regarding a People Mover/Central Airport Terminal Link for LAX. The CD11 motion adapted for Soro NC reads as follows:

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports any comprehensive, pedestrian friendly LAX plan that includes People Mover station location and design, as well as moving walkways, to best encourage convenient and rapid access from the future People Mover rail line to the terminals at LAX. Such design needs to accommodate both pedestrians and disabled travelers.

Considerations

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

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

Arguments for:

First argument in favor. We have been asked to provide our input on a transportation facility that will impact LAX.

Second argument in favor. Soro residents would benefit from this People Mover.

Arguments against:

First argument against the motion. Cost

Second Argument against the motion. Until the Airport comes up with preliminary designs this motion supports a concept and we all know that the devil is in the details.
Support for a Comprehensive Transit Access Plan for the Airports LAX Northside Development

Agenda Item: GB112014-6
Date: 20 November 2014
Proposed By: Jon Liberman

Full Proposal

CD11 Transportation Advisory Committee is a group of Regional Westside Neighborhood Councils. They have asked Soro NC to consider this motion and support it if possible. The Soro NC Transportation Committee met on September 23 and unanimously voted to forward the motion to the Soro Board with a favorable recommendation.

A draft of the letter of support will be provided prior to our Board meeting.

Proposed Motion

South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports the CD 11 Traffic Advisory Committee Motion regarding a comprehensive transit access plan for the Airports LAX Northside development. The CD11 motion adapted for Soro NC reads as follows:

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council, without taking a position now as to the proposed LAX Northside development, requests that the Los Angeles World Airport develop a comprehensive public transit access plan for the LAX Northside development. Because of the scale of this project, the thousands of new trips it will generate, the site’s isolation from existing transit services and the need to provide alternatives to private auto use, it is imperative that this project be required to utilize best practices for assuring that employees, customers and visitors have viable, convenient “last mile” access from local transit to all parts of the proposed project. Such a plan would:

I. Provide shuttle service or a new bus line to connect all areas of the project to existing and planned future transit stops and stations, with service operating frequent and late enough to be viable to employees and visitors, even those working late.

II. Assure that future bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to surrounding neighborhoods and Manchester Blvd. bus stops is not prevented by the plan design, even if such linkages are not enabled at the present time due to current preferences.

III. Incorporate a paved portion of multi-use path along the entire length of the proposed Paseo to accommodate cyclists who need an off-road alternative to the bike lanes on Westchester Parkway, as well as to facilitate use of the Paseo by wheelchairs, baby strollers, push scooters, and skaters. This could serve as an important feeder to the anticipated Light Rail Transit station at the eastern end of the project.
## Considerations

### Committee review:

(Votes For: 0 Against:)

(very highly recommended)

### Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget:

(Applies to funding motions only)

$0$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First argument in favor. We have been asked to provide our input on planning for mitigation of transportation increases that will impact West Los Angeles traffic.</td>
<td>First argument against the motion. Until the Airport comes up with preliminary designs this motion supports a concept and we all know that the devil is in the details.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Full Proposal

What is the People St program? Go to http://peoplest.lacity.org

This is a new LADOT program, supported by the Mayor, to enhance pedestrians' experience of the streets, particularly in urban areas without access to open space and where pedestrian use of sidewalks is constrained. I think most people support the idea (we do) but questions arise as to where the projects (parklets, plazas and bicycle corrals) are to be located. (Recently "parklets" were approved in Palms on Motor Ave. and in the Palisades in a heavily trafficked intersection near Sunset Blvd. which are causing concerns that might have been alleviated if the NCs/CCs had been notified in advance and there had been public discussion as to the proposed locations.) Right now there is no requirement of notice to or consultation with NCs. We think this should be required and apparently at least Councilmember Bonin agrees.

What are "parklets"? These are enclosed areas (with low temporary walls and seating) for people to congregate in, located in the street/parking spaces in front of businesses. See more on the website above.

This motion has been proposed by the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils. If a super majority of member NCs approve the motion, it will be officially endorsed by WRAC.

Proposed Motion

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council urges the Mayor, LADOT and the City Council to amend the process for consideration of design and location of L.A. People St projects (including Plazas, Parklets and Bicycle Corrals) to include a requirement for advance notice to and consultation with Neighborhood and Community Councils. To the extent applicable, designs and locations should comply with local Specific Plans.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review: (highly recommended)</th>
<th>Votes For: 0</th>
<th>Against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Arguments for:

NCs should be apprised of changes in their neighborhoods.

Arguments against:

People St. is a grassroots effort, not necessarily driven by NCs. Space should be given for ideas to come from other sources.
Motion to support Councilmember Koretz’s proposed changes to the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance

Agenda Item: GB112014-8
Date: 20 November 2014
Proposed By: Westside Regional Alliance of Councils

Full Proposal
The 2008 Baseline Mansionization Ordinance sought to control the overdevelopment of residential lots with homes that dwarf the surrounding properties. However, over six years we’ve seen that many aspects of that ordinance need revision. Councilmember Paul Koretz has introduced a series of common-sense changes that will largely address those issues, however forward momentum has stalled.

This motion has been proposed by the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils. If a super majority of member NCs approve the motion, it will be officially endorsed by WRAC.

Proposed Motion
The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports CM Paul Koretz’s proposed amendments to the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (CF14-0656), which include elimination waivers for balconies, upper floor stepbacks, green building and attached garage, as well as the inclusion of interim control ordinances (ICOs) for Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs) and Residential Floor Area (RFA) overlays.

Considerations

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

Arguments for:
Overly large homes are destroying the character of many neighborhoods.

Arguments against:
People should be allowed to build what they want.
Since its inception on May 6, 2008, the City's Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO), (Ordinance No. 179883), has been the guiding land-use regulation for all single-family zoned properties located within non-hillside designated areas.

Over the past six years, we have seen where the BMO has accomplished the intended goals of maintaining and promoting communities that preserve their integrity and livability. However, the past six years have also shown us where the BMO has fallen far short of its mandate to create regulations that allow for sustainable neighborhoods and that protect the interest of all homeowners. The largest victim of these shortcomings is the city’s stock of R1 (single family) zoned lots.

Of all the residential family zoned parcels within the BMO, 234,575 or 77% are zoned R1. And, of those, half are lots in the 5,000-6,000 square foot range. This means the backbone of our city’s single-family neighborhoods are modest sized lots, with modest sized homes. These neighborhoods are integral to the city’s history, as they have provided a consistent presence for our families and economic growth. And despite its good intentions, the BMO has shown to have vulnerabilities that threaten the cohesion and character of our single-family neighborhoods.

I THEREFORE MOVE that the Council instruct the Planning Department, with the assistance of the Department of Building and Safety, and in consultation with the City Attorney, to prepare and present an ordinance that will address the counterproductive provisions of the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (No. 179883), to stabilize the conflict of out-of-scale homes that continue to proliferate in entire neighborhoods as follows:

- **Green Bonus Provisions:** The City’s Green Building Program (Ordinance No. 181480), was instituted as a mandatory requirement for all new construction, which applies energy and resource conservation use. The City’s inclusion of a “Tier 1” bonus of 20% increase in home size has encouraged larger, and more energy and resource consuming homes. Therefore project applicants should not be allowed to enlarge a home, by claiming a 20 percent Floor Area Ratio (FAR) bonus that encourages larger, more energy and resource consuming homes.

- **The BMO’s Two Design Bonuses:** Each resulted in a 20 percent increase in the size of a house, and each appear to produce the large, boxy, suburban-style houses that the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance intended to prevent. The houses actually permitted through the Baseline Mansionization’s two design bonuses need to be carefully reviewed to determine if these bonuses meet the ordinance’s intended goals of stopping mansionization.

- **FAR Bonus and R1 (Single Family) Zones:** R1 lots that exceed 7,500 square feet have a by-right FAR of 45 percent of the lot area, while those below 7,500 square feet have an FAR of 50 percent of the lot area. This small difference has meant that those R1 neighborhoods with the smallest lots and the least amount of setback have the largest home to lot-size ratio of any single-family zone in the city. This provision has encouraged out-of-scale homes that loom over neighborhoods with smaller lots, and the by-right FAR for the smaller lots should be reduced to .45 to ensure that all R-1 lots are covered by the same zoning regulations.

- **Re-evaluate FAR Exemptions:** The six exemptions listed in the BMO need to be re-evaluated to determine their impact citywide on the scale and character of new homes. In particular, exemptions for attached garages, attached porches/patios/breezeways, and double-height entryways appear to result in out of scale and out of character development. They should, therefore, be removed from the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance.

PRESENTED BY: PAUL KORETZ
Councilmember, 5th District

SECONDED BY: [Signature]
Motion to require NC consultation on People St. projects

Agenda Item: GB112014-9
Date: 20 November 2014
Proposed By: Westside Regional Alliance of Councils

Full Proposal

Recent incidents of people being injured by unapproved outdoor dining tables and chairs (often on sidewalks too narrow to accommodate tables) have thrown the need for enforcement into high relief.

One of the difficulties in enforcing City safety, health and insurance requirements for outdoor dining establishments is that there is no easy way to see if a particular business holds an up-to-date permit. This motion asks that businesses complying with the rules put a simple sticker in their window—much like the letter grade signs for restaurant cleanliness.

This motion has been proposed by the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils. If a super majority of member NCs approve the motion, it will be officially endorsed by WRAC.

Proposed Motion

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council requests that the LA City Council amend the outdoor dining "R" permit ordinance to include requiring a window sticker advising the public that businesses have a valid permit.

Considerations

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

Arguments for:
The sticker is a simple, low cost way to see if a business in compliance with City ordinances.

Arguments against:
One more thing for the City to impose on businesses.
Motion for the resumption of hiring and training LAFD firefighters

Agenda Item: GB112014-10
Date: 20 November 2014
Proposed By: Westside Regional Alliance of Councils

Full Proposal

The strength of the Los Angeles Fire Department is reduced by over 100 firefighters per year due to retirement, injury, or death. The Los Angeles Fire Department has not hired new firefighters since 2008, and the current force is stretched to a point that places both its health and the safety of Angelenos at risk. Furthermore, the reduced strength of the force contributes substantially to the LAFD’s overtime budget to adequately staff each shift, especially on “red flag” days. The current evaluation and reconfiguration of LAFD recruitment and hiring practices should be completed without delay. The structural deficit in personnel cannot be easily overcome without a substantial effort placed on accelerated hiring to address the foreseeable and increasing shortfall in staffing. Hiring must occur at a faster rate than attrition to overcome the force’s structural personnel deficit.

This motion has been proposed by the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils. If a super majority of member NCs approve the motion, it will be officially endorsed by WRAC.

Proposed Motion

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council urges the City of Los Angeles to resume and adequately fund the recruitment, hiring, and training of new firefighters by April 1, 2015.

Furthermore, SORO NC recommends that the City evaluate other policies and practices that affect LAFD staffing. Specifically, the City should consider reclassifying some departmental administrative staff positions from sworn personnel to civilian staff and then reassigning sworn personnel in those positions back to the field. Additionally, the City can explore ways to incentive hiring qualified firefighters from other departments.

Considerations

Committee review: (highly recommended)

Votes For: 0
Against:

Arguments for:

Understaffing firehouses creates an unacceptable risk for the residents of LA.

Shifting trained firefighters from administrative to active duty is a much more efficient use of resources.

Arguments against:

Simply put, cost.

Firefighters may be the best option for administrative roles, in that they understand the issues firefighters face.
Motion to request measures to increase pedestrian and bicycle safety and access at the intersection of Robertson and Venice Blvds.

Agenda Item: GB112014-16
Date: 20 November 2014
Proposed By: Jon Liberman

Full Proposal
The motion will be written in response to community feedback at the November 18th Transportation Committee meeting, and distributed at the full Board meeting.

Proposed Motion
I. TBD
Motion Opposing the proposed conversion of a DOT Parking Lot to Senior Housing

Agenda Item: GB112014-17
Date: 20 November 2014
Proposed By: Jon Liberman

Full Proposal

The Department of Transportation proposes that the public parking lot located at 8712 West Pico Blvd be developed into a senior housing project. The primary reason for this is to increase senior housing and to increase the revenue that the city derives from the property.

This parking lot currently provides 41 public parking spaces that provide parking for customers of retail establishments on Pico Blvd., the SOVA food bank and parking for an adjacent synagogue. The proposal anticipates that the project would retain the 41 parking spaces but that the spaces would be dedicated for the sole use of the residents of the Senior Housing project.

The Land Use & Economic Development Committee met on November 4, 2014 to consider this item. We had been advised that Councilman Koretz’s office is in favor of the Senior Housing project. There was no one from DOT, the Developer or the Council Office present to explain the project or advocate for our approval of the project. This left the LUED Committee with a problem. If we took no action that was the same as a “de facto” approval of the plan.

The Committee is in favor of Senior Housing. However, the Committee feels strongly that eliminating public parking at this location will have an immediate deleterious effect on the economic viability of this portion of Pico Blvd as it applies to retail commerce, the many restaurants located on Pico, users of the food bank and members of the synagogue.

After lengthy discussion, the Committee proposes that the General Board send a letter to the Planning Department with a copy to the Council office opposing any redevelopment of this property until the development includes the retention of a minimum of 41 parking spaces dedicated to the public use. We further want to have Councilman Koretz and/or his Land Use Deputy be requested to attend the next LUED Committee meeting to discuss Senior Housing and Parking issues. We hope that we can resolve the matter to accomplish both objectives.

Proposed Motion

I. A letter be sent to the Planning Department opposing the project in its current form and stating that any development of the project be contingent upon the project retaining a minimum of 41 parking spaces devoted to public use.

II. An invitation be issued to Councilman Koretz and/or his Land Use Deputy to meet with the Committee to determine if the project can be revised to accommodate both Senior Housing and public parking.
Considerations

Committee review:  
(Votes For: 5  Against: 1*)

Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget:  
($ -0-)

Arguments for:  
Arguments against:

First argument in favor. Retains the current economic vitality of this portion of Pico Blvd.  
First argument against the motion. It places NC in a position of opposing Senior Housing if they refuse to modify plan.

Second argument in favor. Allows for both objectives to be met if current plan is modified.  
Another argument against. The request to work with the Council Office to adjust the plan is somewhat aggressive for this NC.

* The vote on inviting the Council Office to the next LUED meeting was:

Vote For: 4  Vote Against: 1  Abstention: 1
SORO Mutual Accountability and Cooperation (M.A.C.) Sidewalk Plan

Agenda Item: GB112014-18
Date: 11/20/2014
Proposed By: Kevin Gres

Full Proposal
We all know that the sidewalks in our city are intolerable. This motion is but one modest option to fix this problem in a specific timeframe without using long-term debt financing.

Proposed Motion
I. See attached.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review:</th>
<th>Votes For:</th>
<th>Against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(highly recommended)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sidewalks will be repaired within a fixed timeframe of 11 years.</td>
<td>1. Residents should not have to pay for 50% of the cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The funds for the SORO M.A.C. Plan will be committed and raised up-front. This will not push the financial burden of this project on our children to deal with decades from now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. An independent agency beholden to the Mayor and City Controller will be more cost effective as it will have the authority to complete the project efficiently, without getting involved with City Council politics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The SORO M.A.C. Plan holds our city’s officials accountable for years of neglect, but also recognizes the need for cooperation in bearing the financial burden of such a large endeavor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE SORO M.A.C. PLAN
(Mutual Accountability and Cooperation)

Background:

Los Angeles has the nation’s largest sidewalk system. Originally, Angelenos were required to build and maintain sidewalks under the newly passed Vrooman and California State Improvement Acts of 1885 and 1911. However, in 1973, the Los Angeles City Council voluntarily assumed responsibility for sidewalk building, repair, and maintenance. Just three years later, the City Council decided to discontinue this funding program without any solution in place to build, repair, and maintain the city’s sidewalks.

Los Angeles now stands on the precipice of crisis. Approximately 40% of the city’s 10,000 miles of sidewalks have buckled, are damaged, or simply un-walkable. For decades, city officials have willfully neglected to confront this ever-growing problem with any kind of sustainable sidewalk repair program.

The SORONC believes that it is the City Council’s unwavering and continuing duty to build, repair, and maintain the City’s sidewalks, and that the City Council has utterly failed to honor this duty.

As this crisis continues to grow, the SORONC is deeply disappointed with City Council’s proposed cures, the vast majority of which place the entire financial burden on select city taxpayers.

Despite our belief that sidewalk repair and maintenance is a City duty, the SORONC now puts forth a new plan of action aimed at mutual accountability and cooperation.

The South Robertson Neighborhood Council therefore proposes the creation of an independent agency that will work within a 2 billion dollar budget financed evenly by Angelenos and City Officials operating within following guidelines:

A. Powers and Authority:

(1) The Mayor will establish an independent agency responsible for the building and repair of all pedestrian sidewalks in Los Angeles. This independent agency shall:
   a. Work independently from the Bureau of Engineering, Public Works, and Urban Forest Division;
   b. Report directly to the Mayor and City Controller, with quarterly reports made to the City Council;
   c. Have full and unfettered authority in building and repairing sidewalks;
   d. Determine the private contractors to be used, the materials for repair, which sidewalks will have priority, and which trees to save or remove;
e. Start no later than 12 months from the approval of the bill and have a life of 11 years. After that time, the agency would need to be re-authorized.

f. Formally report its progress to the residents of Los Angeles at least quarterly by posting to the City’s website, and make readily available all contracts and business documents; and

g. Operate within a 2 billion dollar ($2,000,000,000) budget allocated over the duration of this project.

B. Source of Funds:

(1) Residents of Los Angeles will fund 50% of this budget with the issuance of 1 billion dollars of municipal bonds, which will be assessed through an eleven-year ½ percent gas tax increase. This gas tax will sunset after 1 billion dollars have been raised.

(2) The City’s 1 billion dollars will come from only 3 sources:
   a. The annual amount of sidewalk repair funds;
   b. A yet to be determined amount allocated from AB 1290; and
   c. A sale and leaseback program with City property and land.
   d. Revenue can only be raised from only the three above-mentioned sources in subsection a, b, and c.
   e. It is expressly forbidden for The City of Los Angeles to raise revenue from any property tax or special assessment.

(3) Any increase in the 2 billion dollar budget will be the sole responsibility of the City of Los Angeles. In the event more funds are needed in excess of the originally allocated 2 billion dollars, The City of Los Angeles can only use one of the three revenue-raising methods explicitly described in division B subsection (2).

(4) Property Taxes and/or Assessments on property shall not be the source of funding this program either directly or indirectly.

C. Accelerated Repair Provisions

(1) If a property owner wishes to accelerate the repair of his sidewalk, he may select a contractor from a list of pre-approved city contractors. Any licensed contractor may apply to be on this list of pre-approved city contractors. These pre-approved contractors will:
   a. Complete a training and certification process on sidewalk code compliance through the City of Los Angeles.
   b. Subject themselves to spot inspections of sidewalk building/repairs. Three code violations will cause the contractor to be automatically removed from the pre-approved contractors list.
   c. Build/repair sidewalks at a pre-negotiated rate, plus a percentage fee that will go into the general sidewalk fund.
   d. Obtain city sidewalk building/repair permits through an expedited permit process.
D. Project Completion

(1) Following the successful completion of the SORO M.A.C. Plan, the city will remain solely responsible for upkeep of city sidewalks with regularly allocated sidewalk repair funds and AB 1290 funds.
(2) The independent agency will promptly be disbanded.

Advantages of the SORO M.A.C. Plan:

1. Sidewalks will be repaired within a fixed timeframe of 11 years.
2. The funds for the SORO M.A.C. Plan will be committed and raised up-front. This will not push the financial responsibility of this project on our children to deal with decades from now.
3. An independent agency beholden to the Mayor and City Controller will be more cost effective as it will have the authority to complete the project efficiently, without getting involved with City Council politics.
4. The SORO M.A.C. Plan holds our city’s officials accountable for years of neglect, but also recognizes the need for cooperation in bearing the financial burden of such a large endeavor.
Motion to support the prohibition of short-term rentals low density areas

Agenda Item: GB112014-19
Date: November 20, 2014
Proposed By: Terrence Gomes

Full Proposal

Short-term rental abuse occurs when commercial ventures use online platforms such as Airbnb, VRBO, and Homeaway to run multi-million dollar short-term rental businesses. These commercial users game the “home sharing” system: they operate short-term rentals vacant of owners, solely occupied by transient renters. Here are three short term rental abuse trends happening across Los Angeles right now:

1) Independent property management companies convert rent-controlled properties and other long-term housing into short-term rentals.

Rent controlled properties exist to provide affordable housing options for families of all income levels, and to enable the families that already live there to remain. To such families, they are a blessing; to commercial short-term rental operators, they are an enticing business opportunity. These companies offer landlords well over market value (at least 20% more than their asking price) for a rent-controlled property, and then advertise that property as a short-term rental. Families who need the long-term affordable housing lose it, and residential neighborhoods lose those families.

Management companies also obtain “master leases” from apartment owners that give them permission to sublet apartments. These commercialized management entities then work around the thirty day legal minimum for rentals by offering thirty day leases and then prorating the rent to reflect a short-term stay.

2) Individuals convert affordable housing using Airbnb, VRBO, and other online platforms.

Individuals run the same sort of unethical business as the property management companies: they simply operate independently through sites like VRBO and Airbnb to turn affordable housing into a high-volume short-term rental business in a residential neighborhood.

3) Real estate companies market their units directly to commercial short-term rental operators who convert them into short-term rentals. These companies and individuals can and will pay more for a desirable property that they hope to convert. Historic and older properties under rent control are particularly vulnerable to this scheme. Click here for a real world example.

Proposed Motion

a. Whereas, short-term rentals are currently prohibited in R1 (single-family), R2, RD, R3 (lower-density multi-family residential) and RAS3 (residential accessory services) zones in the City of Los Angeles;

Whereas, the unregulated transient commercial use of residential property negatively affects the essential character and stability of our neighborhoods;

Whereas, short-term rental abuse in residential areas threatens the supply of longer-term housing and affordable housing in Los Angeles; and
Whereas, the unregulated practice of short-term rentals poses public safety hazards for hosts, guests and neighbors; and

Whereas, the City is currently reviewing the prohibitions on short-term rentals;

Therefore, be it resolved, the Board of the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council:

Supports the Keep Neighborhoods First goal to reach out to other Neighborhood Councils concerned about the impact of commercialized short-term rental abuse.

Urges the City Administrative Officer to compile and provide the following information and financial analysis so that the City has the information necessary to fully evaluate the impact of the legalization of short-term rentals: the current number of short-term rentals in residential zones throughout the City; the number of listings, whether registered or unregistered properties, that fall under the Rent Stabilization Ordinance; projections on the amount of tax revenue that would be raised; and the costs of regulation and enforcement.

Strongly requests that Mayor Eric Garcetti, members of the Los Angeles City Council, City Attorney Mike Feuer, the Los Angeles Department of Housing and the Department of Building & Safety take steps to immediately ensure the enforcement of current zoning ordinances and building occupancy regulations that prohibit short-term rentals in residential neighborhoods.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Notes

Votes For:  Against:  Abstain:
Motion to approve up to $1600 for a one-year organizational membership to the Westside Urban Forum

Agenda Item: GB112014-20  
Date: November 20, 2014  
Proposed By: Terrence Gomes

Full Proposal

The Westside Urban Forum ("WUF") is a forum, in the Roman sense of the term: a venue for free and open discussion and debate. Monthly breakfast programs bring together leading players from within our real estate community- important and influential people who speak from a variety of perspectives about matters of concern to all of us. Members and participants, benefiting from this exploration of ideas in the court of public opinion, find that WUF:

• activates civic and professional dialogue  
• motivates stakeholders to solve issues of the day  
• attracts people of "unlike minds" to generate interesting and thought provoking debate  
• stimulates creative problem-solving  
• fosters interaction between diverse groups to help form and enhance long term professional  
• offers consensus building between the public and private sectors and among disparate special

WUF empowers us to create livable communities by focusing upon:

• sensible urban planning  
• rational investment in infrastructure  
• a clean environment  
• sustainable ecological practices  
• improved parks and open space  
• affordable housing

Each month WUF invites its Members and participants to review a different expert to moderate a new program on a non-partisan basis. Programs alternate, ranging from in-depth analysis of specific real estate projects (micro) to overarching land use policies (macro). WUF’s panels consist of bold leaders who forge and facilitate broad, balanced, and integrated perspectives on topics of economic, political, and social relevance. We meet, listen and exchange ideas together, then within our own personal and professional lives, work, develop, and strive to improve our urban environment.

By attending our monthly breakfasts – roughly the third Friday morning of each month from 7:30 to 9:00 am - you will engage with your peers in an extended conversation to better your grasp of issues and improve your ability to craft solutions.

Proposed Motion

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council moves to spend up to $1600 for a one year membership for the Westside Urban Forum. This will include membership for up to four members of the Council to attend the monthly meeting of the WUF and up to two special
events with the LUED members having first priority to attend the event. The fee includes membership dues and all related costs for meals and attending the events for one year.

**Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Board Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Votes For:</th>
<th>Against:</th>
<th>Abstain:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>