General Board Attendance Sheet

Period: January 2017– March 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Stein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Mosby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Chocron</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Ferdinand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Warman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lynn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Liberman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Fitzsimmons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michoel Bloom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Blaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahed Guirguis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krystal Navar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee Zeltzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>------</td>
<td>RESIGNED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Eliopoulos</td>
<td></td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Hirsch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Kasbarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Burden</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Levine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marj Safinia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Epstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Mitry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Fink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Shelton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>REMOVED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Edidin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noa Zarur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = missed meeting

**SORO NC Bylaws, Section 7A:**

"Any Board member who misses five (5) total Governing Board Meetings during any twelve (12) month period, or attends fewer than seven (7) Committee meetings during any twelve (12) month period will be subject to removal from the Board. Any meeting of the Neighborhood Council Governing Board, Standing Committees or Ad Hoc Committees, scheduled and noticed as per the Brown Act, shall constitute a meeting for the purpose of determining Board member attendance."
Motion to support the LAX Landside Access Modernization Program

Agenda Item: GB042017-3
Date: 20 April 2017
Proposed By: Doug Fitzsimmons

Background

Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is the second busiest airport in the United States and the largest in California. Our community depends on LAX for the trade, travel and tourism that it brings to our area and the larger Southern California region.

Since the start of the economic recovery in 2009, air service demand at LAX has increased from 56 million annual passengers to 80 million annual passengers in 2016. Los Angeles is now seeking to host the 2024 Olympics.

Due to the increase in air services, LAX is experiencing heavy traffic congestion in and around the airport. On regular days up to 95,000 vehicles enter Los Angeles International Airport’s Central Terminal Area, increasing to 120,000 during the peak Thanksgiving Holiday period. Almost half of the vehicles are buses, shuttles and vans from rental car companies, hotels and shared-ride companies along with taxis who are also competing for the limited space on the streets and curbs in the CTA. 23 different rental car lots scattered around the airport area add to this problem.

To resolve this, Los Angeles is proposing to spend $5.5 billion on the Landside Access Modernization Program, or “LAMP.” LAMP will consist of a 6-million square foot Consolidated Rental Car Facility (CONRAC), two 3-million square foot Intermodal Transportation Facilities (IFTs) or transit hubs, a 2 ¼ mile Automated People Mover (APM) connecting the CONRAC, IFTS and a new light rail station to the airport, and related roadway improvements and property development.

LAMP will relieve traffic congestion within the Central Terminal Area (CTA) and the surrounding street network, improve the LAX passenger experience and keep LAX as the international gateway for the West Coast.

Proposed Motion

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports the proposed Landside Access Modernization Program at Los Angeles International Airport and directs that a letter of support be sent to the operator of the airport, Los Angeles World Airports urging that the Los Angeles City Planning Commission, Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission and the Los Angeles City Council approve this project.

Considerations

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

Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget: $
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This ambitious project will help the area deal with the increasing traffic impact of LAX’s growth.</td>
<td>This is an enormous investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people mover will reduce traffic around the airport and provide a workable connection to mass transit.</td>
<td>Light rail should connect directly with the terminals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deborah Flint  
Chief Executive Officer  
Los Angeles World Airports  
1 World Way  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  

21 April 2017

Re: Support for the LAX Landside Access Modernization Program (LAMP)

Dear Ms. Flint:

The South Robertson Neighborhood Council is pleased to state its support for the Landside Access Modernization Program (LAMP) at Los Angeles International Airport (LAX.) The residents and businesses in our community depend on LAX for the trade, travel, and tourism that it brings to our area, the City of Los Angeles and all of Southern California.

Since the bottom of the recession in 2009, we have watched LAX roar back to life as the international gateway of the West Coast with air service demand increasing from 56 million annual passengers that year to over 80 million in 2016. But with the increase in air service we have also witnessed a rise in traffic congestion in and around LAX. More than 90,000 vehicles enter LAX’s Central Terminal Area on an average day, rising to 120,000 around the peak Thanksgiving Holidays. The proliferation of 23 rental car lots scattered around the airport area adds to this problem.

LAMP will address this issue through a $5.5 billion program that will include a new Consolidated Rental Car Facility (CONRAC), two Intermodal Transportation Facilities (ITFs) and an Automated People Mover connecting these facilities and a new light rail station with the airport. This program will create a new welcoming “front door” for the airport, reduce traffic congestion and emissions, improve the customer experience at LAX, and create thousands of construction jobs over the next six years.

For these reasons we are supporting LAMP as a vital step in insuring that LAX remains a world-class airport and maintains its role as a critical part of our region’s economy. We are also urging all appropriate City and County governmental bodies to approve this vital project and allow it to move forward.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about this comment letter.

Sincerely,

Doug Fitzsimmons  
President, South Robertson Neighborhood Council

cc: Trevor Daley,  
Herb Wesson, Council President, LA City District 10  
Paul Koretz, Councilmember, LA City District 5  
Mark Ridley-Thomas, Supervisor, LA County District 2  
Sheila Kuehl, Supervisor, LA County District 3
LAX is undergoing a $14 billion modernization program. Its proposed Landside Access Modernization Program would help improve the LAX passenger experience, relieve traffic congestion and make LAX a world-class airport.

### AUTOMATED PEOPLE MOVER (APM)

The Automated People Mover would be a free, fast and convenient connection to LAX and to airline terminals for passengers, employees and other users, running 24 hours-per-day with just 2-3-minute wait times at stations.

- 6 total APM stations, with 3 in the LAX Central Terminal Area
- Convenient pedestrian walkways to airline terminals

### INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Two new transit hubs would create more convenience for air travelers, providing locations outside the LAX Central Terminal Area for pick up, drop off and parking. The facilities would also offer connections to hotels, shuttles and public transit.

### CONSOLIDATED RENT-A-CAR CENTER

Making the rental car experience quick and easy, the new center would relocate existing rental car companies into one convenient location by the 405 Freeway with direct connections to the airport using the APM.

### METRO CRENSHAW/LAX LINE

Metro is planning a 96th Street Station to provide rail and bus links to LAX. An APM station above the Metro Station is also being proposed to allow for quick and convenient transfers to the airport.

### METRO GREEN LINE - PROPOSED EXTENSION

Extending the current Metro Green Line to LAX is currently under consideration.

---

*LAX IS HAPPENING™.COM*
Motion to support immigration policies which improve visa issuance

Agenda Item: GB042017-4
Date: April 20, 2017
Proposed By: Ken Blaker

Background

In the March 2017 meeting a motion failed to pass regarding visa issuance and immigration. Discussion of the motion was uncomfortably contentious for many of us, and uncomfortably fueled by overtones of political partisanship. This new motion attempts to directly address valid concerns raised during the board discussion in March without political partisanship.

The South Robertson Neighborhoods are richly diverse. Many of our stakeholders are immigrants to the US, including a sizeable number of immigrants from Iran. Current policies for the issuance of visas are not working. Recent Presidential Executive Orders have instructed the State Department to revise existing policies and procedures in a manner that recognizes global security threats, with attention to certain countries of origin, including Iran.

Without wishing to undermine our national or local security, this board should be sensitive to the personal effect that visa issuance policies and procedures have on stakeholders, and should support policies that support our stakeholders.

The problems with the current immigration system are illustrated by the Hawaiian case of STATE OF HAWAI'I and ISMAIL ELSHIKH vs. DONALD TRUMP, et al. In a widely-reported temporary restraining order by U.S. District Judge Derrick Watson, the judge explains that the mother-in-law of Mr. Elshikh applied for a visa to visit the Elshikh family in September of 2015, which had not yet been resolved on January 31, 2017 (pages 22 and 23 of the order). Though the order mentions some partial advancement of the mother-in-law’s application in March of this year, the final status of the application is not known at this time, 19 months after the application was made – a period spanning 2 Executive administrations. Clearly the example shows a broken system.

This motion proposes that the board takes a stand on this issue that affects many of our community members, supporting revisions that fix the broken system, allow for issuance of visas in a reasonable timeframe, and doing so in manner consistent with national and local security.

Proposed Motion

As a diverse community with a large immigrant population, and especially a large number of immigrants from Iran, all SORO stakeholders benefit when travelers from their former homes are able to travel to the US. Along with the travel of family members, the SORO community benefits from many other types of visitors who come here for activities ranging from academic to medical to cultural.

Further, we are informed by widely publicized cases that long delays in visa issuance are not a new phenomenon in 2017.

While acknowledging security as a critical priority, and that political and social upheaval and anti-American sentiments vary throughout the world, we believe that
there are always many cases where security concerns are extremely remote and where expedited processing is warranted.

We urge our government officials and bureaucrats at all levels to:

• fix the broken system,
• to establish procedures and protocols to identify cases where security risks are extremely remote,
• to establish procedures to expedite low security risk applications, and
• refine procedures for other cases in a manner that supports security concerns without unduly restricting travel.

We as a Board wish to further note that this motion is being heard, discussed and passed in the facilities of the world famous Wiesenthal Museum of Tolerance, and believe that this is an appropriate setting for adopting this non-partisan position.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review:</th>
<th>Votes For:</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Against:</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(highly recommended)</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</table>
Motion to support the City’s proposed Temporary Construction Wall Sign measure

Agenda Item: GB042017-5
Date: 20 April 2017
Proposed By: Doug Fitzsimmons

Background
In October of 2016, the Department of City Planning is proposing a code amendment that would clarify rules for temporary signs on temporary construction walls and solid wood fences surrounding vacant lots. The key components are listed below:

At Construction Sites
Temporary signs are allowed on temporary construction walls, only if:
- The site is an active construction site,
- There is no operating business on the site, including an operating parking lot,
- The construction wall is required for public safety by the Department of Building and Safety.

Temporary signs on construction walls are allowed to remain for as long as the building permit associated with the construction site is valid, or 2 years, whichever is less.

Around Vacant Lots
Temporary signs are allowed on fences of solid wood or similar material surrounding a vacant lot that is not a construction site.

Temporary signs on fences surrounding vacant lots are allowed to remain for up to one year.

Sign Material
Temporary signs on temporary construction walls or fences surrounding vacant lots may be made of paper, vinyl, or other similar material.

Proposed Motion
The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council supports the Department of City Planning’s current recommendations for temporary signs on construction walls.

Considerations

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

Arguments for:
These are common-sense rules that will reign in unlicensed signage.

Arguments against:
Non-conforming landowners will be deprived of a revenue source.
ORDINANCE NO. __________

An ordinance amending the beginning of Article 4.4 and Sections 14.4.2, 14.4.4 and 14.4.17 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to clarify regulations pertaining to signs.

THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES
DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Add a paragraph at the beginning of Article 4.4 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to read as follows:

The regulations in this article do not apply to signs located primarily within a public right-of-way.

Sec. 2. Amend the entry for Section 14.4.17 within the list of sections appearing at the beginning of Article 4.4 to read as follows:

14.4.17 Temporary Signs on Temporary Construction Walls and Solid Wood Fences Surrounding Vacant Lots.

Sec. 3. Amend the following definition in Section 14.4.2 to read as follows:

Temporary Construction Wall. A temporary solid wooden fence or wooden barrier of wood or similar material that provides protection for pedestrians and is erected and maintained on the perimeter of a construction or demolition site pursuant to Section 3303.91.3306 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code of the California Building Code (CBC).

Sec. 4. Subdivision 11 of Subsection B of Section 14.4.4 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

11. Are off-site signs, including off-site digital displays, except when off-site signs are specifically permitted pursuant to a relocation agreement entered into pursuant to California Business and Professions Code Section 5412. This prohibition shall also apply to alterations, enlargements or conversions to digital displays of legally existing off-site signs, except for alterations that conform to the provisions of Section 91.6216 and all other requirements of this Code.

EXCEPTIONS: This prohibition shall not apply to off-site signs, including off-site digital displays, that are specifically permitted pursuant to a legally adopted specific plan, supplemental use district or an approved development agreement, or that are authorized by a valid building permit for a temporary sign on required temporary construction walls surrounding active construction sites or
fences of solid wood or similar material surrounding vacant lots pursuant to
Section 14.4.17.

This exception shall become operative only to the extent that Subdivision
11. is deemed constitutional upon the reversal of the trial court decision in the
case of World Wide Rush, LLC v. City of Los Angeles, United States District
Court Case No. CV 07-238 ABC.

In addition, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 12.26 A.3. of this Code, this
prohibition shall not apply to any building permit issued prior to the effective date of this
ordinance if the Department of Building and Safety determines that both substantial
liabilities have been incurred, and substantial work has been performed on site, in
accordance with the terms of that permit pursuant to Section 91.106.4.3.1 of this Code.

Sec. 5. The heading of Section 14.4.17 shall be amended to read as follows:

SEC. 14.4.17. TEMPORARY SIGNS ON TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION
WALLS AND SOLID WOOD FENCES SURROUNDING VACANT LOTS.

Sec. 6. Subsection A of Section 14.4.17 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is
amended to read as follows:

A. Permit Required. A building permit shall be required for a temporary sign
on a temporary construction wall or a fence of solid wood or similar material surrounding
a vacant lot. Temporary signs on temporary construction walls shall comply with the
construction requirements of Section 14.4.16 E. A permit for a temporary sign shall be
issued only when a temporary construction wall is required for public safety pursuant to
Section 91.3306 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, or a fence of solid wood or similar
material surrounds a vacant lot. No permit for a temporary sign on a temporary
construction wall shall be issued if such wall surrounds an operating business, including
an operating parking lot. If, after the permit is issued, a business on the site or lot that
was not operating at the time of permit issuance begins operating, the Department of
Building and Safety may revoke the permit.

For purposes of this section, the term “applicant” shall mean the owner of the
sign company or, if there is no sign company, the owner of the property.

Sec. 7. Subsection C of Section 14.4.17 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is
amended to read as follows:

C. Time Limit. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 14.4.16 C.1. and 2. of
this Code, signs placed on temporary construction walls, and/or solid wood fences
surrounding vacant lots pursuant to the terms of this section active construction sites
with no operating business of any kind shall be allowed to remain for as long as the
building permits associated with the construction site remain in effect or for a period of
two years, whichever is less. Building permits for signs on solid wood fences of solid wood or similar material surrounding vacant lots, which are not construction sites, shall be issued for a time period not to exceed one year. The Department of Building and Safety shall grant a new building permit for a period equal to the original building permit term upon the receipt of (i) an application for a new building permit, (ii) the payment of the building permit fee and (iii) a written statement from the Director of the Office of Community Beautification consenting to the new building permit. The Office of Community Beautification’s consent to the new building permit shall be based solely on its assessment of the existence of a public nuisance based on the presence of graffiti, posters/handbills and any other illegal postings on public property pursuant to the review described in Subsection G of this Section.

Sec. 8. Subsection F of Section 14.4.17 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to be renumbered Subsection G:

**FG. Special Requirements for Signs on Temporary Construction Walls, and/or Solid Wood Fences Surrounding Vacant Lots.**

Sec. 9. New Subsection F is added to Section 14.4.17 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code:

**F. Construction.** Temporary signs on temporary construction walls or solid wood fences surrounding vacant lots may be made of paper, vinyl, or other similar material.

Sec. 10. The City Clerk shall certify....
Candidates for Organization Representative
*Interim appointment expiring 2018*

**Daniel Braum**
Organization: Shmira Safety Patrol, Maohr HaTorah

Public Safety is my passion. I am currently on the Public Safety Committee. I believe my professional and nonprofit experience would be of use SoRo.

**Linda Theung**
Organization: Reynier Village Neighborhood Association

I ran last year to be an At-Large Representative and did not win. That did not deter me to give my time to SoRo. I joined the Land Use and Economic Development Committee and currently serve as secretary. In this role, I've worked productively with the chair of the committee to draft and finalize minutes for each meeting. I've learned a lot in my short time in this committee, namely to listen to the concerns of the constituents (*especially* if they challenge my personal views), work with fellow committee members to find the best solutions to address issues articulated by residents, and take seriously my role as a representative of the community.
Motion to support hotel project at 1434-1450 S Robertson

Agenda Item:  GB042017-10
Date:  April 20, 2017
Proposed By:  LUED Committee

Background

The applicants and their team presented this 112-guest-room hotel project to the Land Use and Economic Development committee at their April 4, 2017 meeting. The project at 1434-1450 S Robertson contains 73 parking spaces (63 are required) located both at grade and in a subterranean garage. The first level contains the lobby, reception, offices, continental breakfast area, and 5 guest rooms. The second level contains 19 guest rooms, as well as a fitness room and an outdoor deck with swimming pool facing Robertson. The third through sixth levels each contain 22 guest rooms. Unlimited height is allowed per zoning; the proposed building is 77’-6”.

The project application is requesting the entitlements listed below.

- Zone Change from C2-1-O to RAS4-1-O to allow for an increased Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 3:1 (2.7:1 proposed)
- Zoning Administrators Adjustment for reduced side yards from 5 feet to 1 foot
- Conditional Use Permit to allow a hotel within 500 feet of an R zone
- Site Plan Review for a project in excess of 50,000 square feet of non-residential floor area

Proposed Motion

Submit a letter of support to City Planning Department case manager Kinikia Gardner (kinikia.gardner@lacity.org) to be included in case file for a 112-guest-room hotel project at 1434-1450 S Robertson; CPC-2016-4814-VZC-SPR-CU-ZAA; ENV-2016-4815-EAF.

Considerations

Committee review:  (highly recommended)  Votes For:  5  Against:  1

Arguments for:  
The zone change (and subsequent increased FAR) permits the building to utilize a larger footprint, therefore allowing the building’s program to fit in fewer stories.
The neighborhood is in need of a reasonably-priced hotel option.

Arguments against:  
The project does not include any uses open to the community (except as a paying guest).
The existing commercial and apartment buildings will be demolished. Tenants will be displaced.
21 April 2017

Re: Case Number CPC-2016-4814-VZC-SPR-CU-ZAA

Dear Ms. Gardner:

I am writing on behalf of the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council (“SORONC”) to comment on the proposed hotel project at 1434-1450 S Robertson Blvd.

At a duly-noticed meeting of the General Board on April 20, 2017, SORONC voted 00 yes / 00 no / 00 abstain to recommend that the applicant’s project be approved. The addition of a reasonably-priced hotel in this neighborhood is much needed and the zone change would allow the project to utilize a larger footprint, therefore reducing the number of stories necessary to house the building’s program.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about this comment letter.

Sincerely,

Doug Fitzsimmons
President

Cc: Shawn Bayliss, Office of Council Member Paul Koretz
    Krystal Návar, SORONC Land Use and Economic Development Chair
# Neighborhood Purposes Grant to 101 Enterprises to support Movies in the Park 20176 for $1000

**Agenda Item:** GB042017-11  
**Date:** 4/20/17  
**Proposed By:** Marjan Safinia

## Full Proposal

This is the tenth year of Council President Herb Wesson’s Movies in the Park summer series, which is put on through 101 Enterprises. The Council President will be hosting one of the Movies in SORO at Reynier Park. This year’s movie will be on June 25th, allowing us to also use the event as a Great Streets outreach opportunity.

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 has been 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 2017 Movies in the Park Event for Reynier Park.

## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review:</th>
<th>Votes For: 0</th>
<th>Against: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount previously allocated in Committee's working budget:</strong></td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Super popular outreach event.</td>
<td>Cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaches a groups of stakeholders who don’t traditionally participate in SORO NC events</td>
<td>These funds could be spent on other programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
   City Los Angeles
   State CA
   Zip Code 90016

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

1d) PRIMARY CONTACT INFORMATION:
   Jenise Lacy
   Phone (323) 337-7279
   Email jlacy23@aol.com

2) Type of Organization- Please select one:
   - Public School (not to include private schools)
   - 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

6a) Personnel Related Expenses

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

6b) Non-Personnel Related Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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 of 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*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINT Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denise Lacy</td>
<td>CFO</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/29/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12b) Secretary of Non-profit Corporation or Assistant School Principal - REQUIRED*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINT Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judy Smith</td>
<td>Swift</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/29/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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.
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
Motion to fund up to $1200 for outreach regarding possible changes to Reynier Park

Agenda Item: GB042017-12
Date: 20 April 2017
Proposed By: Parks and Recreation

Background

After decades of complaints, the community is interested in exploring a possible rethinking of Reynier Park. To build support for such a project, it is crucial that a broad and representative swath of the community be able to provide input.

The Parks committee has been helping structure those activities. It proposes that at a minimum, the NC should fund the following:

- Booth at 2017 SoRo Festival: $125
- Online survey: Included in NC form/survey service
- 50 yard signs promoting survey: $300
- Printing for school survey flyer: $200
- Mailer to surrounding community: $575
- NC email to the community: Free
- Page on NC website: Free

Proposed Motion

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council will fund up to $1200 to conduct community outreach regarding possible new configurations and facilities at Reynier Park, including but not limited to yard signs, flyers, mailings, and a booth at the SoRo Festival.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review: (highly recommended)</th>
<th>Votes For: 7</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>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arguments for:

We need to make sure as many ideas and opinions as possible are collected to set the project’s direction.

The more support and engagement we demonstrate, the more likely the project will happen.

Arguments against:

It’s expensive.

This doesn’t include community meetings…which will be an additional expense in FY 2017-18.
Bill To
Baila Romm
c/o SORO NC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Reynier Park&quot; tri fold mailer processing</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>184.25T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550 Set up &amp; print, 2 sided color flyer from your PDF file</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 File conversion, CASS process, bar code each to post office specs.</td>
<td>0.06818</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550 Fold and tab seal,- postal regulation for greater discount</td>
<td>0.06364</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550 Inkjet affix N/A's, onto mailer as received</td>
<td>0.10455</td>
<td>57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550 Prep. for pre-sort acceptance, tray &amp; strap &amp; del to L.A. main P.O.</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>158.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550 U.S. Market Mail postal rate (formerly Std. Bulk)</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>16.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $573.77
Motion to Fund up to $1500 for Promotional Items for the Safety Expo @ SOROFEST

Agenda Item: GB042017-13
Date: April 20, 2017
Proposed By: Michael Lynn

Full Proposal

The previous Emergency Preparedness and Safety Expos have laid the groundwork to become an increasingly popular component of the annual SOROFEST. Attractions include Vehicle Extraction (Jaws of Life), LAPD Dunk Tank, Shakey Quakey School House, CPR and CERT demonstrations.

This increased footprint and exposure provides SORO NC with the opportunity to increase general outreach to the safety minded members of our community, by again providing the popular First Aid Kits printed with “Compliments of: South Robertson Neighborhood Council” and/or “soronc.org”. Last year, over 800 kits were given out at the festival, as well as other Public Safety events.

Proposed Motion

To approve SORO NC to fund up to $1500 for the purchase of SORONC branded First Aid Kits.

Considerations

Committee review: (highly recommended) Votes For: 3 Against: 0

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

Arguments for: Arguments against:
Great Outreach item and opportunity Other items/projects may need the funds more
Motion to Fund up to $400 for Labor for the Safety Expo Canopy Setup @ SOROFEST

Agenda Item: GB042017-14
Date: April 20, 2017
Proposed By: Michael Lynn

Full Proposal

The previous Emergency Preparedness and Safety Expos have laid the groundwork to become an increasingly popular component of the annual SOROFEST. Attractions include a LAFD Vehicle Extraction (Jaws of Life), LAPD Dunk Tank, Shakey Quakey School House, CPR and CERT demonstrations.

Since almost all of the Safety Expo participants are non-paying booths, the SORO NC purchased 2 large canopies as a long-term cost savings measure. Although the canopies save a significant amount of money, they do require several bodies to assemble and disassemble. Volunteers are preferred, however have proven less than reliable in the past, promulgating the need for paid labor last year.

Proposed Motion

To approve SORO NC to fund up to $400 to (the same non-profit organization as last year) for the labor to assemble and disassemble both of the SORO NC 20’ x 20’ canopies.

Considerations

Committee review: (highly recommended)
Votes For: 3
Against: 0

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

Arguments for:
Canopies require 2-3 hours and 4 people

Arguments against:
We should rely on volunteers for labor to assemble/disassemble
Motion to recommend change to an odd-year NC election cycle

Agenda Item: GB042017-15
Date: 20 April 2017
Proposed By: Executive

Background

The Neighborhood Council elections for 2020 are currently set to be conducted from March through June. Because the timing of the 2020 Neighborhood Council elections will conflict with the municipal elections transferring to the Los Angeles County Clerk, the Office of the City Clerk will not be able to administer the Neighborhood Council elections simultaneously. This conflict requires shifting the Neighborhood Council 2020 elections to odd number years.

The Department of Neighborhood Empowerment (EmpowerLA) and the Office of the City Clerk are requesting Neighborhood Councils in your March and April meetings to discuss and complete this resolution on which of the following options your Council recommends. Some considerations would include: board members may not want to extend terms and will resign; stakeholders may not want board member terms to be extended; budget impact on general fund could be less or more; if online voting and voter registration moves forward, there would be more or less time to build out; if EmpowerLA’s recommendations in its online voting report back for Neighborhood Council systemic changes are approved, there would be more or less time to implement any changes to Neighborhood Council bylaws if applicable.

Proposed Motion

The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council recommends the following action for the Neighborhood Council elections timing:

I. Extend current board terms by 1 year. Terms currently up for election in 2018 would expire in 2019; terms currently up in 2020 would expire in 2021. This retains the current offset for boards with staggered terms with minimal confusion and avoids having to restagger.

II. Extend the bylaw amendment deadline for changes to Board composition and election provisions from May 1, 2017 to at least April 1, 2018.

III. Reopen subdivision applications on October 1, 2017 instead of October 1, 2018.

Considerations

Committee review: (highly recommended) Votes For: 5 Against: 0

Arguments for: Arguments against:

Minimizes confusion.
Extending all terms by a year erodes public trust in NC elections.
Motion for 2016-2017 budget amendment and FY 2017-2018 budget approval

Agenda Item: GB042017-16
Date: 20 April 2017
Proposed By: Finance

Background
The Finance Committee met on April 2, 2017 to amend its current budget and come up with a proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2017-18.

The amended FY 2016-17 budget reflects current and proposed expenditures, and incorporates an additional $5000 in funding approved by the City Council late last year.

The proposal for next year will be a preliminary budget based on the assumptions that the NC will receive the same amount of funding for the coming fiscal year as they did in FY 2016-17. The budget also assumes that there will be an NC election in FY 2017-18. Both these assumptions are currently being reviewed by the City of Los Angeles. Should either assumption not come through this proposed budget would need revision.

The full budget package will include a strategic plan and outreach assessment to be approved at a future meeting.

Proposed Motion
The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council hereby:
I. Amends its Fiscal Year 2016-17 budget as recommended in the attachment
II. Adopts the proposed budget of the Finance committee for Fiscal Year 2017-18

Considerations

Committee review: (highly recommended)
Votes For: 7
Against: 0

Arguments for:
The Finance committee was comprised of Chairs of most NC committees.

Arguments against:
Individual items may not be funded at an appropriate level.

The budget reflects the values of the NC.
# Draft Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-2017

**South Robertson Neighborhoods Council**

**Current Year**

**Funds:**

| Total Annual Allocation | $ 37,000.00 |

## Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUD</td>
<td>Audio and Visual Services</td>
<td>15.14%</td>
<td>$ 5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>Training and Board Retreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Facilities Related and Space Rental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>Office Equipment and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Postage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Temporary Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL</td>
<td>Translation and Transcription</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.14%</td>
<td>$ 5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVE</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>32.16%</td>
<td>$ 11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Social Media/Survey</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEE</td>
<td>Meeting Expense/ Food</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>General Outreach</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Robertson Vision</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Business Outreach</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Survey Monkey</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.16%</td>
<td>$ 11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Trim Trees on Robertson</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Hami Garden</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Job Board</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Street Mural</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>NC Support-Congress, Awards, Budget Advocates</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.0811%</td>
<td>$ 11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Neighborhood Purpose Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT</td>
<td>Fresh Fruit on Friday</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT</td>
<td>Sorofest 2017</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT</td>
<td>Movies in the Park</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.62%</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELE</td>
<td>Election Outreach Expense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Grand Total

| $ 37,000.00 |

## Budget Narrative:

---

## Projected Monthly Operational Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor / Item/Service Description</th>
<th>Monthly Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Public Storage</td>
<td>$ 250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Vonege</td>
<td>$ 40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Efax</td>
<td>$ 13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Meeting Food-Varies</td>
<td>$ 200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Outreach Printing/ Website</td>
<td>$ 150.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Monthly Operational Expenses**: $ 655.00
## South Robertson Neighborhoods Council
### Revised Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-2017
### APPROVED on

**Funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Annual Allocation</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>42,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUD</td>
<td>Audio and Visual Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>Training and Board Retreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Facilities Related and Space Rental</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>Office Equipment and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Postage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Temporary Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL</td>
<td>Translation and Transcription</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVE</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Social Media / Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEE</td>
<td>Meeting Expense/ Food</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>General Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Survey Monkey</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>$11,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Hami Garden</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>$5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Digital Literacy Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>NC Support-Congress, Awards, Budget Advocates</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>$5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Neighborhood Purpose Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT</td>
<td>Fresh Fruit on Friday</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT</td>
<td>SOROFest 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT</td>
<td>Movies in the Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT</td>
<td>Great Streets Robertson</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>45.24</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Elections (or Selections)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELE</td>
<td>Election Outreach Expense</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Narrative:**

Meeting expense includes food for our NC monthly meetings.
South Robertson Neighborhoods Council  
Draft Budget for Fiscal Year 2017-2018  
APPROVED on  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Total Annual Allocation</th>
<th>$42,000</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>notes</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100 Operations</strong></td>
<td>AudioVisual</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training/Bd Retreat</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Related</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misc Expense</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office Equip/supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temp Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translation/Transcription</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>200 Outreach</strong></td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Media/Surveys</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Expense/Food</td>
<td></td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genral Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>300 Community Improvement</strong></td>
<td>Trim Trees on Robertson</td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hami Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car/Car Seat Event</td>
<td></td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Expo</td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NC Support-Congress,Bud Adv</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>400 Neighborhood Purpose Grants</strong></td>
<td>Fresh Fruit on Friday</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sorofest 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movies in the Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>500 Elections</strong></td>
<td>Election Outreach Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes

a  web site
b  Mtg Space $1000, Pub Storeage $5000
c  Bus Cards $900, Vonage $480
d  PO Box
e  Social Media $2000, Sorofest Survey $300, Reynier Park Survey $500
Motion to amend Article V of bylaws regarding filling seats when no applicant is present

Agenda Item: GB042017-17
Date: April 20, 2017
Proposed By: Bylaws Committee

Background

The bylaws are currently silent on the question of whether the Board is required to vote on candidates for an open seat when no candidate is present. This motion proposes that in such a case the board may table voting for the next meeting.

Proposed Motion

Article V, Section 6, subsection “C” shall be renamed “D.”

A new Article V, Section 6, subsection “C” shall be added, stating:

If no applicant for a vacancy is present when applications are on a General Board agenda, the Board may delay voting for that vacant seat until the next meeting.

Considerations

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To clarify that the Board is not required to vote on candidates not present.</td>
<td>Not worthwhile because the Board implicitly has the right to table voting on motion of a Board member.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motion to amend bylaws regarding recusals that cause loss of quorum

Agenda Item: GB042017-18
Date: April 20, 2017
Proposed By: Bylaws Committee

Background

The bylaws are currently silent on the possibility that a board member’s recusal relative to a specific motion may cause loss of quorum. That possibility leaves the subject motion in limbo and jeopardizes the continuation of the meeting.

This motion amends the bylaws to provide the following solution:

1 – When a member’s recusal will cause a loss of quorum, discussion and voting on that motion will be moved to the end of the meeting agenda.

2 – If no additional members are available for the hearing of the motion at the end of the agenda the motion will be left as unfinished business, without a required motion, and shall then be carried over to the next meeting.

3 – In the event that the motion is for reconsideration the board may vote to carry the motion for reconsideration over to the next meeting, upon the motion by an attending member who voted in the majority on the original motion, and passage of that motion. If no carry over motion is made the motion for reconsideration will expire.

Proposed Motion

Article V, Section 3, subsection B shall be revised to read as follows:

“In the event of a recusal, the Board member must declare the nature of their recusal and leave the room during discussion and vote on the item. If the Board member’s departure would cause loss of a quorum, the motion shall be moved to the end of the agenda.”

A new subsection C shall be added, stating:

“When a recusal has caused a motion to be moved to the end of the agenda and no additional members have joined the meeting when the motion is brought forward again, discussion and voting will be left as unfinished business and carried over to the next meeting.

A new subsection D shall be added, stating:

“When a recusal has caused a motion to be moved to the end of the agenda and no additional members have joined the meeting when the motion is brought forward again, and when the motion is for reconsideration, the reconsideration may be carried over to the next meeting upon successful motion by a Board member who voted in the majority on the original motion.
## Considerations

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addresses a case not currently addressed in the bylaws.</td>
<td>The case described is rare and not worth addressing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motion regarding Board Members changing seats

Agenda Item: GB042017-19
Date: April 20, 2017
Proposed By: Ken Blaker

Background

Article X is currently silent on the possibility that a Board Member may wish to run for a different board seat half way through their term. For instance, a member who moves from one district within SORO to another district, and the sets are voted on different cycles.

This motion proposes that a Board member whose term is not expiring at the time of an election shall be allowed to stand as a candidate for a different seat for which they qualify, but that they will be required to resign the existing seat in the event they are elected to the new seat.

Proposed Motion

Article X, Section 6 shall be renamed Section 7.

A new section 6 shall be inserted stating:

“A Board member whose term is not expiring may stand as a candidate for a different seat for which they qualify. In the event they are elected to the new seat they will be required to resign the existing seat. No member may hold 2 seats.”

Considerations

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

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

Arguments for:  
Addresses a possibility on which the bylaws are currently silent.

Arguments against:  
Unnecessary.
Motion to revise the Bylaws regarding notifications and posting

Agenda Item: GB042017-20
Date: April 20, 2017
Proposed By: Ken Blaker

Background

Article VIII, Section 3 requires specific timing for posting of meeting notice at the Council’s five (5) public notice locations.

In practice, the postings are not in the control of the person who posts. Therefore, this motion proposes that the notice shall be sent to the 5 locations in the specified timeframes, whereas posting on the SORO website shall remain required.

Proposed Motion

Article VIII, Section 3, subsection A shall be revised, replacing the phrase “notice shall be posted at” in the last sentence of that subsection by the phrase: “notice shall be sent to”.

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee review: (highly recommended)</th>
<th>Votes For:</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Against:</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget: (applies to funding motions only)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments for:</td>
<td>Arguments against:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains requirements to things that are within the control of the Board and its members.</td>
<td>It is appropriate that the posting Board member should be required to check all 5 locations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motion to revise the Bylaws regarding timeframe to reconsider a motion

Agenda Item: GB042017-21
Date: April 20, 2017
Proposed By: Ken Blaker

Background
Article VIII, Section 4 deals with motions for reconsideration.

This motion proposes that a motion for reconsideration shall be eligible for carry over one time to the next meeting.

Proposed Motion
Article VIII, Section 4, subsection B shall be amended with a final sentence reading: “The Council may carry over a Motion for Reconsideration one time upon approval by a majority of the Board members present when the Motion for Reconsideration is being discussed.

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

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

Arguments for: Arguments against:
This allows for fully informed resolution of such motions. One month is enough. If the board cannot be fully informed regarding the reasons for reconsideration in a month, then the motion should expire.
Motion to revise the Bylaws to allow for removal of Stakeholders as members

Agenda Item: GB042017-22
Date: April 20, 2017
Proposed By: Ken Blaker

Background

Article VII, Section 3 C provides for Stakeholder membership in Standing Committees except the Executive Committee.

By means of this motion the section will clarify that a committee may remove a Stakeholder member in the event the Stakeholder chooses to act as a public commenter.

Proposed Motion

Article VII, Section 3 C, paragraph 2 shall be renamed as paragraph 3.

A new paragraph 2 shall be inserted, reading:

“A Stakeholder committee member may be removed by the committee in the event the Stakeholder chooses to act as a public commenter. During the committee vote regarding such a removal the Stakeholder shall be ineligible to vote.”

Considerations

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

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

Arguments for:
Avoids committee members crossing lines, and therefore encourages those committee members to address issues as non-partisans.

Arguments against:
Unnecessary.
Motion to revise the Bylaws section regarding removal of board members

Agenda Item: GB042017-23
Date: April 20, 2017
Proposed By: Ken Blaker

Background

Article V, Section 9 of the SORO NC Bylaws requires that the board consult with the Office of the City Attorney throughout the process of removing any board member.

This motion eliminates the word throughout, and replaces it with “during.”

Proposed Motion

At the beginning of Article V, Section 9 of the SORO NC Bylaws, the sentence reading “The Council shall consult with the Office of the City Attorney throughout any Board removal process” shall be changed. The word “throughout” shall be replaced by “during.”

Considerations

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

Arguments for: While consultation with the Office of the City Attorney is reasonable, the requirement that such consultation be “throughout” is excessive, especially non-contentious cases.

Arguments against: By requiring the Board to consult throughout all removal cases the Board is forced to act responsibly regardless of the circumstances of a particular removal.
Motion to amend Article V of bylaws regarding the definition of “Stakeholder groups”

Agenda Item: GB042017-24
Date: April 20, 2017
Proposed By: Bylaws Committee

Background
The last sentence of Article V, section 1 refers to “Stakeholder groups.” The term is not defined, and is potentially confusing.

We propose adding a few words to clarify that the term refers to the groups, A – E, described in the section.

Proposed Motion
The second sentence of Article V, Section 1 of the bylaws currently reads “The composition of the Board shall be as follows (also refer to Attachment B):” That sentence shall be revised to read:

"The composition of the Board shall be made up of 5 stakeholder groups as follows (also refer to Attachment B):"

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

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

Adds some clarification.
Not worthwhile because the current wording, though not explicit in defining the term, is pretty obvious.