Motion to fund $1500 to support Budget Advocates

Agenda Item: GB052120-13
Date: May 19, 2020
Proposed By: Finance Committee
Include motion in Consent Agenda?

Background
This Neighborhood Council has traditionally provided financial support for Budget Advocates. This fiscal year's budget provides for a $750 contribution. In recognition of our financial balance and of the good works done by the Budget Advocates the Finance Committee proposes to increase this amount by $750 to a total of $1500.

Proposed Motion
South Robertson NC shall support the work of Budget Advocates by contributing $1500.

Considerations

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

| Votes For: -3- |
| Against: -0- |

| Amount previously allocated in Committee's working budget: |
| $750 |

| Arguments for: |
| Arguments against: |
| 1. This revised amount reflects past amounts which we have provided to Budget Advocates. |
| 1. none. |

South Robertson Neighborhoods Council
PO Box 35836
Los Angeles, CA 90035

P: (310) 295-9920
F: (310) 295-9906
E: info@soronc.org
soronc.org
Motion to Send Letters to Los Angeles Mayor and City Council to Oppose Further Urbanization Development in Los Angeles Due to COVID-19 Health and Safety Concerns

Agenda Item: GB052120-15
Date: May 21, 2020
Proposed By: Public Safety Committee
Include motion in Consent Agenda: No preference

Background
Cities with higher density were more vulnerable to the COVID-19 impacts. The example of how COVID-19 cases spread through New York City demonstrated in real-time some of the severe health and safety consequences of Urbanization and density.

In NYC, a majority of residents live in high-rise apt buildings with common entrances. This density prevented residents from social and physical distancing. In Los Angeles, most of the residents live in single family homes and low density multi-family units.

Due to its high use, the NYC Public Transportation System was identified as a primary source of spreading the Virus. Most New Yorkers use public transportation, while Los Angeles still relies driving solo in cars (less exposure to other people.)

In Los Angeles, a majority of the COVID-19 cases occurred in dense housing such as Nursing Homes and other areas with higher densities.

In NYC, a number of hospitals were demolished and turned into high-rise luxury housing following their closures.

Proposed Motion
Based on the comparison of COVID-19 cases between areas and cities with higher density (such as NYC), that the SORO NC should send Letters to City Councilmember Herb Wesson, City Councilmember Paul Koretz, City Council President Nury Martinez and Mayor Eric Garcetti:

1. Opposing over development and higher density in its City Planning.
II. Submit copies of CIS to Ethics, Council President Martinez and City Attorney Feuer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee review:</strong> (highly recommended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes For: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount previously allocated in Committee’s working budget:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(applies to funding motions only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arguments for:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SORONC to support CIS for CF20-0491

**Agenda Item:** GB060320-1
**Date:** May 21, 2020
**Proposed By:** Terrence Gomes LANCC
**Include motion in Consent Agenda?** If possible

---

### Background

Discussion and possible action for the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council who is gravely concerned with CF 20-0491. In a recent article on FoxNY, Councilmember Bonin told a news reporter that “the City Council supports the proposal and is looking to fast track it...” This statement suggests that Councilmember Bonin has been communicating, directly or indirectly, with other Councilmembers to build support for this policy decision without complying with the Brown Act. (See 216SutterBayAssociates v. County of Sutter (1997) 58 Cal.App.4th 860, 877 [holding that Brown Act prohibits serial meetings by majority of legislative body to engage in collective deliberation on public business].) Second, Bonin’s statements to the press suggest that he has already determined how he would vote on the issue of using federal funds to purchase distressed properties. To the extent that Bonin is ever asked to vote on whether to acquire distressed properties, he has demonstrated sufficient bias as to require his recusal. See, e.g., Woody’s Group, Inc. v. City of Newport Beach (2015) 233 Cal.App.4th 1021, 1021–1022 [holding that council member whose conduct creates probability of actual bias must recuse from land use decision].) South Robertson Neighborhoods Council finds it disgraceful that our local elected officials, who have had a hand in placing residential properties in a distressed condition, would consider a process to quickly identify residential properties for potential acquisition. The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council recommends that the City Council create a motion to use stimulus funds for bridge loans for Angelenos whose homes have become distressed due to COVID-19 and would keep those Angelenos from becoming homeless and adding an additional burden to the taxpayer. See "LA City councilman proposes using federal stimulus funds to buy distressed properties for homeless housing," Published April 23, 2020 and available at: [https://www.fox5ny.com/news/la-city-councilman-proposes-using-federal-stimulus-funds-to-buy-distressed-properties-for-homeless-housing](https://www.fox5ny.com/news/la-city-councilman-proposes-using-federal-stimulus-funds-to-buy-distressed-properties-for-homeless-housing)

### Proposed Motion

SORO NC should adopt the following:

I. Submit CIS for CF20-0491

II. Submit copies of CIS to Ethics, Council President Martinez and City Attorney Feuer.

---

### Considerations

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

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

(applicable to funding motions only)
### Community Impact Statement

**Council File:** 20-0491

As adopted by vote of the full SORO NC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>For if amended</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Against unless amended</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adopted:</strong></td>
<td>21 May 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SORONC is gravely concerned with CF 20-0491. In a recent article on Fox5NY, Councilmember Bonin told a news reporter that “the City Council supports the proposal and is looking to fast track it...” This statement suggests that Councilmember Bonin has been communicating, directly or indirectly, with other Councilmembers to build support without complying with the Brown Act. (See 216 Sutter Bay Associates v. County of Sutter [1997] 58 Cal. 4th 860, 877 [holding that Brown Act prohibits meetings by majority of legislative body to engage in collective deliberation on public business].) Second, Bonin’s statements to the press suggest that he has already determined how he would vote on the issue of using federal funds to purchase distressed properties. To the extent that Bonin is ever asked to vote on whether to acquire distressed properties, he has demonstrated sufficient bias as to require his recusal. (See e.g., Woody’s Group, Inc. v. City of Newport Beach (2015) 233 Cal.App.4th 1012, 1021–1022 [holding that councilmember whose conduct creates probability of actual bias must recuse from land use decision].) SORONC finds it disgraceful that our local elected officials, who have had a hand in placing residential properties in a distressed condition, would consider a process to quickly identify residential properties for potential acquisition. SORONC recommends that the City Council create a motion to use stimulus funds for bridge loans for Angelinos whose homes have become distressed due to COVID-19 and would keep those Angelinos from becoming homeless and adding an additional burden to the taxpayer. [https://www.fox5ny.com/news/la-city-councilman-proposes-using-federal-stimulus-funds-to-buy-distressed-properties-for-homeless-housing](https://www.fox5ny.com/news/la-city-councilman-proposes-using-federal-stimulus-funds-to-buy-distressed-properties-for-homeless-housing)

### Submitted by:

[Only Exec committee members are approved to submit CISs]
Motion to fund up to $1667 to Sova Food Pantry to aid in feeding those who need assistance

Agenda Item: GB060320-2  
Date: June 3, 2020  
Proposed By: Executive Committee

Include motion in No  
Consent Agenda?

Background  
This Neighborhood Council was authorized during the pandemic to spend up to $5000 as an Emergency fund. By the time that a decision was reached as to where the funds should be spent neighborhood councils were allowed to have Virtual Meetings. This cancelled the ability to fund under the emergency funding procedure but did allow for our neighborhood council to make this contribution by regular funding methods.

The decision was made to spend our funds in support of food banks aiding those in our community that need help in providing basic sustenance for themselves and their families. The $5000 was to be split between three local food banks. At the moment we have sufficient data to proceed with only one of the three food banks. Sova Food Pantry, a food bank that has been active in our community for decades. This is a subsidiary of Jewish Family Services. They have temporarily closed their physical storefront on Pico Blvd. This is due to the pandemic as the physical storefront was staffed by elderly volunteers who would be at risk. Note that this has not stopped the work of the foodbank. Food is prepared and sent out daily to needy recipients within the Soro Boundaries from their San Fernando Valley building. It is transported to our neighborhood by JFS drivers who, had there not been a "Shelter at Home" order, would otherwise be busy transporting seniors to appointments.

We are providing a donation of $1667 which shall be used to provide 1282 meals to members of our community. ($1.30/meal). These meals will be distributed to anyone in our community without regard to religion.

This motion has been reviewed by the City Clerk’s Funding Office. Due to timing and circumstances it can be brought forward as a regular funding motion and not an NPG.

[NOTE: the remaining 2/3 of the $5000 will be brought back to the Board by the next meeting. We did not proceed with them at this time as they have not responded to our phone calls. If Board Members have a different preference as to the use of these funds, they should be submitted to the Finance Committee for consideration.]

Proposed Motion  
South Robertson NC shall contribute $1667 to Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles to be used solely by the SOVA Food and Resource Program to feed Stakeholders of the South Robertson NC
II. Submit copies of CIS to Ethics, Council President Martinez and City Attorney Feuer.

### Considerations

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

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

| Arguments for: | Arguments against: |
Jewish Family Service Donation
1 message

Carol Bar-Or <cbaror@jfsla.org>  
To: "jonliberman@soronc.org" <jonliberman@soronc.org>  
Cc: Chrystal Hagerty <chagerty@jfsla.org>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 4:41 PM

Wednesday, May 20, 2020

Hi Jon,

It was so nice connecting with you!

I want to thank you and the South Robertson Neighborhood Council for your meaningful contribution of $1,667.00.

Your support ensures that our community can count on us and that life-sustaining services continue to be provided during these challenging times.

Kindly make the check out to Jewish Family Service LA and please note in the memo that this donation is earmarked for

SOVA Community Food and Resource Program. Attached is our 501c3 document per your request. Upon receipt of the donation,

JFS will mail a thank you letter.

The check should be mailed to:

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ik=c0bb4699ce&view=pt&sear... 5/20/2020
Jewish Family Service LA
3580 Wilshire Blvd. Suite 700
LA, CA 90010
Attention: Resource Development

If you have any further questions, feel free to reach out.

All the best,
Carol Bar-Or

Carol Bar-Or, MPA
Director Of Resource Development
Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles
3580 Wilshire Blvd. Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Phone: 213.260.7922
Fax: 323.761.8801
cbaror@jfsla.org
www.jfsla.org

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ik=c0bb4699ce&view=pt&sear... 5/20/2020
Notice of Confidentiality

This e-mail transmission and any related attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any retention, disclosure, distribution or other use is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete this e-mail and any attachments. Thank you.

Please consider the environment - Do you really need to print this email?

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ik=c0bb4699ce&view=pt&src... 5/20/2020
In reply refer to: 0248674159
Jan. 26, 2011 LTR 4168C E0
95-1691013 000000 EE
00014108
BODC: TE

JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE OF LOS ANGELES
3580 WILLSHIRE BLVD SUITE 700
LOS ANGELES CA 90010

Employer Identification Number: 95-1691013
Person to Contact: MS. OZEPY
Toll Free Telephone Number: 1-877-829-5500

Dear TAXPAYER:

This is in response to your Jan. 14, 2011, request for information regarding your tax-exempt status.

Our records indicate that you were recognized as exempt under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code in a determination letter issued in DECEMBER 1935.

Our records also indicate that you are not a private foundation within the meaning of section 509(a) of the Code because you are described in section(s) 509(a)(1) and 170(b)(1)(A)(vi).

Donors may deduct contributions to you as provided in section 170 of the Code. Bequests, legacies, devises, transfers, or gifts to you or for your use are deductible for Federal estate and gift tax purposes if they meet the applicable provisions of sections 2055, 2106, and 2522 of the Code.

Please refer to our website www.irs.gov/ezo for information regarding filing requirements. Specifically, section 6033(j) of the Code provides that failure to file an annual information return for three consecutive years results in revocation of tax-exempt status as of the filing due date of the third return for organizations required to file. We will publish a list of organizations whose tax-exempt status was revoked under section 6033(j) of the Code on our website beginning in early 2011.
Motion to fund up to $3,333 for Los Angeles Regional Food Bank

Agenda Item: GB060320-3
Date: June 3, 2020
Proposed By: Jessica Barclay-Strobel
Include motion in Consent Agenda?

Background

The text of a motion (GB052120-10) proposed by the Executive Committee that was tabled on May 21, 2020, provided in relevant part:

This Neighborhood Council was authorized during the pandemic to spend up to $5000 as an Emergency fund. By the time that a decision was reached as to where the funds should be spent neighborhood councils were allowed to have Virtual Meetings. This cancelled the ability to fund under the emergency funding procedure but did allow for our neighborhood council to make this contribution by regular funding methods.

The decision was made to spend our funds in support of food banks aiding those in our community that need help in providing basic sustenance for themselves and their families. The $5000 was to be split between three local food banks. At the moment we have sufficient data to proceed with only one of the three food banks.

The abovementioned motion (GB052120-10) proposed allocating $1,667 to a food bank that has temporarily closed its physical storefront on Pico Blvd. Given the need created by the coronavirus pandemic, the present motion proposes that the remainder of the $5,000—which is $3,333—be given to the LA Regional Food Bank, which is a 501(c)3 nonprofit organization (EIN: 95-3135649). Since 1973, the Los Angeles Regional Food Bank has distributed more than 1.2 billion pounds of food. As reflected in the link below, every $1 provides food for 4 meals to feed hungry children, seniors, and families. https://secure.lafoodbank.org/site/Donation2?2481_donation=form1&df_id=2481&mfc__pref=T

Proposed Motion

SORO NC shall approve funding up to $3,333 to the Los Angeles Regional Food Bank.

Considerations

Arguments for: The coronavirus pandemic has created an extraordinary need that the LA Regional Food Bank is well positioned to meet.

Arguments against: SORO NC funds could be used for other purposes.
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is irrational to cut spending on services that keep streets safe and clean during a pandemic while increasing spending on police when crime has plummeted.</td>
<td>Given that the City Council has in the past approved the Mayor's proposed budgets, it may have little appetite for a fight and so choose to ignore the SORO Neighborhood Council's concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Taxpayer:

This is in response to your Mar. 19, 2012, request for information regarding your tax-exempt status.

Our records indicate that you were recognized as exempt under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code in a determination letter issued in September 1977.

Our records also indicate that you are not a private foundation within the meaning of section 509(a) of the Code because you are described in section(s) 509(a)(1) and 170(b)(1)(A)(vi).

Donors may deduct contributions to you as provided in section 170 of the Code. Bequests, legacies, devises, transfers, or gifts to you or for your use are deductible for Federal estate and gift tax purposes if they meet the applicable provisions of sections 2055, 2106, and 2522 of the Code.

Please refer to our website www.irs.gov/eo for information regarding filing requirements. Specifically, section 6033(j) of the Code provides that failure to file an annual information return for three consecutive years results in revocation of tax-exempt status as of the filing due date of the third return for organizations required to file. We will publish a list of organizations whose tax-exempt status was revoked under section 6033(j) of the Code on our website beginning in early 2011.
Motion to send letter expressing concern about Mayor’s Budget

Agenda Item: To Be Filled in by Exec Committee
Date: June 3, 2020
Proposed By: Jessica Barclay-Strobel
Include motion in Consent Agenda? No

Background

In light of the impacts of the coronavirus pandemic, Mayor Eric Garcetti recently released a Proposed Budget for the Fiscal Year 2020-21, effective July 1, that cuts $230 million in services, weakening vital programs that many Angelenos rely on and imposing furloughs and pay cuts on nearly 16,000 city workers. For example, as summarized in media reports, the proposed cuts and furloughs will result in:

- Street services being reduced by 20%
- Wait times for 311 requests (graffiti removal, fixing potholes, etc.) increasing
- LAPD patrol officers being reassigned to cover civilian employee shifts

While the Proposed Budget reduces spending on workers and services necessary keep our streets clean and safe—services that are critical in a pandemic—the Proposed Budget increases spending on the LAPD despite crime being down 23% percent since the pandemic’s outbreak and violent crime being at historic lows even before the outbreak began. In addition to imposing a 10% pay cut on civilian city workers, the Proposed Budget cuts $139 million through furloughs of these workers. In contrast, the LAPD budget will increase by nearly $120 million in general fund spending, with LAPD receiving 4.8% pay raises, $34 million in additional overtime, and a new $41 million bonus program. As a result, spending on the LAPD will account for just around 54% of the city’s unrestricted revenues, a total of about $5.4 billion.

Concerned that LAPD pay raises and bonuses are being paid for by cuts to vital services provided by civilian city workers, the Los Feliz Neighborhood Council voted on May 26, 2020, to submit a letter voicing opposition to the Proposed Budget. The present motion proposes submitting a letter with the same text as in the Los Feliz Neighborhood Council letter, which can be viewed here:
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B8EIAEOKO4HBN1Z4LXVB0ElacDA

Proposed Motion

SORO NC shall submit the attached letter to the Los Angeles City Council’s Budget and Finance Committee members, Councilmember Herb Wesson, City Council President, Nury Martinez, and Eric Garcetti.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for:</th>
<th>Arguments against:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is irrational to cut spending on services that keep streets safe and clean during a pandemic while increasing spending on police when crime has plummeted.</td>
<td>Given that the City Council has in the past approved the Mayor’s proposed budgets, it may have little appetite for a fight and so choose to ignore the SORO Neighborhood Council’s concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 3, 2020

The Honorable Members of the Budget and Finance Committee
c/o Office of the City Clerk
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring Street, Rm 395
Los Angeles, CA 90012
email: clerk.budgetandfinancecommittee@lacity.org

Re: The Mayor’s Proposed Budget

Dear Councilmembers Krekorian, Price, Koretz, Blumenfield, and Bonin,

We write to express our deep concern regarding the Mayor’s Proposed Budget for the Fiscal Year 2020-21.

We understand that the COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in significant revenue shortfalls for the City and that cuts in spending must be made. We question the priorities and values that are reflected in the Mayor’s Proposed Budget, however, with regard to the cuts he has proposed—and those he has not.

Specifically, we are troubled that in a budget that cuts $230 million in services, weakening vital programs that many Angelenos rely on and imposing furloughs on nearly 16,000 city workers, LAPD officer pay is simultaneously being increased by $144 million. In relative terms compared to last year’s spending—despite the great need created by the COVID-19 outbreak—the Mayor’s Proposed Budget cuts City investments in job programs by 8.9%, housing programs by 9.4%, and homelessness programs by 6%—all while boosting its expenditure on police by 7.1%. This brings LAPD’s share of the City’s total budget to a whopping 54%—despite the fact that crime is down.

Angelenos are currently facing an economic and health crisis of unprecedented proportions. Even before COVID-19, roughly one in three renters in Los Angeles spent more than half their income on housing, and there were over 36,000 unhoused people in our City. The pandemic will only make matters worse. Over half of Angelenos are now unemployed following the massive job losses stemming from COVID-19. And economists predict that many of the recent layoffs will be permanent. Without bold action from the City, more Angelenos will become severely rent-burdened or fall into homelessness.
We applaud the City’s efforts to respond to the COVID-19 emergency: delivering meals to seniors, opening childcare centers for healthcare workers, purchasing personal protective equipment (PPE) for first responders, implementing a small business loan program, committing to providing rental assistance, and setting up testing sites, additional shelters, and more. These are the kinds of interventions Angelenos need at this critical and unprecedented time.

Sadly, the Mayor’s Proposed Budget puts some of these very initiatives on the chopping block. The Department of Aging has reported that furloughs and office closures will directly affect seniors trying to enroll in meal services, many of whom do not have internet access and rely on staff to help them enroll in city programs via telephone. (CAO’s May 19, 2020 Report on the Impact on City Services of the Furlough Program Included in the 2020-21 Proposed Budget, 7.) The Department of Economic Development anticipates that its cuts will cause delays in economic relief and related assistance to the thousands of workers and businesses impacted by the COVID-19 emergency. (Id. at 15.) The Department of Housing and Community Investment predicts that furloughs will reduce its ability to provide services to tenants, prevent poverty and homelessness, and create affordable housing. (Id. at 20.)

In her opening remarks during the May 21, 2020 Council Meeting, Council President Nury Martinez said, “As we start the new fiscal year, it is important to keep in mind the people who need us the most right now—working families, those living in poverty, communities of color that have long been forgotten, seniors and children.” This budget balances itself on the backs of those very people—the most vulnerable among us—largely to provide a raise for LAPD officers. If officers simply received the same pay they did last year, the City could prevent two-thirds of these devastating cuts to critical services.

The cruel calculus of the budget is made all the more unjustifiable by the fact that crime in our city is down 23% percent since the beginning of the COVID-19 outbreak. Even before COVID-19, violent crime in Los Angeles had reached historic lows. In January, Police Chief Moore observed that this is “one of the safest times in Los Angeles” and the Mayor noted that our crime statistics were “better . . . than we’ve seen in decades.” Increasing spending on policing when crime is down and when other urgent needs are so high simply doesn’t make sense.

Public safety should no doubt be one of the City’s highest priorities. But investments in housing and job security, mental health care, and after-school programs are investments in public safety. By cutting these services, this budget will not make Angelenos safer.

As Councilmember Ryu observed in his recent comments on the budget, “If we make cuts to departments and services that serve low-income and working families, we will be paying for those cuts for decades to come.” The Mayor’s Proposed Budget puts political expediency
over the urgent needs of the Angelenos who are suffering most acutely in this time of crisis, and it will cost our City dearly if enacted without significant revision.

We urge you, as our representatives, to rework the 2020-21 budget so that it meets the needs of this moment. Budgets are moral documents that reflect our values. What kind of city cuts services and increases spending on law enforcement when its people are struggling to eat? What does that say about us? We need not take this path.

The coronavirus outbreak has laid bare many hard truths—about the fragility of our healthcare system, the vulnerability of the many Angelenos living paycheck to paycheck, the growing inequality in our society—and our City. By taking an honest look, however, we are presented with an opportunity to improve upon the past instead of repeating its mistakes. It is in that spirit that our Neighborhood Council asks you for a compassionate budget—and through it, for a more just, equitable, and humane Los Angeles.

Sincerely,

Martin Epstein
President, South Robertson Neighborhoods Council

CC: Herb Wesson
Councilmember, 10th District
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Hon. Nury Martinez
City Council President
Councilmember, 6th District
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N Spring Street, Ste 470
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Mayor Eric Garcetti
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Motion to Reimburse Board Member Michael Lynn, $29.98 for NC Expenses

Agenda Item: GB060320-6
Date: May 21, 2020
Proposed By: Michael Lynn
Include motion in Consent Agenda? No preference

Background

During the months of April and May, the SORO NC Public Safety Committee Meetings, as per Governor Gavin Newsom’s order lifting of certain elements of the Brown Act, Michael Lynn purchased 2 monthly subscriptions of Zoom Pro @ $14.99 per month to hold the committee meetings, while DONE was setting up a ZOOM account for NC use.

Proposed Motion

The SORO NC reimburse SORO NC Board Member Michael Lynn in the amount of $29.98 for Video Teleconferencing Services purchased to conduct Public Safety Committee meetings.

Considerations

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

Amount previously allocated in Committee's working budget: $ N/A

Arguments for: | Arguments against:
|----------------|------------------|
## CHARGE DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge Description</th>
<th>Service Period</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Tax</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Pro Monthly</td>
<td>05/10/2020-06/09/2020</td>
<td>$14.99</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$14.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## INVOICE TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subtotal:</th>
<th>$14.99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (Including Tax):</td>
<td>$14.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoice Balance:</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TAX DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge Name</th>
<th>Tax Name</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Charge Amount</th>
<th>Tax Amount</th>
<th>Total Tax</th>
<th>$0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## TRANSACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction Date</th>
<th>Transaction Number</th>
<th>Transaction Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Applied Amount</th>
<th>$14.99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/12/2020</td>
<td>P-21059211</td>
<td>Payment</td>
<td></td>
<td>($14.99)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Invoice Balance: $0.00
Zoom Phone services provided by Zoom Voice Communications, Inc. Rates, terms and conditions for Zoom Phone services are set by Zoom Voice Communications, Inc.
### CHARGE DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge Description</th>
<th>Service Period</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Tax</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Pro Monthly</td>
<td>04/10/2020-05/09/2020</td>
<td>$14.99</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$14.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INVOICE TOTALS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td>$14.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Including Tax):</td>
<td>$14.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoice Balance:</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TAX DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge Name</th>
<th>Tax Name</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Charge Amount</th>
<th>Tax Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRANSACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction Date</th>
<th>Transaction Number</th>
<th>Transaction Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Applied Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2020</td>
<td>P-15910874</td>
<td>Payment</td>
<td></td>
<td>($14.99)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Invoice Balance: $0.00
Zoom Phone services provided by Zoom Voice Communications, Inc. Rates, terms and conditions for Zoom Phone services are set by Zoom Voice Communications, Inc.