Motion for timely community notification of development plans

Agenda Item: GB082015-2
Date: 20 August 2015
Proposed By: Westside Regional Alliance of Councils

Background

Access to public records is a fundamental right of every California resident. An increasing number of grading operations in commercial, residential and hillside areas have the potential of undercutting and damaging adjacent properties.

The owners of these adjacent properties, and the general public, have the right to have access to grading plans, geology reports and soils engineering reports that are submitted to the City for the purpose of development. Access to these public records must occur before grading plans are approved to give the public the ability to review the plans and/or allow an independent expert to examine the plans to assure themselves that the proposed grading and development will not have an adverse affect on his or her own property or the environment.

Currently, adjacent property owners are not given timely notification that would allow them to inspect the plans submitted to the City.

Proposed Motion

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports all efforts to increase public access to all submitted development plans (including grading plans, geology reports, and soil engineering) and requests that the Department of Building and Safety devise a protocol that would:

a. give timely access to the plans for public inspection, including access via the internet; and

b. provide notice to adjacent property owners, Neighborhood Councils, and Community Councils as soon as such plans are submitted to the City.

Considerations

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount previously allocated in Committee's working budget: (applies to funding motions only)</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides important information to the community about upcoming development in their area.</td>
<td>The cost to implement a robust solution is unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE HONORABLE SHEILA JAMES KUEHL, MEMBER OF THE STATE SENATE, has requested an opinion on the following question:

Are interim grading documents, including geology reports, compaction reports, and soils reports, submitted by a property owner to a city’s building department in conjunction with an application for a building permit subject to public inspection and copying under the California Public Records Act at the time the documents are first received by the building department?
CONCLUSION

Interim grading documents, including geology reports, compaction reports, and soils reports, submitted by a property owner to a city’s building department in conjunction with an application for a building permit are subject to public inspection and copying under the California Public Records Act at the time the documents are first received by the building department.

ANALYSIS

We are informed that a city commonly requires property owners in hillside areas to submit interim grading documents, including geology reports, compaction reports, and soils reports, when applying for building permits from the city’s building department. These reports are prepared by civil engineers and are reviewed by the building department’s professional staff in determining whether to issue the permits requested. These reports are preliminary in nature in the sense that they do not become “final” until approved by the city’s staff. (See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6735.) Grading and construction activity may proceed only on the basis of final, approved documents.

The question presented for resolution is whether these interim grading documents are subject to inspection and copying by members of the public at the time the documents are first submitted to the city’s building department. We conclude that the documents must be made available for inspection and copying from the time they first come into the custody of the building department.

The California Public Records Act (Gov. Code, §§ 6250-6276.48; “Act”)\(^1\) generally requires state and local agencies, including cities,\(^2\) to allow members of the public to inspect records in their custody and obtain copies thereof (§§ 6250, 6252, 6253). The Act “was passed for the explicit purpose of ‘increasing freedom of information’ by giving the public ‘access to information in possession of public agencies’ [Citation]. Maximum disclosure of the conduct of governmental operations was to be promoted by the Act. [Citation.]” (CBS, Inc. v. Block (1986) 42 Cal.3d 646, 651; see also Roberts v. City of Palmdale (1993) 5 Cal.4th 363, 370; Marylander v. Superior Court (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 1119, 1125.)

\[^1\] All references hereafter to the Government Code are by section number only.

\[^2\] A city is a “local agency” by definition under section 6252, subdivision (b).
“Public records” are defined to include “any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public's business prepared, owned, used, or retained by any state or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics.” (§ 6252, subd. (e).) A “writing” is further defined to include “any handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing, photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording upon any tangible thing any form of communication or representation. . . .” (§ 6252, subd. (g).)

The Act specifies that “[p]ublic records are open to inspection at all times during the office hours of the state or local agency and every person has a right to inspect any public record, except as hereafter provided. . . .” (§ 6253, subd. (a).) Of particular relevance to our discussion here are the requirements of section 6253, subdivision (b):

“Except with respect to public records exempt from disclosure by express provisions of law, each state or local agency, upon a request for a copy of records that reasonably describes an identifiable record or records, shall make the records promptly available to any person upon payment of fees covering direct costs of duplication, or a statutory fee if applicable. Upon request, an exact copy shall be provided unless impracticable to do so.”

Thus, when a request is made for a copy of any identifiable public record, a state or local agency must promptly provide an exact copy, unless impracticable to do so, upon payment of a fee that covers the direct cost of duplication or a statutory fee if applicable. In short, “all public records are subject to disclosure unless the Legislature has expressly provided to the contrary.” (Williams v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal.4th 337, 346; 86 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 132, 133 (2003).)

The grading documents in question, although prepared and submitted by private property owners, are reviewed by the city in determining whether a building permit should be issued. They are writings that (1) relate to the conduct of the public’s business and (2) are “used” by the city’s building department. (See Coronado Police Officers Assn. v. Carroll (2003) 106 Cal.App.4th 1001, 1006-1007.) As such, unless some exemption applies, they must be made promptly available for inspection and copying by members of the public. (See 88 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen.153 (2005) [parcel boundary map data maintained in an electronic format by a county assessor subject to public inspection and copying under the Act]; 86 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 132, supra [arrested person’s mug shot is a writing and a public record subject to inspection and copying]; 78 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 104 (1995) [names, addresses, and telephone numbers of persons who have filed noise complaints concerning operation of a city airport are subject to disclosure under the Act unless exception applies].)

Section 6254 is the primary exemption statute, specifying a diverse assortment of categories of public records that a state or local agency may in its discretion keep confidential. (§ 6254, subds. (a)-(cc).) Other special exemptions exist. (See, e.g., §§ 6254.1, 6254.3, 6254.4 6454.20, 6254.22, 6254.25.) Finally, the Act contains a “catchall” exemption that permits a public agency to withhold a requested public record when “on the facts of the particular case the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record.” (§ 6255, subd. (a); see, e.g., 84 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 55, 56-60 (2001); 81 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 383, 386-388 (1998).)

Only a few of these statutory exemptions merit discussion here. Subdivision (a) of section 6254 provides an exemption for “[p]reliminary drafts, notes, or interagency or intra-agency memoranda that are not retained by the public agency in the ordinary course of business, provided that the public interest in withholding those records clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure.” We reject the application of this exemption to interim grading documents for several reasons. First, these documents are retained “in the ordinary course of business,” as they are carefully reviewed by the department’s professional staff and remain on file until the approval process is completed. Indeed, we are informed that these reports are retained by the department for a five-year period. Second, this exemption is inapplicable to factual materials that are prepared by private parties. Instead, this exemption is intended to protect deliberative writings prepared by a public agency. (See *Citizens for A Better Environment v. Department of Food & Agriculture* (1985) 171 Cal.App.3d 704, 713.) Finally, as discussed below, the public interest in withholding these documents would not clearly outweigh the public interest in disclosure. (See *id.* at pp. 714-716.)

Subdivision (k) of section 6254 allows exemption from disclosure for “[r]ecords, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law, including, but not limited to, provisions of the Evidence Code relating to privilege.” Records

---

3 For the same reason, the importance of public disclosure of interim grading documents would render inapplicable the “catchall” exemption of section 6255.
or information not required to be disclosed pursuant to this exemption include, but are not limited to, records or information identified in the statutes listed in sections 6276.02 through 6276.48. (§ 6276.) If certain information in the interim grading documents were subject to the protection of one of the specified statutes, the documents would be subject to review to determine whether some portion of them should be withheld. However, we have not been informed of the presence of any such information in these documents.

Another exemption that may at first appear applicable is found in section 6254, subdivision (e), which exempts “[g]eological and geophysical data, plant production data, and similar information relating to utility systems development, or market or crop reports, that are obtained in confidence from any person.” Here, however, even if this exemption were otherwise applicable, the reports in question are not “obtained in confidence.” (See Uribe v. Howie (1971) 19 Cal.App.3d 194, 211-212; National Resources Def. v. U. S. Dept. of Defense (C.D. Cal. 2005) 388 F.Supp.2d 1086, 1107-1108.) Rather, their importance as public records is demonstrated by the statutory scheme relating to the sale of subdivided lands. Business and Professions Code section 11010 states:

“(a) Except as otherwise provided pursuant to subdivision (c) or elsewhere in this chapter [concerning subdivided lands], any person who intends to offer subdivided lands within this state for sale or lease shall file with the Department of Real Estate an application for a public report consisting of a notice of intention and a completed questionnaire on a form prepared by the department.

“(b) The notice of intention shall contain the following information about the subdivided lands and the proposed offering:

“.................................................................

“(14) A true statement, if applicable, referencing any soils or geologic report or soils and geologic reports that have been prepared specifically for the subdivision.

“.................................................................”

---

4 We need not define the term “utility systems development” for purposes of this opinion or decide whether the phrase “relating to utility systems development” modifies the phrase “[g]eological and geophysical data.”
This statutorily mandated inclusion referencing the reports at issue serves to promote timely public access in considering whether a proposed building project may impact surrounding properties.\(^5\)

No other statutory exemption warrants analysis.\(^6\) We thus conclude that interim grading documents, including geology reports, compaction reports, and soils reports, submitted by a property owner to a city’s building department in conjunction with an application for a building permit are subject to public inspection and copying under the Act at the time the documents are first received by the building department.

\(^{*****}\)

---

\(^5\) We note that the Act “does not allow limitations on access to a public record based upon the purposes for which the record is being requested, if the record is otherwise subject to disclosure.” (§ 6257.5; see Fairley v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal.App.4th 1414, 1417-1418; Wilder v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal.App.4th 77, 82-83.)

\(^6\) A special exemption exists for corporate proprietary information, including trade secrets. (§ 6254.15.) We have not been informed that such information would be contained in interim grading documents.
Motion to oppose Assembly Bill 744, limiting local authority over parking for density bonus projects

Agenda Item: GB082015-3
Date: 20 August 2015
Proposed By: Westside Regional Alliance of Councils

Background

Assembly Bill 744 maintains that addressing “excessive parking requirements is a matter of statewide concern and is not a municipal affair.” It therefore seeks to further limit local government’s ability to set policies on parking requirements for development within their own boundaries.

Current state law (the infamous Senate Bill 1818) requires that local government provide a “density bonus”—usually allowing the developer to build larger projects than City zoning allows—if the project includes a minimum amount of “very low, low, or moderate-income” units. It also prohibits the local government from requiring more parking than the State-mandated minimum.

Assembly Bill 744 would further require that cities and counties completely eliminate a minimum onsite parking requirement for a development that receives a density bonus and meets any of the following criteria:

a. The development is located within one half mile of a major transit stop;

b. The development is a senior citizen housing development; or,

c. The development is a special needs development.

While the premises of the bill may be admirable (reducing rents, car traffic, and greenhouse gasses), such a coarsely-conceived, one-size-fits-all law destroys the ability to fine-tune a parking policy appropriate for each municipality. It effectively doubles-down on one of the most prescriptive aspects of an already bad law.

Proposed Motion

Believing that local municipalities throughout California should be able to determine their own appropriate policies for required parking for bonus density projects, the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council recommends that the City of Los Angeles oppose California Assembly Bill 744 on those grounds and requests Councilmembers Mike Bonin and Paul Koretz introduce a resolution to City Council formally opposing the bill.

Considerations

Committee review: (highly recommended)
Votes For: n/a
Against:

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>The best parking policy for a small inland community is not necessarily the best for a far-flung metropolis—particularly with State funding for mass transit drying to a trickle. Stripping municipalities of the ability to set their own zoning standards for parking is egregious over-reach, and the idea that cities are too &quot;unenlightened&quot; to legislate responsibly is the height of out-of-touch arrogance.</td>
<td>Minimum parking requirements increase development costs and distort the market, thus raising rental rates. Developers may always build more parking if the market demands it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSEMBLY BILL No. 744

Introduced by Assembly Members Chau and Quirk
(Principal coauthor: Assembly Member Gonzalez)
(Coauthor: Senator Beall)

February 25, 2015

An act to amend Section 65915 of the Government Code, relating to housing.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 744, as amended, Chau. Planning and zoning: density bonuses.

The Planning and Zoning Law requires, when a developer of housing proposes a housing development within the jurisdiction of the local government, that the city, county, or city and county provide the developer with a density bonus and other incentives or concessions for the production of lower income housing units or the donation of land within the development if the developer, among other things, agrees to construct a specified percentage of units for very low, low-, or moderate-income households or qualifying residents. Existing law requires continued affordability for 55 years or longer, as specified, of all very low and low-income units that qualified an applicant for a density bonus. Existing law prohibits a city, county, or city and county from requiring a vehicular parking ratio for a housing development that
meets these criteria in excess of specified ratios. This prohibition applies only at the request of the developer and specifies that the developer may request additional parking incentives or concessions.

This bill would, notwithstanding the above-described provisions, additionally prohibit, at the request of the developer, a city, county, or city and county from imposing a vehicular parking ratio, inclusive of handicapped and guest parking, in excess of 0.5 spaces per bedroom on a development that includes the maximum percentage of low- or very low income units, as specified, and is located within one-half mile of a major transit stop, as defined, and there is unobstructed access to the transit stop from the development. The bill would also prohibit, at the request of the developer, a city, county, or city and county from imposing a vehicular parking ratio, inclusive of handicapped and guest parking, in excess of specified amounts per unit on a development that consists solely of units with an affordable housing cost to lower income households, as specified, if the development is within one-half mile of a major transit stop and there is unobstructed access to the transit stop from the development, is a for-rent housing development for individuals that are 62 years of age or older, that complies with specified existing laws regarding senior housing, or is a special needs housing development, as those terms are defined. The bill would require a subject development that is a for-rent housing development for individuals that are 62 years of age or older or a special needs housing development to have either paratransit service or be located within one-half mile of fixed bus route service that operates at least 8 times per day. The bill would make findings and declarations in this regard, including that this constitutes a matter of statewide concern and is not a municipal affair.

By imposing additional duties on local governments in awarding density bonuses, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) Having a healthy housing market that provides an adequate supply of homes that are affordable to Californians at all income levels is critical to the economic prosperity and quality of life in the state.

(b) There exists a severe shortage of affordable housing, especially for persons and families of extremely low, very low, low, and low income, and there is an immediate need to encourage the development of new housing, not only through the provision of financial assistance but also through reforms to regulation.

(c) Affordable housing is expensive to build in California.

(d) The cost of building affordable housing in California is impacted by local opposition, changes imposed by local design and review, and requirements for on-site parking.

(e) The average construction cost per space, excluding land cost, in a parking structure in the United States is about $24,000 for aboveground parking and $34,000 for underground parking. In an affordable housing project with a fixed budget, every $24,000 spent on a required parking space is $24,000 less to spend on housing.

(f) The biggest single determinant of vehicle miles traveled and therefore greenhouse gas emissions is ownership of a private vehicle.

(g) A review of developments funded through the Department of Housing and Community Development’s Transit-Oriented Development Implementation Program (TOD program) shows that lower-income households drive 25 to 30 percent fewer miles when living within one-half mile of transit than those living in non-TOD program areas. When living within one-quarter mile of frequent transit, they drove nearly 50 percent less.

(h) When cities require off-street parking with all new residential construction, they shift what should be the cost of driving, the cost of parking a car, into the cost of housing, which artificially increases the cost of housing.

(i) Increases in public transportation and shared mobility options and the development of more walkable and bikeable neighborhoods reduce the demand for parking.
(j) Consistent with Chapter 488 of the Statues of 2006 (AB 32) and Chapter 728 of the Statutes of 2008 (SB 375), it is state policy to promote transit-oriented infill development to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

(k) The high cost of the land and improvements required to provide parking significantly increases the cost of transit-oriented development, making lower cost and affordable housing development financially infeasible and hindering the goals of SB 375.

(l) Eliminating minimum parking requirements will allow the limited funding available for affordable housing to support more housing for more Californians. A given housing subsidy fund can benefit about 6.5 times more households with no parking spaces than households with 2 spaces per unit.

(m) Minimum parking requirements provide large subsidies for parking, which in turn encourage more people to drive cars.

(n) Minimum parking requirements create a barrier to effective use of the density bonus law contained in Section 65915 of the Government Code. The parking required for the extra units adds construction and land costs that may be prohibitive and requires vacant land that may be unavailable, especially in locations near transit.

(o) Increasing the supply of affordable housing near transit helps achieve deeper affordability through reduced transportation costs, in addition to reduced housing costs.

(p) Governmental parking requirements for infill and transit-oriented development reduce the viability of transit by limiting the number of households or workers near transit, increasing walking distances, and degrading the pedestrian environment.

(q) Reducing or eliminating minimum parking requirements for infill and transit-oriented development and allowing builders and the market to decide how much parking is needed can achieve all of the following:

1. Ensure sufficient amounts of parking at almost all times.
2. Reduce the cost of development and increase the number of transit-accessible and affordable housing units.
3. Allow for more effective use of the density bonus law.
4. Increase density in areas with the most housing demand, and improve the viability of developing alternate modes of
transportation, such as public transit, ridesharing, biking, and walking.

(5) Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled by removing an incentive to drive.

(r) It is the intent of the Legislature to reduce the cost of development by eliminating excessive minimum parking requirements for transit-oriented developments that includes affordable housing, senior housing, and special needs housing.

(s) The Legislature further declares that the need to address infill development and excessive parking requirements is a matter of statewide concern and is not a municipal affair as that term is used in Section 5 of Article XI of the California Constitution. Therefore, this act shall apply to all cities, including charter cities.

SEC. 2. Section 65915 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65915. (a) When an applicant seeks a density bonus for a housing development within, or for the donation of land for housing within, the jurisdiction of a city, county, or city and county, that local government shall provide the applicant with incentives or concessions for the production of housing units and child care facilities as prescribed in this section. All cities, counties, or cities and counties shall adopt an ordinance that specifies how compliance with this section will be implemented. Failure to adopt an ordinance shall not relieve a city, county, or city and county from complying with this section.

(b) (1) A city, county, or city and county shall grant one density bonus, the amount of which shall be as specified in subdivision (f), and incentives or concessions, as described in subdivision (d), when an applicant for a housing development seeks and agrees to construct a housing development, excluding any units permitted by the density bonus awarded pursuant to this section, that will contain at least any one of the following:

(A) Ten percent of the total units of a housing development for lower income households, as defined in Section 50079.5 of the Health and Safety Code.

(B) Five percent of the total units of a housing development for very low income households, as defined in Section 50105 of the Health and Safety Code.

(C) A senior citizen housing development, as defined in Sections 51.3 and 51.12 of the Civil Code, or a mobilehome park that limits...
residency based on age requirements for housing for older persons pursuant to Section 798.76 or 799.5 of the Civil Code.

(D) Ten percent of the total dwelling units in a common interest development, as defined in Section 4100 of the Civil Code, for persons and families of moderate income, as defined in Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code, provided that all units in the development are offered to the public for purchase.

(2) For purposes of calculating the amount of the density bonus pursuant to subdivision (f), an applicant who requests a density bonus pursuant to this subdivision shall elect whether the bonus shall be awarded on the basis of subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1).

(3) For the purposes of this section, “total units” or “total dwelling units” does not include units added by a density bonus awarded pursuant to this section or any local law granting a greater density bonus.

(c) (1) An applicant shall agree to, and the city, county, or city and county shall ensure, the continued affordability of all very low and low-income rental units that qualified the applicant for the award of the density bonus for 55 years or a longer period of time if required by the construction or mortgage financing assistance program, mortgage insurance program, or rental subsidy program. Rents for the lower income density bonus units shall be set at an affordable rent as defined in Section 50053 of the Health and Safety Code.

(2) An applicant shall agree to, and the city, county, or city and county shall ensure that, the initial occupant of all for-sale units that qualified the applicant for the award of the density bonus are persons and families of very low, low, or moderate income, as required, and that the units are offered at an affordable housing cost, as that cost is defined in Section 50052.5 of the Health and Safety Code. The local government shall enforce an equity sharing agreement, unless it is in conflict with the requirements of another public funding source or law. The following apply to the equity sharing agreement:

(A) Upon resale, the seller of the unit shall retain the value of any improvements, the downpayment, and the seller’s proportionate share of appreciation. The local government shall recapture any initial subsidy, as defined in subparagraph (B), and its proportionate share of appreciation, as defined in subparagraph (C), which
amount shall be used within five years for any of the purposes described in subdivision (e) of Section 33343.2 of the Health and Safety Code that promote home ownership.

(B) For purposes of this subdivision, the local government’s initial subsidy shall be equal to the fair market value of the home at the time of initial sale minus the initial sale price to the moderate-income household, plus the amount of any downpayment assistance or mortgage assistance. If upon resale the market value is lower than the initial market value, then the value at the time of the resale shall be used as the initial market value.

(C) For purposes of this subdivision, the local government’s proportionate share of appreciation shall be equal to the ratio of the local government’s initial subsidy to the fair market value of the home at the time of initial sale.

(3) (A) An applicant shall be ineligible for a density bonus or any other incentives or concessions under this section if the housing development is proposed on any property that includes a parcel or parcels on which rental dwelling units are or, if the dwelling units have been vacated or demolished in the five-year period preceding the application, have been subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of lower or very low income; subject to any other form of rent or price control through a public entity’s valid exercise of its police power; or occupied by lower or very low income households, unless the proposed housing development replaces those units, and either of the following applies:

(i) The proposed housing development, inclusive of the units replaced pursuant to this paragraph, contains affordable units at the percentages set forth in subdivision (b).

(ii) Each unit in the development, exclusive of a manager’s unit or units, is affordable to, and occupied by, either a lower or very low income household.

(B) For the purposes of this paragraph, “replace” shall mean either of the following:

(i) If any dwelling units described in subparagraph (A) are occupied on the date of application, the proposed housing development shall provide at least the same number of units of equivalent size or type, or both, to be made available at affordable rent or affordable housing cost to, and occupied by, persons and families in the same or lower income category as those households
in occupancy. For unoccupied dwelling units described in subparagraph (A) in a development with occupied units, the proposed housing development shall provide units of equivalent size or type, or both, to be made available at affordable rent or affordable housing cost to, and occupied by, persons and families in the same or lower income category in the same proportion of affordability as the occupied units. All replacement calculations resulting in fractional units shall be rounded up to the next whole number. If the replacement units will be rental dwelling units, these units shall be subject to a recorded affordability restriction for at least 55 years. If the proposed development is for-sale units, the units replaced shall be subject to paragraph (2).

(ii) If all dwelling units described in subparagraph (A) have been vacated or demolished within the five-year period preceding the application, the proposed housing development shall provide at least the same number of units of equivalent size or type, or both, as existed at the highpoint of those units in the five-year period preceding the application to be made available at affordable rent or affordable housing cost to, and occupied by, persons and families in the same or lower income category as those persons and families in occupancy at that time, if known. If the incomes of the persons and families in occupancy at the highpoint is not known, then one-half of the required units shall be made available at affordable rent or affordable housing cost to, and occupied by, very low income persons and families and one-half of the required units shall be made available for rent at affordable housing costs to, and occupied by, low-income persons and families. All replacement calculations resulting in fractional units shall be rounded up to the next whole number. If the replacement units will be rental dwelling units, these units shall be subject to a recorded affordability restriction for at least 55 years. If the proposed development is for-sale units, the units replaced shall be subject to paragraph (2).

(C) Paragraph (3) of subdivision (c) does not apply to an applicant seeking a density bonus for a proposed housing development if his or her application was submitted to, or processed by, a city, county, or city and county before January 1, 2015.

(d) (1) An applicant for a density bonus pursuant to subdivision (b) may submit to a city, county, or city and county a proposal for
the specific incentives or concessions that the applicant requests pursuant to this section, and may request a meeting with the city, county, or city and county. The city, county, or city and county shall grant the concession or incentive requested by the applicant unless the city, county, or city and county makes a written finding, based upon substantial evidence, of any of the following:

(A) The concession or incentive is not required in order to provide for affordable housing costs, as defined in Section 50052.5 of the Health and Safety Code, or for rents for the targeted units to be set as specified in subdivision (c).

(B) The concession or incentive would have a specific adverse impact, as defined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5, upon public health and safety or the physical environment or on any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact without rendering the development unaffordable to low- and moderate-income households.

(C) The concession or incentive would be contrary to state or federal law.

(2) The applicant shall receive the following number of incentives or concessions:

(A) One incentive or concession for projects that include at least 10 percent of the total units for lower income households, at least 5 percent for very low income households, or at least 10 percent for persons and families of moderate income in a common interest development.

(B) Two incentives or concessions for projects that include at least 20 percent of the total units for lower income households, at least 10 percent for very low income households, or at least 20 percent for persons and families of moderate income in a common interest development.

(C) Three incentives or concessions for projects that include at least 30 percent of the total units for lower income households, at least 15 percent for very low income households, or at least 30 percent for persons and families of moderate income in a common interest development.

(3) The applicant may initiate judicial proceedings if the city, county, or city and county refuses to grant a requested density bonus, incentive, or concession. If a court finds that the refusal to
grant a requested density bonus, incentive, or concession is in
violation of this section, the court shall award the plaintiff
reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit. Nothing in this
subdivision shall be interpreted to require a local government to
grant an incentive or concession that has a specific, adverse impact,
as defined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5,
upon health, safety, or the physical environment, and for which
there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the
specific adverse impact. Nothing in this subdivision shall be
interpreted to require a local government to grant an incentive or
concession that would have an adverse impact on any real property
that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources.
The city, county, or city and county shall establish procedures for
carrying out this section, that shall include legislative body
approval of the means of compliance with this section.

(e) (1) In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply
any development standard that will have the effect of physically
precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria
of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or
incentives permitted by this section. An applicant may submit to
a city, county, or city and county a proposal for the waiver or
reduction of development standards that will have the effect of
physically precluding the construction of a development meeting
the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the
concessions or incentives permitted under this section, and may
request a meeting with the city, county, or city and county. If a
court finds that the refusal to grant a waiver or reduction of
development standards is in violation of this section, the court
shall award the plaintiff reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of
suit. Nothing in this subdivision shall be interpreted to require a
local government to waive or reduce development standards if the
waiver or reduction would have a specific, adverse impact, as
defined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5,
upon health, safety, or the physical environment, and for which
there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the
specific adverse impact. Nothing in this subdivision shall be
interpreted to require a local government to waive or reduce
development standards that would have an adverse impact on any
real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical
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Resources, or to grant any waiver or reduction that would be contrary to state or federal law.

(2) A proposal for the waiver or reduction of development standards pursuant to this subdivision shall neither reduce nor increase the number of incentives or concessions to which the applicant is entitled pursuant to subdivision (d).

(f) For the purposes of this chapter, “density bonus” means a density increase over the otherwise maximum allowable residential density as of the date of application by the applicant to the city, county, or city and county. The applicant may elect to accept a lesser percentage of density bonus. The amount of density bonus to which the applicant is entitled shall vary according to the amount by which the percentage of affordable housing units exceeds the percentage established in subdivision (b).

(1) For housing developments meeting the criteria of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (b), the density bonus shall be calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Low-Income Units</th>
<th>Percentage Density Bonus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) For housing developments meeting the criteria of subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (b), the density bonus shall be calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Very Low Income Units</th>
<th>Percentage Density Bonus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) For housing developments meeting the criteria of subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (b), the density bonus shall be 20 percent of the number of senior housing units.

(4) For housing developments meeting the criteria of subparagraph (D) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (b), the density bonus shall be calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Moderate-Income Units</th>
<th>Percentage Density Bonus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(5) All density calculations resulting in fractional units shall be rounded up to the next whole number. The granting of a density bonus shall not be interpreted, in and of itself, to require a general plan amendment, local coastal plan amendment, zoning change, or other discretionary approval.

(g) (1) When an applicant for a tentative subdivision map, parcel map, or other residential development approval donates land to a city, county, or city and county in accordance with this subdivision, the applicant shall be entitled to a 15-percent increase above the otherwise maximum allowable residential density for the entire development, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Very Low Income</th>
<th>Percentage Density Bonus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) This increase shall be in addition to any increase in density mandated by subdivision (b), up to a maximum combined mandated density increase of 35 percent if an applicant seeks an increase pursuant to both this subdivision and subdivision (b). All density calculations resulting in fractional units shall be rounded up to the next whole number. Nothing in this subdivision shall be construed to enlarge or diminish the authority of a city, county, or city and county to require a developer to donate land as a condition of development. An applicant shall be eligible for the increased density bonus described in this subdivision if all of the following conditions are met:

(A) The applicant donates and transfers the land no later than the date of approval of the final subdivision map, parcel map, or residential development application.

(B) The developable acreage and zoning classification of the land being transferred are sufficient to permit construction of units affordable to very low income households in an amount not less than 10 percent of the number of residential units of the proposed development.

(C) The transferred land is at least one acre in size or of sufficient size to permit development of at least 40 units, has the appropriate general plan designation, is appropriately zoned with appropriate development standards for development at the density described in paragraph (3) of subdivision (c) of Section 65583.2, and is or will be served by adequate public facilities and infrastructure.

(D) The transferred land shall have all of the permits and approvals, other than building permits, necessary for the development of the very low income housing units on the transferred land, not later than the date of approval of the final subdivision map, parcel map, or residential development application, except that the local government may subject the proposed development to subsequent design review to the extent authorized by subdivision (i) of Section 65583.2 if the design is not reviewed by the local government prior to the time of transfer.

(E) The transferred land and the affordable units shall be subject to a deed restriction ensuring continued affordability of the units consistent with paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (c), which shall be recorded on the property at the time of the transfer.
(F) The land is transferred to the local agency or to a housing
developer approved by the local agency. The local agency may
require the applicant to identify and transfer the land to the
developer.

(G) The transferred land shall be within the boundary of the
proposed development or, if the local agency agrees, within
one-quarter mile of the boundary of the proposed development.

(H) A proposed source of funding for the very low income units
shall be identified not later than the date of approval of the final
subdivision map, parcel map, or residential development
application.

(h) (1) When an applicant proposes to construct a housing
development that conforms to the requirements of subdivision (b)
and includes a child care facility that will be located on the
premises of, as part of, or adjacent to, the project, the city, county,
or city and county shall grant either of the following:
(A) An additional density bonus that is an amount of square
feet of residential space that is equal to or greater than the amount
of square feet in the child care facility.
(B) An additional concession or incentive that contributes
significantly to the economic feasibility of the construction of the
child care facility.

(2) The city, county, or city and county shall require, as a
condition of approving the housing development, that the following
occur:
(A) The child care facility shall remain in operation for a period
of time that is as long as or longer than the period of time during
which the density bonus units are required to remain affordable
pursuant to subdivision (c).
(B) Of the children who attend the child care facility, the
children of very low income households, lower income households,
or families of moderate income shall equal a percentage that is
equal to or greater than the percentage of dwelling units that are
required for very low income households, lower income
households, or families of moderate income pursuant to subdivision
(b).

(3) Notwithstanding any requirement of this subdivision, a city,
county, or city and county shall not be required to provide a density
bonus or concession for a child care facility if it finds, based upon
substantial evidence, that the community has adequate child care facilities.

(4) “Child care facility,” as used in this section, means a child day care facility other than a family day care home, including, but not limited to, infant centers, preschools, extended day care facilities, and schoolage child care centers.

(i) “Housing development,” as used in this section, means a development project for five or more residential units. For the purposes of this section, “housing development” also includes a subdivision or common interest development, as defined in Section 4100 of the Civil Code, approved by a city, county, or city and county and consists of residential units or unimproved residential lots and either a project to substantially rehabilitate and convert an existing commercial building to residential use or the substantial rehabilitation of an existing multifamily dwelling, as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 65863.4, where the result of the rehabilitation would be a net increase in available residential units.

For the purpose of calculating a density bonus, the residential units shall be on contiguous sites that are the subject of one development application, but do not have to be based upon individual subdivision maps or parcels. The density bonus shall be permitted in geographic areas of the housing development other than the areas where the units for the lower income households are located.

(j) (1) The granting of a concession or incentive shall not be interpreted, in and of itself, to require a general plan amendment, local coastal plan amendment, zoning change, or other discretionary approval. This provision is declaratory of existing law.

(2) Except as provided in subdivisions (d) and (e), the granting of a density bonus shall not be interpreted to require the waiver of a local ordinance or provisions of a local ordinance unrelated to development standards.

(k) For the purposes of this chapter, concession or incentive means any of the following:

(1) A reduction in site development standards or a modification of zoning code requirements or architectural design requirements that exceed the minimum building standards approved by the California Building Standards Commission as provided in Part 2.5 (commencing with Section 18901) of Division 13 of the Health and Safety Code, including, but not limited to, a reduction in setback and square footage requirements and in the ratio of
vehicular parking spaces that would otherwise be required that
results in identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual cost
reductions.

(2) Approval of mixed-use zoning in conjunction with the
housing project if commercial, office, industrial, or other land uses
will reduce the cost of the housing development and if the
commercial, office, industrial, or other land uses are compatible
with the housing project and the existing or planned development
in the area where the proposed housing project will be located.

(3) Other regulatory incentives or concessions proposed by the
developer or the city, county, or city and county that result in
identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual cost reductions.

(l) Subdivision (k) does not limit or require the provision of
direct financial incentives for the housing development, including
the provision of publicly owned land, by the city, county, or city
and county, or the waiver of fees or dedication requirements.

(m) This section does not supersede or in any way alter or lessen
the effect or application of the California Coastal Act of 1976
(Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public
Resources Code).

(n) If permitted by local ordinance, nothing in this section shall
be construed to prohibit a city, county, or city and county from
granting a density bonus greater than what is described in this
section for a development that meets the requirements of this
section or from granting a proportionately lower density bonus
than what is required by this section for developments that do not
meet the requirements of this section.

(o) For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall
apply:

(1) “Development standard” includes a site or construction
condition, including, but not limited to, a height limitation, a
setback requirement, a floor area ratio, an onsite open-space
requirement, or a parking ratio that applies to a residential
development pursuant to any ordinance, general plan element,
specific plan, charter, or other local condition, law, policy,
resolution, or regulation.

(2) “Maximum allowable residential density” means the density
allowed under the zoning ordinance and land use element of the
general plan, or if a range of density is permitted, means the
maximum allowable density for the specific zoning range and land
use element of the general plan applicable to the project. Where
the density allowed under the zoning ordinance is inconsistent
with the density allowed under the land use element of the general
plan, the general plan density shall prevail.

(p) (1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), upon the
request of the developer, a city, county, or city and county shall
not require a vehicular parking ratio, inclusive of handicapped and
guest parking, of a development meeting the criteria of subdivisions
(b) and (c), that exceeds the following ratios:

(A) Zero to one bedroom: one onsite parking space.
(B) Two to three bedrooms: two onsite parking spaces.
(C) Four and more bedrooms: two and one-half parking spaces.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), if a development includes
the maximum percentage of low- or very low income units
provided for in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (f) and is
located within one-half mile of a major transit stop, as defined in
subdivision (b) of Section 21155 of the Public Resources Code,
and there is unobstructed access to the major transit stop from the
development, then, upon the request of the developer, a city, county,
or city and county shall not impose a vehicular parking
ratio, inclusive of handicapped and guest parking, that exceeds 0.5 spaces per bedroom.

(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), if a development consists
solely of rental units, exclusive of a manager’s unit or units, with
an affordable housing cost to lower income families, as provided
in Section 50052.5 of the Health and Safety Code, then, upon the
request of the developer, a city, county, or city and county shall
not impose a minimum vehicular parking requirement, if the
development meets any of the following criteria:

(A) If the development is located within one-half mile of
a major transit stop, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 21155
of the Public Resources Code, and there is unobstructed access to
the major transit stop from the development: development, the
ratio shall not exceed 0.5 spaces per unit. For purposes of this
paragraph, a development shall have unobstructed access to the
major transit stop if a resident is able to walk to access the major
transit stop without encountering natural or constructed
impediments.
(B) The development is a for-rent housing development for individuals who are 62 years of age or older that complies with Sections 51.2 and 51.3 of the Civil Code. The development shall have either paratransit service or be located within one-half mile of fixed bus route service that operates at least eight times per day.

(C) The development is a special needs housing development, as defined in Section 51312 of the Health and Safety Code. The development shall have either paratransit service or be located within one-half mile of fixed bus route service that operates at least eight times per day.

(4) If the total number of parking spaces required for a development is other than a whole number, the number shall be rounded up to the next whole number. For purposes of this subdivision, a development may provide on-site parking through tandem parking or uncovered parking, but not through on-street parking.

(5) This subdivision shall apply to a development that meets the requirements of subdivisions (b) and (c), but only at the request of the applicant. An applicant may request parking incentives or concessions beyond those provided in this subdivision pursuant to subdivision (d).

(6) This subdivision does not preclude a city, county, or city and county from reducing or eliminating a parking requirement for development projects of any type in any location.

(7) Notwithstanding paragraphs (2) and (3), if a city, county or city and county has conducted an area-wide or jurisdiction-wide parking study in the last five years, then the city, county, or city and county may impose a higher vehicular parking ratio not to exceed the ratio described in paragraph (1), based upon substantial evidence found in the parking study conducted by an independent consultant, that includes, but is not limited to, an analysis of parking availability, differing levels of transit access, walkability access to transit services, the potential for shared parking, and the effect of parking requirements on the cost of market-rate and subsidized developments. The city, county, or city and county shall make findings supporting the need for the higher parking ratio.
SEC. 3. If the Commission on State Mandates determines that
this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to
local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made
pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division
4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.
Candidates for Student Representative

One year term expiring 2016

Noa Zarur, YULA Girls High School
I believe I will be a strong candidate for the student representative position on the board because I live and go to school in the SORO community and I feel very passionately about helping better the community. I have so many ideas of different programs that will benefit the community, for example, I think that in order to encourage more physical activity we can create a sports day and have high schoolers volunteer to help run all the sports like: baseball, volleyball, basketball, soccer, tennis, track, etc. Additionally just like the current tutoring program we have in Shenandoah Street Elementary School for the core curriculum, we should create a similar program for art and drawing so children who want to further their skills, have the opportunity to do so. I also think that for the Shenandoah Street Elementary School tutoring program, we should dedicate 15 minutes every time for a book club for anyone that wants to join. I have many more ideas for how to help the environment, the less fortunate, schools and more. I would really love to be able to better the community around us and I believe the best way to accomplish this is by joining the Board and being about to have an input on the things going on in our community.

My leadership experiences are:

Board of YULA Israel Advocacy club, board of Future Business Leaders of America (FBLA), voluntarily tutoring kids at Shenandoah Street Elementary School, counselor at Camp Ariel, counselor at Bnai David-Judea Congregation, and Bnai Akiva counselor.

The extracurriculars I do are:


Who do I admire:

The person I admire deeply is Rosa Parks because she did not let her gender, her skin tone, her place in society or anything else stop her from doing what she believed in, which was civil rights for African-Americans. She knew what she wanted and she went for it no matter what people or society told her.

Jenna Kirschenbaum, YULA Girls High School
As part of the board, I feel that I can offer a lot to our community. As a Jewish modern orthodox teenager, I can offer a unique perspective of both the other Jews an other teens in my community. Additionally, I'm hardworking, quick thinking, and will do whatever it takes to get the job done.
Nominee for Green Team Vice-Chair
Nicole Zwiren

Nicole Zwiren is a union utility sound technician and a freelance sound mixer, with her MFA in Sound Design from Chapman University and her Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology and African-American Studies from UCLA. She has experience as a volunteer for her community as both an event planner for Robertson Park and a member of the Green Team committee of the South Robertson neighborhood. As a volunteer for Robertson Park she has planned and coordinated 3 separate basketball events along with her own Basketball for Peace in conjunction with the Peace Picnic in September of 2014. On the Green Team she has been concerned with the greenery and the community garden along with starting a new community garden in the neighborhood.

On her agenda for the new year she wants to help Aimee as the co-chair of the green team. She is concerned with such issues as protecting the trees during the renovation of the Robertson Park, teaching the importance of preserving the environment to protect the wildlife of the community, teaching how people can sustain the planet better by doing their own composting, and educating the neighborhood on the dangers of allowing the electric company to pollute our homes with unnecessary radio frequencies in the form of smart meter installations. She plans on getting more of a variety of people to attend the meetings and to encourage activism in the form of writing letters, calling politicians in office, starting petitions and spearheading events to bring important issues to recognition.
Motion to support naming Gibson St and Robertson BL The Barbara Mendes Square

Agenda Item: GB082015-10
Date: 08-20-2015
Proposed By: Terrence Gomes

Background

Barbara Mendes is a Visionary Narrative artist who created underground comix in the 70's as Willy Mendes, then made and sold Mystical paintings drawing on world culture until encountering her own Judaic Heritage in 1992, which led to immersion in Jewish learning resulting in countless paintings and 3 Biblical Murals; "Beresheit" (on Genesis) is in Boca Raton, FL; "Shemot" (on Exodus) is at the Sephardic Educational Center in the Old City of Jerusalem, and "VAYIKRA", illuminating all 859 verses in the Book of Leviticus.

Creating the most beautiful corner in Los Angeles was the goal of the Barbara Mendes. The Angel Wall celebrates heavenly Angels such as Whitney Houston, Marilyn Monroe, Bob Marley and Jimi Hendrix; the giant Angel honors Oma "Annie" Kunstler, beloved daughter of the artist, who died in 2006, after living far beyond her 1973 brain cancer prognosis of one year.

Proposed Motion

I. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council (SORONC) moves to support the naming of Gibson St. and Robertson BL "The Barbara Mendes Square"

II. SORONC moves to write a letter of support to Council Districts 5 and 10 for the naming of Gibson St. and Robertson BL as "The Barbara Mendes Square"

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review:</th>
<th>Votes For: 0</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: | $0 |
| (applies to funding motions only) | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First argument in favor. Use these points to help frame the debate.</td>
<td>First argument against the motion. Try to be fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second argument in favor. This bottom part is created with a table in Word. It's easier to use if you display Gridlines (under the Table menu in Word).</td>
<td>Another argument against. Add more rows to the table if you have more arguments pro or con.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councilmember Paul Koretz
City of Los Angeles Council District 5
200 North Spring Street, Room 440
Los Angeles, CA 90012

20 August 2015

Re: Barbara Mendes, Artist and Cultural Treasure

Dear Councilmember Koretz:

As it has been for many years, the South Robertson community is graced by the mystical, celebratory, ecstatic art of Barbara Mendes.

Whether in her canvases or murals, Ms. Mendes articulates a personal and open-hearted worldview that gives voice to the vibrant inclusiveness of her larger community. Her epic public artwork, “The Angel Wall,” is an acclaimed and recognizable landmark within the City, celebrating a broad cross-section of divine and worldly angels, from Jimi Hendrix to current local students to her own late daughter.

Ms. Mendes career began as a pioneering feminist voice in the underground art of early 1970’s comix. After graduating from UC Riverside, she co-created 1970’s groundbreaking It Ain’t Me Babe, a rare women-produced comic book in a male-dominated field, while simultaneously pursuing her fine arts career.

In the decades since, Barbara Mendes has continued to fuse her distinctly bold palette to world culture and spiritual themes, completing major commissions across the globe that include her three biblical murals, Beresheit, Shemot, and Vayikra, the latter illuminating all 859 verses of Leviticus. She is an invaluable and civic-minded asset to the arts, to the South Robertson community, and to the City of Los Angeles.

For these reasons, the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council therefore requests that the intersection of Gibson Street and Robertson Boulevard be named Barbara Mendes Square in recognition.

Sincerely,

Doug Fitzsimmons
President, South Robertson Neighborhoods Council

cc: Council President Herb Wesson
Mayor Eric Garcetti
Council President Herb Wesson
Members of the Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Commission
Danielle Brazell, General Manager, Department of Cultural Affairs
Motion to allocate $1000 for the Walk to School Day on October 7, 2015 at Shenandoah Elementary School

Agenda Item: GB082015-11
Date: 08-20-2015
Proposed By: Terrence Gomes

Background
The City of Los Angeles Walk To School Day 2014 was a great success with over 18,000 students from 67 Los Angeles schools participating in Walk-tober. International Walk to School Day brings together thousands of schools to host students, school administration, community members, and elected officials to celebrate a walk to school. Walk to School Day will be held on October 7, 2015.

The SORONC will partner with LAUSD, LAPD, Sanitation, LADOT, and LAFD to have a fun and informative day with presentations and giveaways.

SORONC will supply smart snacks and drinks to all participants with a theme for the items based on the event.

Why Walk to School Day? This allows parents and children to have fun, increase physical activity, improve health, and highlight walking, bicycling and traffic concerns! The City of Los Angeles Walk to School Day is a phenomenal first step for the City to make students visible and promote Safe Routes to School everywhere!

Proposed Motion
I. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council (SORONC) moves to support the Walk to School Day
II. SORONC moves to allocate $1000.00, ($1.00 per participant) to pay for smart snacks and drinks, materials, and themed giveaways.

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

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

Arguments for: Arguments against:
Great way for community involvement Costs $1000.00
Teaches school children traffic safety
Motion to ask the City of Los Angeles to provide transparency on the Coalition of Labor’s proposed contract

Agenda Item: GB082015-12
Date: 08/20/15
Proposed By: Terrence Gomes

Background

According to a Los Angeles Times article ([http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-coalition-unions-contract-20150805-story.html](http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-coalition-unions-contract-20150805-story.html)) city officials have reached a tentative contract agreement with the unions representing more than half Los Angeles’ civilian workforce, bringing within reach the conclusion to more than a year of tense bargaining and sharp rhetoric over public-employee pay. Sources familiar with the proposed four-year contract said it would freeze raises for three years, with a 2% raise in the final year. The deferral of pay increases was a particularly important point in the negotiations, since the coalition in 2007 secured a nearly 25% across-the-board raise for its members that exacerbated the city’s budget woes during the economic downturn.

Although negotiations could occur from the view of the public, Neighborhood Councils should be afforded the opportunity to review and weigh in on contracts and motions brought before the City Council.

Proposed Motion

I. SORONC moves that the City of Los Angeles immediately release any and all details of the proposed labor contract with the coalition of unions, that was announced last week, and allow Neighborhood Councils a minimum of 60 days to place on their agendas to discuss the merits of the contract proposed per our Charter mandate before City Council takes any action.

Considerations

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

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

Arguments for: Arguments against:

First argument in favor. Use these points to help frame the debate.
First argument against the motion. Try to be fair.

Second argument in favor. This bottom part is created with a table in Word. It’s easier to use if you display Gridlines (under the Table menu in Word).
Another argument against. Add more rows to the table if you have more arguments pro or con.