Motion to call for California Homelessness State of Emergency and creation of temporary housing

Agenda Item: GB081816-2
Date: 18 August 2016
Proposed By: Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Coalition (LANCC)

Background from LANCC

Los Angeles is in a state of emergency and the resources of the City and County are unable to solve the crisis of homelessness.

When the City of Los Angeles declared a state of emergency on homelessness on September 22, 2015 after the historic motion by the Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Coalition (LANCC) and supported by the Certified Neighborhood Councils on January 3, 2015 to declare a state of emergency, dedicate $150,000,000 to combat the problem, and to utilize abated motels and vacate city buildings, the homeless population was at 35,000.

According to a recent article in the Los Angeles Times, the homeless population hovers at 47,854 people on the streets and many experts feel that the population will swell to 50,000 husbands, wives, brothers, and sisters living in squalor on Los Angeles’ streets by the end of the year.

It is not the purpose of local population to solve a national problem. We need State and Federal help.

Proposed Motion

I. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council demands that the Governor of California, Edmund G. Brown Jr., declare a state of emergency for the Los Angeles metro area for the purpose of combating the suffering of over 47,000 people living on the streets of Los Angeles. The Governor needs to understand that Los Angeles has more people living on the streets of Los Angeles than most towns in America have residents. He needs to act now.

II. The City of Los Angeles and the County needs to identify all vacant property currently owned by the City and County and all of its departments and agencies that can house temporary FEMA-style trailers for up to two years to start the housing process. All identified properties must also be large enough to have supportive services onsite. Any properties that have covenants placed on them by State of Federal agencies need to be negotiated to temporarily relieve those covenants during the crisis.

Considerations

Committee review: (highly recommended)  
Votes For: 4  
Against: 0
Neighborhood Purposes Grant to 101 Enterprises to support Movies in the Park 2016 for $1000

Agenda Item: GB081816-8
Date: 8/18/16
Proposed By: Marjan Safinia & Jon Liberman

Full Proposal

This is the ninth year of Council President Herb Wesson’s very successful Movies in the Park summer series, which is put on through 101 Enterprises. The Council President has chosen once again to bring one of the evenings to SORO and host a community movie screening at Reynier Park. This year’s movie will be on August 26th.

In the past, this event has attracted close to 1000 people to the park, making it one of the largest Outreach opportunities we support in the community. It’s a great family night out, and offers us significant outreach into the Latino community, who usually attend in great numbers and who we could benefit from reaching out to more.

This also offers us an opportunity to continue our close collaboration with the Council President Wesson and the CD-10 office.

Our portion of the funds will be used to purchase food items for the event including hot dogs, burgers, popcorn candy and drinks. This event was already accounted for in our annual budgeting.

Proposed Motion

I. That SORO NC approve the attached Neighborhood Purposes Grant to 101 Enterprises for $1000 towards the production of Council President Wesson’s 2016 Movies in the Park Event for Reynier Park.

Considerations

Committee review: Votes For: 8 Against: 0

Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget: $1000

Arguments for:

Super popular outreach event.
Reaches a groups of stakeholders who don’t traditionally participate in SORO NC events

Arguments against:

Cost.
These funds could be spent on other programs.
Neighborhood Council Funding Program
APPLICATION for Neighborhood Purposes Grant (NPG)

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

Name of NC from which you are seeking this grant: South Robertson Neighborhoods Council

SECTION I - APPLICANT INFORMATION

1a) Organization Name
101 Enterprises Foundation

Federal I.D. # (EIN#) 02-0713867
State of Incorporation CA
Date of 501(c)(3) Status (if applicable) 03/03/04

1b) Organization Mailing Address
PO Box 45143
Los Angeles, CA 90016

City State Zip Code

1c) Business Address (If different)
c/o Jenise Lacy, 2208 Victoria Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90016

City State Zip Code

1d) PRIMARY CONTACT INFORMATION:

Jenise Lacy
(323) 337-7279 jiacy23@aol.com

Name Phone Email

2) Type of Organization- Please select one:
   □ Public School (not to include private schools) or □ 501(c)(3) Non-Profit (other than religious institutions)
   Attach Grant Request on School Letterhead Attach IRS Determination Letter

3) Name / Address of Affiliated Organization (If applicable)

City State Zip Code

SECTION II - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

4) Please describe the purpose and intent of the grant.
   Movies in the Park is an event that is produced by 101 Enterprises Foundation and Council President Wesson. This is also done in partnership with our SORO NC. These are open to the public and generally have an attendance about 1000 plus people. This movie will be heald at Reynier Park, 2803 Reynier Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90034 on August 26, 2016.

5) How will this grant be used to primarily support or serve a public purpose and benefit the public at-large.
   (Grants cannot be used as rewards or prizes for individuals)
   The grant of $1000 will be used to purchase food. Hot dogs, hamburgers, popcorn, candy, punch as well as water are given out to all participants free of charge at the event. The money will be used for food that is given to all attendees.
### SECTION III - PROJECT BUDGET OUTLINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a) Personnel Related Expenses</th>
<th>Requested of NC</th>
<th>Total Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council District Staff time</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Recreation and Parks staff time</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6b) Non-Personnel Related Expenses</th>
<th>Requested of NC</th>
<th>Total Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film production</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Have you (applicant) applied to any other Neighborhood Councils requesting funds for this project?  
   - No  
   - Yes, please list names of NCs:  

8) Is the implementation of this specific program or purpose described in box 4 above contingent on any other factors or sources or funding?  
   (Including NPG applications to other NCs)  
   - No  
   - Yes, please describe:  

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

9) What is the TOTAL amount of the grant funding requested with this application?  
   - $1,000.00

10a) Start date: 08/26/16  
10b) Date Funds Required: 08/24/16  
10c) Expected completion date: 08/26/16  
   (After completion of the project, the applicant must submit a follow-up form to the Neighborhood Council and the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment)

### SECTION IV - POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

11a) Do you (applicant) have a former or existing relationship with a Board Member of the NC?  
   - No  
   - Yes - Please describe below:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of NC Board Member</th>
<th>Relationship to Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11b) If yes, did you request that the board member consult the Office of the City Attorney before filing this application?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   *(Please note that if a Board Member of the NC has a conflict of interest and completes this form, or participates in the discussion and voting of this NPG, the Department will deny the payment of this grant in its entirety.)*

### SECTION V - DECLARATION AND SIGNATURE

I hereby affirm that, to the best of my knowledge, the information provided herein and communicated otherwise is truly and accurately stated. I further affirm that I have read Appendix A, "What is a Public Benefit," and Appendix B "Conflicts of Interest" of this application and affirm that the proposed project(s) and/or program(s) fall within the criteria of a public benefit project/program and that no conflict of interest exist that would prevent the awarding of the Neighborhood Purposes Grant. I affirm that I am not a current Board Member of the Neighborhood Council to whom I am submitting this application. I further affirm that if the grant received is not used in accordance with the terms of the application stated here, said funds shall be returned immediately to the Neighborhood Council.

12a) Executive Director of Non-Profit Corporation or School Principal - REQUIRED*  
   PRINT Name: Denise Lacy  
   Title: CFO  
   Signature:  
   Date: 7/29/16

12b) Secretary of Non-profit Corporation or Assistant School Principal - REQUIRED*  
   PRINT Name:  
   Title:  
   Signature:  
   Date: 7/29/16

* If a current Board Member holds the position of Executive Director or Secretary, please contact the Department at (213) 978-1551 for instructions on completing this form

Revised 012615 - Page 2 of 2
Dear Applicant:

Based on information you supplied, and assuming your operations will be as stated in your application for recognition of exemption, we have determined you are exempt from federal income tax under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code as an organization described in section 501(c)(3).

Because you are a newly created organization, we are not now making a final determination of your foundation status under section 509(a) of the Code. However, we have determined that you can reasonably expect to be a publicly supported organization described in sections 509(a)(1) and 170(b)(1)(A)(vi).

Accordingly, during an advance ruling period you will be treated as a publicly supported organization, and not as a private foundation. This advance ruling period begins and ends on the dates shown above.

Within 90 days after the end of your advance ruling period, you must send us the information needed to determine whether you have met the requirements of the applicable support test during the advance ruling period. If you establish that you have been a publicly supported organization, we will classify you as a section 509(a)(1) or 509(a)(2) organization as long as you continue to meet the requirements of the applicable support test. If you do not meet the public support requirements during the advance ruling period, we will classify you as a private foundation for future periods. Also, if we classify you as a private foundation, we will treat you as a private foundation from your beginning date for purposes of section 507(d) and 4940.

Grantors and contributors may rely on our determination that you are not a private foundation until 90 days after the end of your advance ruling period. If you send us the required information within the 90 days, grantors and contributors may continue to rely on the advance determination until we make
Funding SORO NC Town Hall 2016 for up to $1090

Agenda Item: GB081816-9
Date: 8/18/16
Proposed By: Marjan Safinia & Charlie Stein

Full Proposal

SORO NC’s Bylaws call for us to organize an annual Town Hall event where we offer stakeholders the opportunity to interact directly with City officials about issues that affect their lives.

This election year, there are currently an unprecedented 26 ballot initiatives facing voters, and there are still a few weeks to go before deadlines end. With a complex series of choices to make at the City, County and State level, voters may face a hard time navigating tricky ballot initiative language. The Outreach Committee believes that a town hall focused on some of the most relevant ballot initiatives, with a clear and impartial presentation of fact, pros and cons by The League of Women Voters, can help our stakeholders make the best informed choices. There is also enthusiasm from our elected representative’s offices to participate in the program.

We are proposing holding the event one week before the election on November 1st at Hamilton High School Auditorium. This date avoids major Jewish holidays but remains close to election time. Hamilton Auditorium is available on this evening. The program will run from 7-9pm and we will work closely with the League of Women Voters to cover as many of the initiatives as we think are most relevant, controversial or confusing, to best serve our stakeholders. The League will also provide their comprehensive printed voter guide covering all of the initiatives with information and pros and cons to all attendees. This printed literature is included in their speaker fee. We will also reach out to neighboring NCs to see if there is interest in cross-promotion and attendance.

This funding motion is to cover the costs associated with hosting and spreading the word about the Town Hall, so that we may organize a successful event.

Costs will include:

- Custodial and sound technician fees for Hamilton High School (arranged and agreed with Principal Pensamiento)
- League of Women Voters speaker
- Yard Signs to promote event
- Printing flyers

Proposed Motion

I. That SORO NC fund up to $1090 for costs associated with the production and outreach for SORO NC’s 2016 Town Hall Event to be held November 1st 2016.
Considerations

Committee review: Votes For: 8 Against: 0

Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget: $500

Arguments for: Arguments against:

It’s a valuable opportunity to allow stakeholders to be better informed when voting.

Cost. The event might run more than previously allocated in the budget (but we can draw from allocated General Outreach funds too).

The number of ballot initiatives in absolutely unprecedented and we will be providing a tangible service to our stakeholders.

Nov. 1st is one week before election and some stakeholders may have already voted by mail. We will address this in early outreach.
Motion to submit a Community Impact Statement in support of the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance Amendment

Agenda Item: GB072116-22
Date: July 21, 2016
Proposed By: LUED Committee Working Group

Background

The Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) was enacted in 2008 to establish new regulations to limit height, setbacks, and Floor Area Ratio in single-family zones.

On November 20, 2014, this Board passed a motion to support Councilmember Koretz’s proposed changes to the BMO. If a super majority of member NCs approved the motion, it was to be officially endorsed by the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils. However, there is currently no letter from this Board in the Council file for the BMO amendment.

The BMO amendment was passed by the City Planning Commission on July 14, 2016. Next, it will go before the City Council’s Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee, after which it will go before City Council.

As such, the LUED Committee formed a working group to devise language to be included in a Community Impact Statement that aims to strike a balance between the varied opinions of our neighborhoods residents and the economic impact of the proposed amendments.

Proposed Motion

I. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports these aspects of the Department of City Planning’s proposed changes to the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance:

   a. Eliminate RFA bonuses: green buildings, proportional stories, & front façade articulation
   b. Require upper-story decks be set back 3 ft from the minimum side yard

II. However, SORO NC recommends the following amendments to the Department’s proposed changes:

   a. Retain garage sf, over-in-height ceilings, & covered porch exemptions
   b. Maintain 0.50 FAR for lots <7,500 sf
   c. Do not establish angled encroachment plane
   d. Do not require side/front façade articulation

III. Send a letter to the City Council and Committees and submit a Community Impact Statement for Council File Number 14-0656 to reflect NC’s position.
## Considerations

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

### Arguments for:
Many neighbors have voiced concern that the current BMO exceptions result in oversized homes.

### Arguments against:
Property owners should be allowed to build what they want on their property.

Aside from formally polling property owners, there is no way to know the consensus of the neighborhood.
Niall Huffman
City of Los Angeles Planning Department
Office of Zoning Administration
200 N. Spring Street, Room 720
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Via Email: NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org

21 July 2016

Re: Council File 14-0656

Dear Mr. Huffman,

On July 21, 2016, the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council held a regularly-scheduled, Brown Act-noticed, public meeting of the full governing board with a quorum of 00 board members present at which the board approved the following motion and directed that a Community Impact Statement be filed reflecting its position by a vote of 00 yes to 00 no and 00 abstentions.

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports revisions to the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) with important exceptions. Following is a list of those revisions we support and the exceptions.

SUPPORT

1. Eliminate the Residential Floor Area bonus option for green buildings

After the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) became effective in January of 2014, providing incentives to builders or homeowners to be “green” became unnecessary. Also, encouraging larger, more energy-consuming homes to be built runs counter to the goal of incentivizing “green” homes.

2. Eliminate the two Residential Floor Area bonuses (proportional stories and front façade articulation)

The two design-based bonuses result in 20% larger homes, while being ineffective in producing well-designed homes.

3. Require upper-story decks, balconies, and terraces to be set back at least three feet from the minimum side yard

Stepping upper-story decks away from the minimum side yard by three feet minimizes the view angle from the upper deck down into a neighboring home or yard. This minimized view angle gives the neighbor a better opportunity to maintain their privacy with taller planting along their property lines.

EXCEPTIONS

1. Retain the garage square footage exemption

Requiring the square footage of a home’s garage to be counted toward the total Residential Floor Area encourages builders to build the smallest garage allowable by code. Smaller garages are quickly overtaken with storage. The unintended consequence will be fewer cars parked in their garages and more cars parked on already-crowded streets.
2. **Retain the over-in-height ceilings exemption**

Over-in-height ceilings (or double-height spaces) result in homes with dynamic spatial relationships, instead of two floor plates pancaked on top of one another. Exempting the first 100 square feet of over-in-height ceilings allows designers to design interesting homes without having to count unoccupiable air space as Residential Floor Area.

3. **Retain the covered porch exemption**

Covered porches, patios, and breezeways are design features that not only add visual interest to a home, they add to the livability of a home, particularly in our Southern California climate. Counting these features toward the total Residential Floor Area will result in builders not including them in homes in order to maximize occupiable indoor space.

Additionally, the South Robertson neighborhood is home to a large Jewish community. Many Jewish homes incorporate a covered patio (a sukkah) that is used during Sukkot, a holiday where families eat and sleep outside for eight days and seven nights. As a city, we must be careful how rules we establish may have a disproportionately negative effect on a particular group of people.

4. **Maintain the FAR at 0.50 for lots smaller than 7,500 square feet**

The majority of lots in the South Robertson neighborhood are less than 7,500 square feet in size. Many are less than 6,000 square feet in size. An FAR of 0.50 for a 6,000 square foot lot produces a 3,000 max square foot house. R1 lots are meant for a single family. A family which includes a few kids, in-laws, and the occasional houseguest requires multiple bedrooms, multiple bathrooms, ample storage space, a large living room for gathering, and a kitchen large enough to host get-togethers. A 3,000 square foot house is not a mansion; it is a home for a family.

Also, the need for larger homes is particularly evident in Jewish communities, where Jewish families can be large and many homes incorporate two kitchens in order to keep kosher and to use during Passover.

Additionally, minimizing the allowable home size in R1 zones could result in a loss of value for those lots and an increase in value for nearby R2 and RD1.5 zones that do not have these restrictions in home size.

5. **Do not establish an angled encroachment plane limit for buildings taller than 20 feet**

The angled encroachment plane is an unnecessary and clumsy restriction on a home’s building envelope that will, when inevitably maxed out by a builder, result in an awkwardly proportioned home. The intent of this diagram is to reduce the visual impact of a home’s mass. However, the result will be to amplify the visual impact of an oddly proportioned upper floor, as this diagram would be applied to both sides of the house. The most effective way to reduce mass is by eliminating the bonuses, as previously mentioned.

6. **Do not require articulation of side or front façades**

Requiring articulation of the side and front façades, as currently described, is overly restrictive and will be ineffective in producing well-designed homes.
The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports the BMO; however, weighing the varied opinions of homeowners with the economic impact of these changes, we feel the amendment as proposed too drastically decreases buildable square footage while not doing enough to mitigate the concerns of some homeowners. We hope Planning staff will take into consideration our suggestions in an effort to pass a revised BMO that strikes a balance between the varied opinions of homeowners and the economic impact of these changes throughout the city.

Sincerely,

Doug Fitzsimmons
President, South Robertson Neighborhoods Council

Cc: Hon. Eric Garcetti, Mayor, City of Los Angeles
LA City Council Members
Vince Bertoni, Director of Planning, Department of City Planning
Council Member Paul Koretz, Council District 5
Council President Herb Wesson, Jr., Council District 10
Shawn Bayliss, Director of Planning and Legislation, Council District 5
Faisal Alserri, Senior Planning Deputy, Council District 5
Jordan Beroukhim, Planning Deputy, Council District 10
Community Impact Statement
As adopted by vote of the full SORO NC governing board

Yes: 0  No: 0  Abstain: 0  Recuse: 0

Date of vote: 21 July 2016

The SORO NC supports revisions to the BMO with important exceptions.

SUPPORT
1. Eliminate RFA bonuses: green buildings, proportional stories, & front façade articulation
2. Require upper-story decks be set back 3 ft from the min side yard

EXCEPTIONS
1. Retain garage sf, over-in-height ceilings, & covered porch exemptions
2. Maintain 0.50 FAR for lots <7,500 sf
3. Do not establish angled encroachment plane
4. Do not require side/front façade articulation

Submitted by: Doug Fitzsimmons
Motion to fund up $1000 for SORO NC business cards

Agenda Item: GB081816-11
Date: 18 August 2016
Proposed By: Executive

Full Proposal

LA City business cards help identify us as official City representatives. In this proposal, all new Board members, returning Board members who are running low or whose card is out of date would receive a set of 200. The paper is recycled. Last time we ordered, each set was $33.50; the proposal would fund 25 sets of cards ($837.50, assuming the price hasn't increased). We'll also place an order for NC picture ID badges on lanyards for events, and for more blank tent cards and plastic holders.

The motion also includes a small contingency for unforeseen press costs, tax, etc.—although since it is up to $1000, we are not committed to spend the full amount. Not all returning Board members will need new cards.

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

While we may be able to find cheaper alternatives, cards printed by the City's General Services Department have the advantage of an engraved and embossed City seal and union label (and streamlined inter-departmental billing): this is clearly an official City of LA card. On the other hand, if we go with an outside vendor and skipped the engraving and embossing (using, say, morningprint.com), we could design the card any way we want, have a full-color back with our logo, and still be $10 cheaper per set. The NC has opted for the official LA City card in the past.

Proposed Motion

I. To approve up to $1000 for the printing of business cards, ID badges, and tent cards with holders for SORO NC Board members.

Considerations

Committee review: (highly recommended) Votes For: 4 Against: 0

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

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

Arguments against: Cost. And it is not budgeted.
Motion for $1750 to Sponsor CPR/AED/First Aid Classes for SORO
Agenda Item: GB081816-12
Date: August 18, 2016
Proposed By: Public Safety Committee- Michael Lynn

Full Proposal
As part of an overall SORO NC Emergency Preparedness Plan and the Public Safety Committee’s “Neighborhood Team Program” (NTP), it is important that stakeholders be trained in CPR, Child CPR, Automated External Defibrillator (AED), and First Aid.

In a major emergency or disaster where first responders and medical professionals may be overwhelmed, these classes would train residents to perform potentially life-saving rescue and medical care. Training and skills could also prove critical to potentially saving someone’s life during non-disaster situations. A certified instructor(s) would demonstrate and train participants in basic first aid techniques, CPR for adults and infants, and proper use of an AED. Participants that complete the training course will obtain American Heart Association certification.

The Public Safety Committee would schedule 2 classes for (up to) 50 total participants, tentatively scheduled for September 17-18, 2015. SORO NC would cover the costs of instruction and necessary supplies, while the participant would provide their own or purchase an Instruction Manual ($18), if desired.

In 2012, SORO NC sponsored three CPR/Child CPR/First Aid/AED classes that were very successful and highly praised. Within a month, one of the participants was able to use his skills and assist in the saving of a life. 2014 and 2015 classes were equally popular.

Proposed Motion
To fund $1750 for the SORO NC to sponsor and fund CPR/Child CPR/AED/First Aid classes for up to 50 Participants.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review: (highly recommended)</th>
<th>Votes For: 5</th>
<th>Against: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget:</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments for:</td>
<td>Arguments against:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes in 2012 and 2014 were popular and well attended.</td>
<td>Will require outreach to attract participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills can help save a life at any time. Previous attendee helped save a life.</td>
<td>Limited to 50 participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This training is part of the 2011 NTP plan that the General Board voted to approve.</td>
<td>Funds can be used elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>