Motion to advise the City on NC minutes policy

Agenda Item: GB111915-2
Date: 19 November 2015
Proposed By: Executive Committee

Background

The Board of Neighborhood Commissioners is considering system-wide rules regarding Neighborhood Council minutes.

While the Brown Act does not specifically require minutes for meetings, open government and parliamentary best practices do underscore their importance in keeping the public informed of Board actions.

In the vast majority of cases, the full NC Board is the only body authorized to make final decisions on funding matters, policy recommendations, and bylaws amendments. It is vital that the community understand how these decisions are made; therefore, minutes must recorded at any meeting in which a final action is taken on behalf of the Board.

Committees that merely advise the Board or develop motions for Board consideration, however, aren’t taking final action. The work of the committee is reflected in the motions it brings forward, or in the formal recommendations it proposes. We feel that minutes should be strongly encouraged for committees, but not required unless the Board has specifically delegated decision-making authority to the committee.

Minutes do not serve their purpose unless they are available to everyone. To that end, we include recommendations for posting deadlines and multimedia alternatives.

Proposed Motion

Regarding a potential citywide policy on NC minutes developed by the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners (BONC):

I. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council recommends to BONC that all Neighborhood Councils be required to record minutes of full Board meetings, including a listing of how each Board member votes on all motions, amendments, and parliamentary actions;

II. Board committees should be encouraged to record minutes as a best practice, but not required to take them. If the Board delegates decision-making authority to a committee however, the committee must take minutes;

III. Draft meeting minutes must be posted to the NC’s website and otherwise be made available to the public no later than 72 hours before the next meeting. Approved minutes must be posted within five (5) business days after the meeting;

IV. Due to accessibility concerns, audio and/or video recordings may not be substituted for written minutes, but are encouraged as a supplementary resource.
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review:</th>
<th>Votes For: 2</th>
<th>Against: 0</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>Every final action made by the NC should be available to the public.</td>
<td>All public meetings should have public minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a practical matter, committees may not have the volunteer bandwidth to take regular minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidate for Zone 3 Representative

Interim term expiring June 2016

Michael Bitton

Candidates for At-Large 1 Representative

Interim term expiring June 2016

Shariff Hazan
I've lived in the Pico Robertson community for close to 10 years. I'm a community organizer and sit on the board of many Jewish organizations and non Jewish organizations in the community. Excited to do outreach and create partnerships.

Heather Leikin
I am a realtor and care about the needs of our neighborhood. I understand zoning and land use and love the culture and charm of our neighborhoods while I favor sensible progress. I am forward thinking with a strong understanding of green issues as they relate to building better communities that will flourish. I tend to favor local businesses and walkability, drought tolerant landscaping and communal meeting places for enjoyment of our shared spaces. However, I understand that there is value in our area. I tend to think working with builders with vision (especially renovators that will keep the charm of our existing homes as opposed to tear downs and McMansions) will help us more than fighting progress on all fronts.

I have been a member of the green team for 3 years and was very involved with the town hall on water conservation that we put on.

Ken Blaker
I have been in the SoRo area for over eight years. I work here. I live here with my wife and 2 young children. I serve on the board of my condo building here. I shop here. I pray here (my family and I are Jewish Orthodox, and our synagogue is here in SoRo). We find this area to be a community of diversity enhanced through a general feeling of friendliness and respect for individuals and groups. As a Board Member I will be maintain focus on the maintaining and building the values of a great neighborhood: safety for individuals and families, excellent services, businesses which serve the community and create jobs, diversity and communal acceptance and respect.

Ellen Lanet
SORO neighborhood has always been the place I've spent many memorable life events. I have lived most of my life in or near SORO. I have very deep roots in the community and good friends throughout the neighborhood. My 2 daughters have called SORO their home for the past 24+ years. Between us we've attended daycare, preschools, high school, day camps, temple programs, swimming classes, yoga classes, library groups....in SORO. I was on the SORO-NC Board from 2012-2014 as Zone 8 representative. Although I did not seek reelection, I did continue participating as a member of the Land Use Committee and as the Vice Co-Chair of the
Transportation Committee. My participation on these committees allows me to use my professional Architecture and Urban Design skills to be of service to our special neighborhood. Our evolving neighborhood continues to flourish by strengthening our unique qualities and supporting our diverse residents to live well together. All neighborhood councils encourage local leaders to remember the important qualities of each NC’s “Spirit of Place and Residents”. I look forward to being an At-Large SORO-NC Board Member to work with all stakeholders to continue advocating for the unique “Spirit of Place” SORO is and integrating new opportunities.

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 recommend modification of the NC Community Stakeholder definition

Agenda Item: GB101515-12
Date: 15 October 2015
Proposed By: Doug Fitzsimmons

Full Proposal

Some years ago, the original definition of who qualified as a stakeholder in the Neighborhood Council system was changed by the City Council at the suggestion of the Neighborhood Council Review Commission (NCRC), a group chartered in 2007 to fine-tune the NC system.

The thinking was that the original “live, work or own property” definition tended to limit NC participation. In their final report, the NCRC said: “...because the neighborhood council democracy model is meant to reach more deeply into the community than traditional outreach models, the goal of diversity must be pursued aggressively.” They therefore recommended that it also include “those who declare a stake in the neighborhood and affirm the factual basis for it.”

Problems with the very broad “factual basis” definition became quickly apparent. Suddenly, anyone could vote in an NC election with as little proof as a receipt from a local coffee shop. Some NCs were taken over by outside groups who, in at least one case, bussed people in to vote for candidates who favored a particular development project.

In response, the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners (BONC) officially recommended/required that each council reserve one at-large seat for factual basis stakeholders. That a single token at-large seat was thought to be an acceptable and necessary compromise demonstrated how deeply flawed the language was.

In 2013, a new NC reform initiative again took up the issue of stakeholder definition. Of the three working groups, 2/3 proposed removing factual basis stakeholders. That a single token at-large seat was thought to be an acceptable and necessary compromise demonstrated how deeply flawed the language was.

At the final meeting to find compromise language, a last-minute proposal (with little basis in the prior work of the groups) was put forward and adopted with little debate:

“Stakeholders” shall be defined as those who live, work or own real property in the neighborhood and also to those who declare a stake in the neighborhood as a community interest stakeholder, defined as a person who affirms a substantial and ongoing participation within the Neighborhood Council’s boundaries and who may be in a community organization such as, but not limited to, educational, non-profit and/or religious organizations.

This confusing syntax substituted the open-ended and un-verifiable “substantial and ongoing participation” for “declare a stake in the neighborhood” without defining “substantial” or “ongoing.” It did add a provision for being “in a community organization”—but here again, it did not define what being “in” meant and was so open-ended as to be meaningless. It was a marginal improvement, at best.
If the goal is to include non-residents who are nevertheless legitimately invested in the community, we have to have some verifiable measure of that activity. But that exercise is doomed to failure: it is impossible to craft language that would cover every eventuality.

Moreover, it’s debatable whether any of these changes were needed at all. Before the 2007 change, most NCs had expanded the basic stakeholder definition on their own, tailoring it to their community: in fact, a study before the definition change showed that 88% of NCs had broader-than-required stakeholder definitions. For example, SORO NC had created special seats for schools and community organizations.

The authors of the City Charter felt that Neighborhood Councils should be tailored to their own communities and stakeholders. The proposed language below allows Neighborhood Councils the opportunity to broaden the base stakeholder definition to suit their own particular needs and character. It does not preclude “community interest” stakeholders if the Neighborhood Council wishes.

**Proposed Motion**

I. To recommend to the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners and the Los Angeles City Council that the City administrative code be amended to define Neighborhood Council stakeholders as such:

> Stakeholders shall be defined as those who live, work, or own real property within the Neighborhood Council boundaries. With the approval of the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment, Neighborhood Councils may—and are encouraged to—expand this definition within their bylaws to include other defined groups of stakeholders.

**Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review:</th>
<th>Votes For: n/a</th>
<th>Against: 0</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>Allows individual NCs to tailor an expanded stakeholder definition that best reflects their community.</td>
<td>NCs are intended to be more inclusive. If you view “stakeholder” as someone who contributes to and benefits from the character of a community, a very broad definition makes sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserves the baseline “live, work, own property” definition—and so protects against any attempt to be too restrictive.</td>
<td>Some NCs may only use the basic definition and thereby fail to reach important neighborhood constituencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides clarity on who constitutes a stakeholder and avoids undue outside influence on NC elections.</td>
<td>While election abuses may exist, they are not as widespread or common as some suggest. Changing the definition for edge cases is overkill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motion to approve 2016 General Board meeting schedule

Agenda Item: GB111915-9
Date: 19 November 2015
Proposed By: Doug Fitzsimmons

Full Proposal

In an effort to allow full community and Board input into SORO NC’s General Meeting dates, this motion seeks to establish an approved meeting calendar for 2016.

In the past, some stakeholders and Board members have expressed concern about meeting scheduling. The NC has endeavored to avoid conflicts with other events, holidays, and celebrations, but it hasn’t always been possible. Opening the schedule to public discussion—while it still may not fully satisfy all parties—will ensure a more transparent process.

The following informational calendar includes the "regular date" (the customary third Thursday of each month) as well as notations on possible conflicts and alternate dates. In developing the list of potential conflicts, a best effort was made to survey U.S. Federal, Jewish, Christian, and Islamic celebrations. Any omissions are unintentional.

The Board may opt to adopt the regular calendar as it stands or modify it through amendments to this motion. Note that none of the normal dates fall on a Federal or State holiday.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular 2016 Date</th>
<th>Possible Conflict</th>
<th>Possible Alternate(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17</td>
<td>St. Patrick’s Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20</td>
<td>Sukkot IV</td>
<td>Thurs., Oct. 13 or 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Motion

I. To adopt the 2016 SORO NC General Board meeting schedule ("Regular 2016 Dates") shown above.

II. This motion does not supersede any aspect or procedure set forth in the NC bylaws, particularly Article VIII, Section 1, Item 2: Special Board Meetings.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review:</th>
<th>Votes For: 0</th>
<th>Against: 0</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) | |

Arguments for:  
Setting a yearly meeting calendar allows for community input into our schedule.

Meeting on a consistent date (i.e., the third Thursday of the month) may be more easily remembered by stakeholders.

Arguments against:  
The dates may still need to be amended as emergencies arise or if we are unable to secure a meeting location on those dates (however unlikely).

Although this calendar sets the dates for regular meetings, special meetings may be need to be called that go beyond the schedule listed here.
Motion for action on development at 8590 Pico Blvd 7 story, 36 unit apartment project with 1000 feet of retail.

Agenda Item: GB111915-10
Date: August 19, 2015
Proposed By: Terrence Gomes

Background
Developer presented to LUED Committee the action on development at 8590 Pico Blvd 7 story, 36 unit apartment project with 1000 feet of retail. After the presentation, many questions were not answered about the project. The committee could not make a recommendation to the Board and requested the developer to make a presentation to the Board.

Proposed Motion

I. Motion to be decided by Board

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review:</th>
<th>Votes For: 4</th>
<th>Against: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(highly recommended)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adds additional housing stock for the community.</td>
<td>Applicant was unable to articulate as to how this project will meet the 25% reduction in water usage mandated by the Governor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate resident, guest, or shopping parking was not addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motion to fund up to $205 to Co-Sponsor a FREE CHP “Child Car Seat Check Up” Event

Agenda Item: GB111915-11
Date: November 19, 2015
Proposed By: SORO NC Public Safety Committee

Full Proposal

A child’s life depends on the car seat they’re riding in. It’s imperative to make sure it’s properly installed and that it is size appropriate. More than 80 percent of car seats are critically misused.

The CHP established the Child Car Seat Check Up program in 1999, with funding provided by a grant from the California Office of Traffic Safety through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. They seek to partner with numerous community organizations that are willing to host and sponsor a Car Seat Check Up Event, which is at no cost to the organization and open to the public (also at no cost.)

Parents and/or Guardians are encouraged to bring their children along with their car seat to a designated location and have it inspected by specially trained Child Safety Seat Technicians. The technicians will be available to properly set up and adjust the car seats for the child. In addition, they provide safety information regarding updated child-restraint laws and proper child-restraint practices.

By Sponsoring (or Hosting) this proposed Event, SORO NC would be responsible for planning and coordinating the Event logistics, promoting the Event to the community, and providing volunteers to assist at the Event. Current promotion plans include a PSA press release to media, email blast to CD 5 & 10, and Social Media postings (Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor, etc…).

Proposed Motion

1.) That the SORO NC co-sponsor a FREE CHP “Car Seat Check” event on Sunday February 21, 2016 in coordination with the CHP, CD5 and Assemblymember Bloom.

2.) That the SORO NC fund $22.86 for 3 cases of bottled water. Provide bags of snacks from existing supplies in Storage.

3.) That the SORO NC fund $181.67 for 100 SORO Flashlight Keychains, to be given away at event.
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review:</th>
<th>Votes For: 3</th>
<th>Against: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(highly recommended)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FREE!!!!! Can help protect children from injury or death.</td>
<td>Requires a few volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was very successful event last year</td>
<td>Success will depend on Publicity and Social Media for Event promotion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motion to present Small business Forum on ADA Compliance Regulation

Agenda Item: GB111915-12
Date: November 19, 2015
Proposed By: Beth Hirsch

Background

At least five of our store front businesses on South Robertson Blvd have reported that they have been hit with discrimination law suits regarding no handicapped parking in the back of their premises. These businesses generally have a small amount of private parking for employees, owners and in some cases residents who live above the store fronts. There has been confusion by the business owners as to why they are not compliant as they consider it to be private parking. Why they are being targeted and not clear on what all the rules are and how they should address this issue going forward. Some have hired attorneys who are giving conflicting advice. These businesses have asked for help and advice from the Neighborhood Council and the City.

Proposed Motion

I. Therefore the NC should provide an ADA Compliance Forum for our small businesses. A small panel including a representative from our City Attorney and Councilman’s offices should be on hand to provide current information, and answer questions regarding the laws and ordinances surrounding this issue and help the group find possible solutions to becoming ADA compliant or to improve their status for the betterment of the disabled public and to help them avoid further litigation on ADA issues.

- Asking the Board to support the NC providing a small informal panel discussion at an appropriate location for a small event and assistance in outreach to small business that would need this advice.

- That the NC would formally ask that the appropriate city officials attend and help provide representatives for the panel.

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: Arguments against:

1. In addition to providing a much needed service to our disabled residents. This 1. NC would need to be cautious that we were not providing legal advice directly.
would also provide a much needed opportunity to bring together, connect with and provide support to our small businesses in a meaningful way.

2. NC may also discover better ways to help our disabled public.

2. The NC or are small business would not want to appear to be insensitive to our disabled public during these discussions.
Motion to provide environmental feedback on the Robertson Recreation Center project

Agenda Item: GB111915-13
Date: November 19, 2015
Proposed By: The Green Team

Background

The Robertson Recreation Center at Robertson and Airdrome is currently being redesigned and the existing building will be replaced with a new structure beginning 2016.

Members of the Green Team Committee attended a design meeting in August 2015 asking for input on the design of the exterior grounds. During those discussions, we presented the City with a verbal and rough draft "wish list" of environmental design ideas and suggestions that would make the building environmentally sustainable going forward. Many of these design suggestions are modeled after ones currently being used in a multipurpose community center in Virginia Avenue Park in Santa Monica. This building served as guide to the committee’s suggestions. The Virginia Avenue Park Multipurpose Center is applying for a LEED Platinum certification.

The Green Committee thought it prudent to put these ideas and suggestions in writing and send them to the City Lead for the project, Mr. Jaime Contreras, Bureau of Engineering, Department of Public Works. It is our hope that as many of these elements as possible, will be incorporated into our new recreation center.

Proposed Motion

To send the attached letter from the SORO NC Board listing the SORO Green Team committee’s design suggestions for the exterior of the new Robertson Recreation Center which would make the building more environmentally sustainable and nature-friendly going forward.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review: (highly recommended)</th>
<th>Votes For: 4</th>
<th>Against: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount previously allocated in Committee's working budget: (applies to funding motions only)</td>
<td>$ N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments for:</td>
<td>Arguments against:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members can see first hand how these systems can actually work</td>
<td>Some sustainable elements can increase the initial cost of the structure (but pay great dividends over time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Los Angeles prides itself on being one of the five greenest large scale cities in the world. This building would be a source of pride for our community and country.

Seeing these elements at work in community buildings sends the message that we are serious about doing our part in turning around climate change.
November 19, 2015

Jaime Contreras
Bureau of Engineering, Department of Public Works
1149 S. Broadway, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90015-2213

Dear Mr. Contreras,

Thank you for holding a meeting at the Robertson Recreation Center on Thursday, August 6th to discuss and receive input on the exterior grounds.

Pursuant to that meeting, the Board and Green Team Committee of the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council wanted to confirm with you in writing, the elements that we would like to see incorporated into the design of the Recreation Center, if at all possible.

I. General points are:

   a. Install shade awnings wherever possible to provide shaded areas externally and to help to cut down glare and cool the building internally. We provided you with examples used in the multi-purpose LEED platinum grade building in Victoria Avenue Park in Santa Monica.

   b. If feasible,* use solar panel arrays to create a canopy shade system in the parking lot.

      * Feasible means if parking lot is not needed for tented community events, or panels not obscured by surrounding trees, or not in danger of being damaged by stray balls from basketball games.

   c. Integrate natural landscaping into parking lots.

   d. Provide and try to exceed the maximum number of permanently anchored bicycle racks.

   e. Provide and try to exceed the maximum number of charging stations for electrical vehicles.

   f. To mitigate water runoff and effectively use water:

      i. Wherever possible, paved surfaces should be permeable.

      ii. Direct runoff to permeable landscaping

      iii. Prevent storm water pollution with the use of oil filters, sand filters, detention basins, trenches, swales, downspout filtration,

      iv. Design any irrigation timing to minimize runoff

      v. Stabilize soil with California native vegetation

      vi. Consider installing a water capture cistern using the captured water to flush toilets (this system is being used in the Multipurpose building in Victoria Avenue Park, Santa Monica)
II. Landscaping
   a. At minimum, restore all trees that are removed or damaged due to construction at a ratio of 2 trees planted for each tree damaged or removed and replace with the maximum maturity possible. If site plan cannot accommodate the extra trees, they should be planted adjacent to the Robertson Recreation Center to reduce the heat island effect (Suggestion 7-Eleven or adjacent gas station, and Robertson Library). Consider California native species.
   b. To reduce cooling loads, whenever feasible, plant or retain shade trees, especially on the south, southeast, and southwest.
   c. Plant low-water-needs California natives. They create important habitat for resident and migratory wildlife.
   d. Plant California native, drought tolerant vegetation: outdoor water use accounts for 35% of overall water consumption in LA.
   e. Minimize lawn
   f. Use drip irrigation
   g. Do not use artificial turf

III. Playground
   a. Rubberized surface should be adequate enough to accommodate all handicapped persons wanting to use the play equipment.
   b. Limit the use of sand, but do not eliminate it. If possible, employ covers for sand.
   c. After discussing the playground with the headmasters of several preschools in our neighborhood, we learned that integrating natural elements into play areas stimulates high quality free play and discovery learning. We would prefer limiting themed play structures. The goal in designing the children's outdoor environment should be to use landscape and vegetation as the play setting and nature as much as possible as the play materials. We cite research and references at the end of this letter to help guide you in the integration of nature into your design.
   d. Install multiple, lockable bicycle racks

IV. Waste Recycling
   a. Designate an area in the park for larger, color-coded dumpsters with clear signage for effective recycling.
   b. Smaller exterior and interior bins and waste receptacles should be clearly marked and color-coded for: trash, paper/tin/plastic, waste.
   c. Designate an area for composting garden leaves and clippings
   d. Consider signage making the park a battery recycling depository

Once again, thank you for your efforts on behalf of our community.
Yours truly,

Doug Fitzsimmons  
President, South Robertson Neighborhoods Council

1 References and Research Studies Using Nature in Playground Design


Haas, Malka, "Children In The Junkyard", Childhood Education, v72, n6, 1996,  
Association for Childhood Education International, Wheaton, MD.

Francis, Mark (interview), au Kathryn Devereaux, "Children of Nature", U. C. Davis Magazine, v9, n2, 1991, University of California, Davis.


Barrows, Anita, "The Ecopsychology of Child Development", Ecopsychology,  


Hart, Roger A., Children's Participation: The Theory and Practice of Involving Young Children in Community Development and Environmental Care, London, UK,


Once again, thank you for all your efforts regarding this very important project.
To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Chana Karna Blugrind, and I am the Director of Yaldei Yisroel Preschool. I heard about the current plans for the renovation of Robertson Park, and I have some concerns. I have 18 years of experience working in early childhood education, and both my own experience, and numerous scientific studies bolster the beneficial aspects of sensory play for children, the most widely used of which are sand and water play. Sand and water play benefit all children through exploration and sensory play, but especially children with special needs, and in particular, those with sensory issues and developmental delays. It would be a grave mistake to omit such an important sensory play area from the newly renovated Robertson Park.

It is a well known fact that children benefit greatly from playing with sand and water, and if it is your aim to create a place for children it is important to take the needs of those children into account. For safety purposes, rubber flooring is a wonderful option for most of the park, but a small sand play area is crucial for the developmental needs of small children. A sand area can be made that does not impinge on the rest of the park. An excellent example is Roxbury Park, which has recently completed a beautiful and extensive playground renovation which removed sand from the majority of the park while still preserving a small sand station that includes water play, weather permitting. I believe room could be made in the Robertson Park renovation plans for sensitive inclusion of a sensory play area in a way that would not impinge on the general design of the new park, and which would pose no risk to the floors of the community center.

In terms of making a themed playground, numerous studies back up the benefits of open-ended play and environments, which have been shown to spark imagination in children. Why limit children to a train, when a more sensitively designed play area could be a train, or a plane, or a rocket ship, or a dinosaur, or anything a child could imagine. If you are seeking to create the best possible play environment for the children of Pico Robertson, I encourage you to reach out to professionals in the field of early childhood and special education, who can help guide you as to the real needs of children at play, and to read the many studies that have been done. There is such a wealth of knowledge in our own community, on the internet, and beyond that can help guide the South Robertson Neighborhood Council in making the best possible design for the new space at Robertson Park.

If I can be of any further help, please be in touch.

Sincerely,

Chana Karna Blugrind  
Preschool Director  
Yaldei Yisroel Early Learning Academy  
9051 West Pico Blvd  
Los Angeles, CA  
90035  
Office: 310 288 5920  
Mobile: 310 595 4148
Motion to annually allocate up to $2500 to trim Pico and Robertson trees

Agenda Item: GB111915-14
Date: November 19, 2015
Proposed By: Nicole Zwiren

Full Proposal

The 17 elm trees between Cattaraugus and Cadillac on South Robertson Blvd. along with the 7 Chinese Flame trees on South Pico along the 8500 – 9800 block have been planted by the Green Team. Such trees have been receiving funding from the SORONC Board and are in need of perpetual funding annually for maintenance and pruning. Moreno’s Five Star Tree Service has been the company of choice hired for pruning. Jesus Moreno from Five Star Tree Service will be able to prune all of the trees annually for no more than $2500 per year. The South Robertson community is responsible for keeping their trees from impeding on citizens walking on the sidewalks and driving on the streets. The City will not fund South Robertson’s tree pruning for another 90 years as they are on a 90 year tree trimming cycle, according to Liz Carlin, Deputy-West.

Proposed Motion

SORO NC should adopt the following:

I. Allot funds not exceeding $800/year for Pruning of 17 Robertson Elm Trees annually.

II. Allot funds not exceeding $1700/year for Pruning of 7 Pico Chinese Flame Trees annually

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review:</th>
<th>Votes For: 3</th>
<th>Against: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget:</th>
<th>$ ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Arguments for:

FREE!!!! Can help protect children from injury or death.
Was very successful event last year

Arguments against:

Requires a few volunteers.
Success will depend on Publicity and Social Media for Event promotion.
Motion to pay up to $750.00 to have an Independent Arborist examine tree situation at Robertson Recreation Center

Agenda Item: GB111915-15
Date: November 19, 2015
Proposed By: Aimee Zeltzer

The purpose of this specialist is to get an unbiased, non interested, educated opinion as to what will happen to the current trees on Robertson Blvd. during the construction phase of Robertson Recreation Center. There are some that say the City can build the center without damaging the trees, and others who say that the construction will destroy the trees and take decades to re-grow. This specialist is non biased and educated in the field and will provide us with his own professional opinion as to what is realistic to expect what will happen to the trees during construction. Once we are aware of the effect the construction will have on the current living trees we will be able to move forward to a true discussion as to what to do if the trees will be lost during construction and what concessions the city will make should that be case to re-grow new trees. We have two sides with different expert opinions (the city and the environmentalist) thus there is a need for a third unbiased opinion.

Proposed Motion

SORO NC should adopt the following:

I. To hire and pay Jan Scrow, a tree expert recommended by the Tree People, to give his expert opinion and report to us about what will happen to the healthy trees (and only the healthy ones) surrounding Robertson Recreation Center during reconstruction.

II. Payment is as follows: $225 for first hour in the field. $175 for every hour after or in the office. $6.00 if billed and not paid in advance. Maximum amount: $750.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review:</th>
<th>Votes For: 0</th>
<th>Against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget: $
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get a clear and unbiased opinion about the future of the Robertson Rec Center trees.</td>
<td>Listen to the arguments of those who are involved even though they are biased by their own backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With an unbiased professional opinion we will know what to realistically expect what will happen to the current trees and be able to make proper and timely request for action to save the trees or give other concessions for loss of the trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 11/9/15
To: Paula Waxman
Info: Aimee Zeltzer
From: Jan Scow
Subject: Cost of services- Assess Tree impacts from new Community Center
Reference: Email dated 10/13/15 at 4:01 PM from Paula Waxman

Based on the referenced email (generated by my website online form) I estimate it will take two hours in the field and possibly two hours in my office to review and report on the impacts to the trees in question. The work will not exceed $750.

Work product will include a report citing my conclusions as to the impacts of subject project on the trees in question.

Please let us know if we can be of any further assistance or if you have any additional questions. Our goal is to satisfy our clients and help them to better care for their trees in the most effective way possible. We look forward to working with you toward that goal!

Sincerely,

Jan C. Scow
ASCA Registered Consulting Arborist #382
ISA Certified Arborist # WC1972

Attached: LA City Tax Registration Certificate
CITY OF LOS ANGELES TAX REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE

THIS CERTIFICATE IS GOOD UNTIL SUSPENDED OR CANCELLED

BUSINESS TAX

ACCOUNT NO. 0000454964-0001-5
FUND/CLASS L049
DESCRIPTION Professions/Occupations
ISSUED: 3/16/2015

STARTED 6/13/1997
STATUS Active

JAN C SCOW CONSULTING ARBORISTS, LLC
1739 FRANKLIN STREET #A
SANTA MONICA CA 90404-4226

ISSUED TO

1739 FRANKLIN STREET #A
SANTA MONICA, CA 90404-4226

ISSUED FOR TAX COMPLIANCE PURPOSES ONLY
NOT A LICENSE, PERMIT, OR LAND USE AUTHORIZATION

ISSUED BY:

ANTINETTE D. CHRISTIANDEL
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

NOTIFY THE OFFICE OF FINANCE IN WRITING OF ANY CHANGE IN OWNERSHIP OR ADDRESS - Office of Finance, P.O. Box 53200, Los Angeles CA 90053-0200

IMPORTANT - READ REVERSE SIDE

FORM 2000 (Rev. 4/12)
Motion to support the Los Angeles Homeless Veterans Leasing Act of 2015 S. 2013 and H.R. 3484

Agenda Item: GB111915-16
Date: November 19, 2015
Proposed By: Terrence Gomes

Background

WHEREAS, South Robertson Neighborhoods Council (SORONC) represents over 40,000 stakeholders, who live, work, or own real property in the City of Los Angeles, and our communities who have Veteran stakeholders who use the West Los Angeles VA Medical Center (West LA VA) and support the use of the property to directly benefit our Veterans.

WHEREAS, Los Angeles County has the highest number of homeless Veterans in the nation. According to the most recent homeless count conducted by the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, there are 4,363 homeless Veterans in the county.

WHEREAS, in order to address this crisis, the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) is currently implementing a Homeless Plan and developing a Master Plan which will serve as a roadmap for housing and programs at the West LA VA.

WHEREAS, the current best practices for housing homeless Veterans is to offer Permanent Supportive Housing with comprehensive services. There is strong evidence-based data confirming a high rate of success and stability using this Housing First model.

WHEREAS, the VA would like to build an appropriate number of Permanent Supportive Housing units on the West LA VA based on the needs of the most chronically homeless Veterans, including women, aging and disabled Veterans. Permanent Supportive Housing requires a vehicle called an Enhanced Use Lease. The West LA VA does not currently have Enhanced Use Leasing authority and therefore cannot build Permanent Supportive Housing.

WHEREAS, Senator Feinstein and Congressman Lieu have introduced companion bills known as the Los Angeles Homeless Veterans Leasing Acts of 2015. These Acts give the VA the authority to enter into Enhanced Use Leases for the sole purpose of providing supportive housing. The authority has a number of safeguards, including the prohibition against selling or disposing of the land for private development. There are also regular reporting requirements to Congress about the status and success of the supportive housing.

WHEREAS, we are pleased the VA is striving to transform the West LA VA into a Veteran-centric property and we support their efforts to use the property to serve our nation’s Veterans.

Proposed Motion