



Motion for timely community notification of development plans

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

Background

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

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

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

Proposed Motion

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

- a. give timely access to the plans for public inspection, including access via the internet; and
- b. provide notice to adjacent property owners, Neighborhood Councils, and Community Councils as soon as such plans are submitted to the City.

Considerations

Committee review: <i>(highly recommended)</i>	Votes For: n/a	Against:
---	----------------	----------

Amount previously allocated in Committee's working budget: <i>(applies to funding motions only)</i>	\$
---	----

Arguments for:

Provides important information to the community about upcoming development in their area.

Arguments against:

The cost to implement a robust solution is unknown.

Doug Fitzsimmons
President

Kevin Gres
Vice-President

Terrence Gomes
Treasurer

Beth Hirsch
Secretary

**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



TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
State of California

BILL LOCKYER
Attorney General

OPINION	:	No. 05-1004
	:	
of	:	February 28, 2006
	:	
BILL LOCKYER	:	
Attorney General	:	
	:	
GREGORY L. GONOT	:	
Deputy Attorney General	:	
	:	

THE HONORABLE SHEILA JAMES KUEHL, MEMBER OF THE STATE SENATE, has requested an opinion on the following question:

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

CONCLUSION

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

ANALYSIS

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

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

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

¹ All references hereafter to the Government Code are by section number only.

² A city is a "local agency" by definition under section 6252, subdivision (b).

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

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

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

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

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

For reasons of privacy, safety, and efficient governmental operations, the Legislature has provided for exemptions from disclosure in limited situations. (*Haynie v. Superior Court* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 1061, 1064.) These statutory exemptions are to be construed narrowly (*City of Hemet v. Superior Court* (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 1411, 1425; *San Gabriel Tribune v. Superior Court* (1983) 143 Cal.App.3d 762, 773; see Cal. Const., art. I, § 3, subd. (b)(2); 88 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen., *supra*, at pp. 157-159), and the burden is on the public agency to show that the records are exempt from disclosure (*Rogers v. Superior Court* (1993) 19 Cal.App.4th 469, 476).

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

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

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

³ For the same reason, the importance of public disclosure of interim grading documents would render inapplicable the “catchall” exemption of section 6255.

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

Another exemption that may at first appear applicable is found in section 6254, subdivision (e), which exempts “[g]eological and geophysical data, plant production data, and similar information relating to utility systems development, or market or crop reports, that are obtained in confidence from any person.” Here, however, even if this exemption were otherwise applicable,⁴ the reports in question are not “obtained in confidence.” (See *Uribe v. Howie* (1971) 19 Cal.App.3d 194, 211-212; *National Resources Def. v. U. S. Dept. of Defense* (C.D. Cal. 2005) 388 F.Supp.2d 1086, 1107-1108.) Rather, their importance as public records is demonstrated by the statutory scheme relating to the sale of subdivided lands. Business and Professions Code section 11010 states:

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

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

“.....

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

“.....”

⁴ We need not define the term “utility systems development” for purposes of this opinion or decide whether the phrase “relating to utility systems development” modifies the phrase “[g]eological and geophysical data.”

This statutorily mandated inclusion referencing the reports at issue serves to promote timely public access in considering whether a proposed building project may impact surrounding properties.⁵

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

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

⁶ A special exemption exists for corporate proprietary information, including trade secrets. (§ 6254.15.) We have not been informed that such information would be contained in interim grading documents.



Motion to oppose Assembly Bill 744, limiting local authority over parking for density bonus projects

Agenda Item: GB082015-3

Date: 20 August 2015

Proposed By: Westside Regional Alliance of Councils

Background

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

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

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

- a. The development is located within one half mile of a major transit stop;
- b. The development is a senior citizen housing development; or,
- c. The development is a special needs development.

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

Proposed Motion

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

Considerations

Committee review:
(highly recommended)

Votes For: n/a

Against:

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

Doug Fitzsimmons
President

Kevin Gres
Vice-President

Terrence Gomes
Treasurer

Beth Hirsch
Secretary

**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





Arguments for:

The best parking policy for a small inland community is not necessarily the best for a far-flung metropolis—particularly with State funding for mass transit drying to a trickle. Stripping municipalities of the ability to set their own zoning standards for parking is egregious over-reach, and the idea that cities are too “unenlightened” to legislate responsibly is the height of out-of-touch arrogance.

Arguments against:

Minimum parking requirements increase development costs and distort the market, thus raising rental rates. Developers may always build more parking if the market demands it.

AMENDED IN SENATE JULY 8, 2015
AMENDED IN SENATE JUNE 23, 2015
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY JUNE 2, 2015
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 26, 2015
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2015–16 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 744

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

February 25, 2015

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

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

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

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

meets these criteria in excess of specified ratios. This prohibition applies only at the request of the developer and specifies that the developer may request additional parking incentives or concessions.

This bill would, notwithstanding the above-described provisions, additionally prohibit, at the request of the developer, a city, county, or city and county from imposing a vehicular parking ~~ratio~~ *ratio, inclusive of handicapped and guest parking*, in excess of 0.5 spaces per bedroom on a development that includes the maximum percentage of low- or very low income units, as specified, and is located within ~~one-half~~ $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of a major transit stop, as defined, and there is unobstructed access to the transit stop from the development. The bill would also prohibit, at the request of the developer, a city, county, or city and county from imposing a vehicular parking ratio, *inclusive of handicapped and guest parking*, in excess of specified amounts per unit on a development that consists solely of units with an affordable housing cost to lower income households, as specified, if the development is within ~~one-half~~ $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of a major transit stop and there is unobstructed access to the transit stop from the development, is a for-rent housing development for individuals that are 62 years of age or ~~older~~, *older* that complies with specified existing laws regarding senior housing, or is a special needs housing development, as those terms are defined. *The bill would require a subject development that is a for-rent housing development for individuals that are 62 years of age or older or a special needs housing development to have either paratransit service or be located within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of fixed bus route service that operates at least 8 times per day.* The bill would make findings and declarations in this regard, including that this constitutes a matter of statewide concern and is not a municipal affair.

By imposing additional duties on local governments in awarding density bonuses, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

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

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.
State-mandated local program: yes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

36 (i) Increases in public transportation and shared mobility options
37 and the development of more walkable and bikeable neighborhoods
38 reduce the demand for parking.

1 (j) Consistent with Chapter 488 of the Statutes of 2006 (AB 32)
2 and Chapter 728 of the Statutes of 2008 (SB 375), it is state policy
3 to promote transit-oriented infill development to reduce greenhouse
4 gas emissions.

5 (k) The high cost of the land and improvements required to
6 provide parking significantly increases the cost of transit-oriented
7 development, making lower cost and affordable housing
8 development financially infeasible and hindering the goals of SB
9 375.

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

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

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

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

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

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

35 (1) Ensure sufficient amounts of parking at almost all times.

36 (2) Reduce the cost of development and increase the number of
37 transit-accessible and affordable housing units.

38 (3) Allow for more effective use of the density bonus law.

39 (4) Increase density in areas with the most housing demand,
40 and improve the viability of developing alternate modes of

1 transportation, such as public transit, ridesharing, biking, and
2 walking.

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

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

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

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

16 65915. (a) When an applicant seeks a density bonus for a
17 housing development within, or for the donation of land for housing
18 within, the jurisdiction of a city, county, or city and county, that
19 local government shall provide the applicant with incentives or
20 concessions for the production of housing units and child care
21 facilities as prescribed in this section. All cities, counties, or cities
22 and counties shall adopt an ordinance that specifies how
23 compliance with this section will be implemented. Failure to adopt
24 an ordinance shall not relieve a city, county, or city and county
25 from complying with this section.

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

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

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

39 (C) A senior citizen housing development, as defined in Sections
40 51.3 and 51.12 of the Civil Code, or a mobilehome park that limits

1 residency based on age requirements for housing for older persons
2 pursuant to Section 798.76 or 799.5 of the Civil Code.

3 (D) Ten percent of the total dwelling units in a common interest
4 development, as defined in Section 4100 of the Civil Code, for
5 persons and families of moderate income, as defined in Section
6 50093 of the Health and Safety Code, provided that all units in the
7 development are offered to the public for purchase.

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

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

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

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

36 (A) Upon resale, the seller of the unit shall retain the value of
37 any improvements, the downpayment, and the seller's proportionate
38 share of appreciation. The local government shall recapture any
39 initial subsidy, as defined in subparagraph (B), and its proportionate
40 share of appreciation, as defined in subparagraph (C), which

1 amount shall be used within five years for any of the purposes
2 described in subdivision (e) of Section 33334.2 of the Health and
3 Safety Code that promote home ownership.

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

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

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

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

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

33 (B) For the purposes of this paragraph, "replace" shall mean
34 either of the following:

35 (i) If any dwelling units described in subparagraph (A) are
36 occupied on the date of application, the proposed housing
37 development shall provide at least the same number of units of
38 equivalent size or type, or both, to be made available at affordable
39 rent or affordable housing cost to, and occupied by, persons and
40 families in the same or lower income category as those households

1 in occupancy. For unoccupied dwelling units described in
2 subparagraph (A) in a development with occupied units, the
3 proposed housing development shall provide units of equivalent
4 size or type, or both, to be made available at affordable rent or
5 affordable housing cost to, and occupied by, persons and families
6 in the same or lower income category in the same proportion of
7 affordability as the occupied units. All replacement calculations
8 resulting in fractional units shall be rounded up to the next whole
9 number. If the replacement units will be rental dwelling units,
10 these units shall be subject to a recorded affordability restriction
11 for at least 55 years. If the proposed development is for-sale units,
12 the units replaced shall be subject to paragraph (2).

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

34 (C) Paragraph (3) of subdivision (c) does not apply to an
35 applicant seeking a density bonus for a proposed housing
36 development if his or her application was submitted to, or
37 processed by, a city, county, or city and county before January 1,
38 2015.

39 (d) (1) An applicant for a density bonus pursuant to subdivision
40 (b) may submit to a city, county, or city and county a proposal for

1 the specific incentives or concessions that the applicant requests
2 pursuant to this section, and may request a meeting with the city,
3 county, or city and county. The city, county, or city and county
4 shall grant the concession or incentive requested by the applicant
5 unless the city, county, or city and county makes a written finding,
6 based upon substantial evidence, of any of the following:

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

11 (B) The concession or incentive would have a specific adverse
12 impact, as defined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section
13 65589.5, upon public health and safety or the physical environment
14 or on any real property that is listed in the California Register of
15 Historical Resources and for which there is no feasible method to
16 satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact without
17 rendering the development unaffordable to low- and
18 moderate-income households.

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

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

23 (A) One incentive or concession for projects that include at least
24 10 percent of the total units for lower income households, at least
25 5 percent for very low income households, or at least 10 percent
26 for persons and families of moderate income in a common interest
27 development.

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

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

38 (3) The applicant may initiate judicial proceedings if the city,
39 county, or city and county refuses to grant a requested density
40 bonus, incentive, or concession. If a court finds that the refusal to

1 grant a requested density bonus, incentive, or concession is in
2 violation of this section, the court shall award the plaintiff
3 reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit. Nothing in this
4 subdivision shall be interpreted to require a local government to
5 grant an incentive or concession that has a specific, adverse impact,
6 as defined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5,
7 upon health, safety, or the physical environment, and for which
8 there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the
9 specific adverse impact. Nothing in this subdivision shall be
10 interpreted to require a local government to grant an incentive or
11 concession that would have an adverse impact on any real property
12 that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources.
13 The city, county, or city and county shall establish procedures for
14 carrying out this section, that shall include legislative body
15 approval of the means of compliance with this section.

16 (e) (1) In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply
17 any development standard that will have the effect of physically
18 precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria
19 of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or
20 incentives permitted by this section. An applicant may submit to
21 a city, county, or city and county a proposal for the waiver or
22 reduction of development standards that will have the effect of
23 physically precluding the construction of a development meeting
24 the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the
25 concessions or incentives permitted under this section, and may
26 request a meeting with the city, county, or city and county. If a
27 court finds that the refusal to grant a waiver or reduction of
28 development standards is in violation of this section, the court
29 shall award the plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees and costs of
30 suit. Nothing in this subdivision shall be interpreted to require a
31 local government to waive or reduce development standards if the
32 waiver or reduction would have a specific, adverse impact, as
33 defined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5,
34 upon health, safety, or the physical environment, and for which
35 there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the
36 specific adverse impact. Nothing in this subdivision shall be
37 interpreted to require a local government to waive or reduce
38 development standards that would have an adverse impact on any
39 real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical

1 Resources, or to grant any waiver or reduction that would be
2 contrary to state or federal law.

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

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

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

Percentage Low-Income Units	Percentage Density Bonus
10	20
11	21.5
12	23
13	24.5
14	26
15	27.5
17	30.5
18	32
19	33.5
20	35

31
32 (2) For housing developments meeting the criteria of
33 subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (b), the density
34 bonus shall be calculated as follows:

Percentage Very Low Income Units	Percentage Density Bonus
5	20
6	22.5
7	25
8	27.5

1	9	30
2	10	32.5
3	11	35

4
5 (3) For housing developments meeting the criteria of
6 subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (b), the density
7 bonus shall be 20 percent of the number of senior housing units.

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

11	Percentage Moderate-Income Units	Percentage Density Bonus
12		
13	10	5
14	11	6
15	12	7
16	13	8
17	14	9
18	15	10
19	16	11
20	17	12
21	18	13
22	19	14
23	20	15
24	21	16
25	22	17
26	23	18
27	24	19
28	25	20
29	26	21
30	27	22
31	28	23
32	29	24
33	30	25
34	31	26
35	32	27
36	33	28
37	34	29
38	35	30
39	36	31
40	37	32

1	38	33
2	39	34
3	40	35

4

5 (5) All density calculations resulting in fractional units shall be
6 rounded up to the next whole number. The granting of a density
7 bonus shall not be interpreted, in and of itself, to require a general
8 plan amendment, local coastal plan amendment, zoning change,
9 or other discretionary approval.

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

16

17	Percentage Very Low Income	Percentage Density Bonus
18	10	15
19	11	16
20	12	17
21	13	18
22	14	19
23	15	20
24	16	21
25	17	22
26	18	23
27	19	24
28	20	25
29	21	26
30	22	27
31	23	28
32	24	29
33	25	30
34	26	31
35	27	32
36	28	33
37	29	34
38	30	35

39

1 (2) This increase shall be in addition to any increase in density
2 mandated by subdivision (b), up to a maximum combined mandated
3 density increase of 35 percent if an applicant seeks an increase
4 pursuant to both this subdivision and subdivision (b). All density
5 calculations resulting in fractional units shall be rounded up to the
6 next whole number. Nothing in this subdivision shall be construed
7 to enlarge or diminish the authority of a city, county, or city and
8 county to require a developer to donate land as a condition of
9 development. An applicant shall be eligible for the increased
10 density bonus described in this subdivision if all of the following
11 conditions are met:

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

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

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

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

36 (E) The transferred land and the affordable units shall be subject
37 to a deed restriction ensuring continued affordability of the units
38 consistent with paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (c), which
39 shall be recorded on the property at the time of the transfer.

1 (F) The land is transferred to the local agency or to a housing
2 developer approved by the local agency. The local agency may
3 require the applicant to identify and transfer the land to the
4 developer.

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

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

12 (h) (1) When an applicant proposes to construct a housing
13 development that conforms to the requirements of subdivision (b)
14 and includes a child care facility that will be located on the
15 premises of, as part of, or adjacent to, the project, the city, county,
16 or city and county shall grant either of the following:

17 (A) An additional density bonus that is an amount of square
18 feet of residential space that is equal to or greater than the amount
19 of square feet in the child care facility.

20 (B) An additional concession or incentive that contributes
21 significantly to the economic feasibility of the construction of the
22 child care facility.

23 (2) The city, county, or city and county shall require, as a
24 condition of approving the housing development, that the following
25 occur:

26 (A) The child care facility shall remain in operation for a period
27 of time that is as long as or longer than the period of time during
28 which the density bonus units are required to remain affordable
29 pursuant to subdivision (c).

30 (B) Of the children who attend the child care facility, the
31 children of very low income households, lower income households,
32 or families of moderate income shall equal a percentage that is
33 equal to or greater than the percentage of dwelling units that are
34 required for very low income households, lower income
35 households, or families of moderate income pursuant to subdivision
36 (b).

37 (3) Notwithstanding any requirement of this subdivision, a city,
38 county, or city and county shall not be required to provide a density
39 bonus or concession for a child care facility if it finds, based upon

1 substantial evidence, that the community has adequate child care
2 facilities.

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

7 (i) "Housing development," as used in this section, means a
8 development project for five or more residential units. For the
9 purposes of this section, "housing development" also includes a
10 subdivision or common interest development, as defined in Section
11 4100 of the Civil Code, approved by a city, county, or city and
12 county and consists of residential units or unimproved residential
13 lots and either a project to substantially rehabilitate and convert
14 an existing commercial building to residential use or the substantial
15 rehabilitation of an existing multifamily dwelling, as defined in
16 subdivision (d) of Section 65863.4, where the result of the
17 rehabilitation would be a net increase in available residential units.
18 For the purpose of calculating a density bonus, the residential units
19 shall be on contiguous sites that are the subject of one development
20 application, but do not have to be based upon individual
21 subdivision maps or parcels. The density bonus shall be permitted
22 in geographic areas of the housing development other than the
23 areas where the units for the lower income households are located.

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

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

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

34 (1) A reduction in site development standards or a modification
35 of zoning code requirements or architectural design requirements
36 that exceed the minimum building standards approved by the
37 California Building Standards Commission as provided in Part 2.5
38 (commencing with Section 18901) of Division 13 of the Health
39 and Safety Code, including, but not limited to, a reduction in
40 setback and square footage requirements and in the ratio of

1 vehicular parking spaces that would otherwise be required that
2 results in identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual cost
3 reductions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

37 (2) “Maximum allowable residential density” means the density
38 allowed under the zoning ordinance and land use element of the
39 general plan, or if a range of density is permitted, means the
40 maximum allowable density for the specific zoning range and land

1 use element of the general plan applicable to the project. Where
 2 the density allowed under the zoning ordinance is inconsistent
 3 with the density allowed under the land use element of the general
 4 plan, the general plan density shall prevail.

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

10 (A) Zero to one bedroom: one onsite parking space.

11 (B) Two to three bedrooms: two onsite parking spaces.

12 (C) Four and more bedrooms: two and one-half parking spaces.

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

23 (3) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), if a development consists
 24 solely of rental units, exclusive of a manager's unit or units, with
 25 an affordable housing cost to lower income families, as provided
 26 in Section 50052.5 of the Health and Safety Code, then, upon the
 27 request of the developer, a city, county, or city and county shall
 28 not impose a ~~minimum~~ vehicular parking ~~requirement~~, ~~if the~~
 29 ~~development meets any of the following criteria:~~ *ratio, inclusive*
 30 *of handicapped and guest parking, that exceeds the following*
 31 *ratios:*

32 (A) ~~The~~ *If the* development is located within one-half mile of
 33 a major transit stop, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 21155
 34 of the Public Resources Code, and there is unobstructed access to
 35 the major transit stop from the ~~development~~: *development, the*
 36 *ratio shall not exceed 0.5 spaces per unit*. For purposes of this
 37 paragraph, a development shall have unobstructed access to the
 38 major transit stop if a resident is able to ~~walk to~~ *access* the major
 39 transit stop without encountering natural or constructed
 40 impediments.

1 (B) ~~The~~ *If the development is a for-rent housing development*
2 *for individuals who are 62 years of age or older that complies with*
3 *Sections 51.2 and 51.3 of the Civil Code. Code, the ratio shall not*
4 *exceed 0.5 spaces per unit. The development shall have either*
5 *paratransit service or be located within one-half mile of fixed bus*
6 *route service that operates at least eight times per day.*

7 (C) ~~The~~ *If the development is a special needs housing*
8 *development, as defined in Section 51312 of the Health and Safety*
9 *Code. Code, the ratio shall not exceed 0.3 spaces per unit. The*
10 *development shall have either paratransit service or be located*
11 *within one-half mile of fixed bus route service that operates at*
12 *least eight times per day.*

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

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

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

27 (7) Notwithstanding paragraphs (2) and (3), if a city, county or
28 city and county has conducted an area-wide or jurisdiction-wide
29 parking study in the last ~~5~~ *seven* years, then the city, county, or
30 city and county may impose a higher vehicular parking ratio not
31 to exceed the ratio described in paragraph (1), based upon
32 substantial evidence found in the parking study conducted by an
33 independent consultant, that includes, but is not limited to, an
34 analysis of parking availability, differing levels of transit access,
35 walkability access to transit services, the potential for shared
36 parking, and the effect of parking requirements on the cost of
37 market-rate and subsidized developments. The city, county, or city
38 and county shall make findings supporting the need for the higher
39 parking ratio.

1 SEC. 3. If the Commission on State Mandates determines that
2 this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to
3 local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made
4 pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division
5 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

O

SORO NC Board Applicant Statements

20 August 2015

Candidates for Student Representative

One year term expiring 2016

Noa Zarur, YULA Girls High School

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

My leadership experiences are:

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

The extracurriculars I do are:

Model United Nations, YULA Israel Advocacy club, Future Business Leaders of America (FBLA), debate team, Girls Who Code, Bnai Akiva, volleyball, and swimming.

Who do I admire:

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

Jenna Kirschenbaum, YULA Girls High School

As part of the board, I feel that I can offer a lot to our community. As a Jewish modern orthodox teenager, I can offer a unique perspective of both the other Jews and other teens in my community. Additionally, I'm hardworking, quick thinking, and will do whatever it takes to get the job done.

Nominee for Green Team Vice-Chair Nicole Zwiren

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

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



Motion to support naming Gibson St and Robertson BL The Barbara Mendes Square

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

Background

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

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

Proposed Motion

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

Considerations

Committee review:
(highly recommended)

Votes For: 0

Against:

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

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

Arguments for:

First argument in favor. Use these points to help frame the debate.

Second argument in favor. This bottom part is created with a table in Word. It's easier to use if you display Gridlines (under the Table menu in Word).

Arguments against:

First argument against the motion. Try to be fair.

Another argument against. Add more rows to the table if you have more arguments pro or con.



Councilmember Paul Koretz
City of Los Angeles Council District 5
200 North Spring Street, Room 440
Los Angeles, CA 90012

20 August 2015

Re: Barbara Mendes, Artist and Cultural Treasure

Dear Councilmember Koretz:

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Doug Fitzsimmons
President, South Robertson Neighborhoods Council

Doug Fitzsimmons
President

Kevin Gres
Vice-President

Terrence Gomes
Treasurer

Beth Hirsch
Secretary

**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

cc: Council President Herb Wesson
Mayor Eric Garcetti
Council President Herb Wesson
Members of the Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Commission
Danielle Brazell, General Manager, Department of Cultural Affairs



Motion to allocate \$1000 for the Walk to School Day on October 7, 2015 at Shenandoah Elementary School

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

Background

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

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

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

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

Proposed Motion

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

Considerations

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

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

Arguments for:	Arguments against:
----------------	--------------------

Great way for community involvement	Costs \$1000.00
Teaches school children traffic safety	

Doug Fitzsimmons
President

Kevin Gres
Vice-President

Terrence Gomes
Treasurer

Beth Hirsch
Secretary

**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 ask the City of Los Angeles to provide transparency on the Coalition of Labor's proposed contract

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

Background

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

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

Proposed Motion

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

Considerations

Committee review:
(highly recommended)

Votes For: 0

Against:

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

Arguments for:

First argument in favor. Use these points to help frame the debate.

Second argument in favor. This bottom part is created with a table in Word. It's easier to use if you display Gridlines (under the Table menu in Word).

Arguments against:

First argument against the motion. Try to be fair.

Another argument against. Add more rows to the table if you have more arguments pro or con.

Doug Fitzsimmons
President

Kevin Gres
Vice-President

Terrence Gomes
Treasurer

Beth Hirsch
Secretary

**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

