



Motion to consider a Conditional Use Permit application for Alcohol Beverages (CUP) and change of hours of operation at Smart and Final located at 1835 S. La Cienega Blvd

Agenda Item: GB101812-5

Date: 15 October 2012

Proposed By: Victor Mitry

Full Proposal

Smart and Final located at 1835 S. La Cienega Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90034 is applying for a Conditional Use Permit application for Alcohol Beverages (CUP). Per LAMC 12.24-w, 1, a Conditional Use Permit to allow the sale of a full-line of alcohol for off-site consumption in conjunction with the operation of an existing 15,452 sq.ft. Smart and Final store and change hours of operation 5:00 AM to 11:00PM in lieu of the required 7:00 AM opening time. Per LAMC 12.22-A, a deviation from Commercial Corner hours of operation to allow operating hours to begin at 5:00AM in lieu of the required 7:00 AM opening time.

The Land Use Committee asked Smart and Final to do an outreach to the homes that are in the immediate area prior to the full board meeting on October 18th. The letter to include the SORONC Land Use committee email address, and date, time and location of the October full board meeting. The LUED committee voted to move the motion to the full board without a recommendation since Smart and Final is going through an expedited application process.

Proposed Motion

To support/not support the application for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the sale of a full-line of alcohol for off-site consumption in conjunction with the operation of an existing 15,452 sq.ft. supermarket. Hours of operation 5:00AM to 11:00PM daily, hours of alcohol sales 6:00 AM to 11:00 PM daily.

Considerations

Committee review:
(highly recommended)

Votes For: 0

Against:

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

Arguments for:

Arguments against:

CVS already sells package liquor in the La Cienega Plaza.

The neighborhood doesn't need more alcohol sales.

Doug Fitzsimmons
President

Brian Kite
Vice-President

Terrence Gomes
Treasurer

Martin Epstein
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



Dear Neighbor:

Smart and Final has enjoyed serving your neighborhood for almost 20 years at 1835 S. La Cienega, offering a great selection of food and grocery items in addition to cleaning supplies, cookware, etc. All Smart and Final stores offer alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption and we are requesting this ability at your local store. This will allow you the convenience of purchasing all of your grocery, cleaning and beverage needs at the same time.

Smart and Final operates hundreds of stores throughout the state, and offers alcoholic beverages in a responsible and professional manner. This request will simply allow this store to operate in the same manner as the rest of the chain. The store will only sell alcohol in larger quantities (no miniatures or single sales) and will install age verification devices on their point of sale registers to verify the age of all alcohol purchasers.

We would appreciate your support of this application. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the request, please feel free to contact;

- The South Robertson Neighborhoods Council
 - landusechair@soronc.org

- Art Rodriguez and Associates
 - (626)683-9777
 - brett4artrodriguez@yahoo.com

You may also voice your opinion at the upcoming SORO Board Meeting:

October 18, 2012 at 8:00PM

Simon Wiesenthal Center
1399 Roxbury Dr., 3rd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Thank you for your continued support of our store.



Motion to Support Proposition 37: Mandatory Labeling of GMO's in California Food Supply

Agenda Item: GB101812-6
Date: October 18, 2012
Proposed By: Green Team Committee

Full Proposal

The following summary was taken from two LA Times articles:

LA Times.com, "*Battle over genetically engineered food heading to voters*", Marc Lifsher, July 19, 2012.

LA Times, "*Prop. 37: 'Another example of the perils of the initiative process'*", Michael Hiltzik, Sept. 16, 2012

Proposition 37 on the Nov. California ballot requires certain genetically engineered foods sold in California to be labeled. Genetically engineered food is produced from a plant or animal whose biological traits contain DNA that has been manipulated in a laboratory at the cellular level. The technique was pioneered over two decades ago to boost productivity by making crops resistant to insects, plant diseases, pesticides and herbicides. Genetically engineered crops account for about 90% of U.S. corn, soybean and sugar beet production. Genetically modified fresh fruits and vegetables...include Hawaiian papayas, sweet corn, zucchini and yellow squash. There would be exemptions for meat, dairy products, eggs, certified organic foods, alcoholic beverages and, restaurant food. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has decreed genetically engineered foods to be safe...and ruled that labels need not reflect whether ingredients have been genetically engineered. The FDA's labeling policy ...[claims it] "has no basis for concluding that bioengineered foods differ from other foods in any meaningful or uniform way."

But concerns persist about the unforeseen consequences of this laboratory tinkering on human health and the environment...Some consumers and scientists worry about... risks, such as the potential for GMO foods to cause allergic reactions in humans or the contamination of GMO seeds in non-genetically engineered fields. Critics also fear that big companies could gain monopolies over supplies of expensive patented seeds that make crops resistant to...herbicides.' Proponents maintain that "...People are interested in knowing what's in their food..." About 50 countries across Europe, South America and Asia have passed labeling requirements for genetically engineered foods....Similar efforts in 20 U.S. states...failed to overcome opposition from the processed food and biotech industries."

"Opponents say labeling would unfairly besmirch popular and reputable products, raise food prices and spur frivolous lawsuits while doing little to protect the public's health. Passage of the initiative could create a cumbersome... state food labeling laws if other states follow California's lead..." Furthermore, labels are "very costly, are not going to be informative, and there is absolutely no basis in science for this," said Martina Newell-McGloughlin, director of life and health science research initiatives at UC Davis. The labeling campaign, she said, is sowing fear and doubt"...Organic farmers and food processors could use the initiative as a marketing tool to boost market share for their products, which are typically more expensive

Doug Fitzsimmons
President

Brian Kite
Vice-President

Terrence Gomes
Treasurer

Martin Epstein
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





The Creation of the Motion

Eight science students from Hamilton High studied this issue over the 2012 summer, and put together a panel of 6 speakers who were willing to publically discuss both sides of Proposition 37. These students are: Raquel Avalos, Jennifer Bennitez, Elias Garcia, Abraham Mendez, Erick Morales, Fateen Mukarean, Pejman Salehsari, and Sienna Tsan.

The Pro Prop 37 Panelists were: Pamm Larry, Initiator of the Proposition 37 Initiative; Andy Shrader, Deputy of Environmental Affairs and Sustainability, Office of City Councilman Paul Koretz; and David King, Founding Chair, Seed Library of Los Angeles, Gardening and Horticulture Instructor, UCLA Extension.

Against Prop 37 were: Chhandak Basu, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Dept. Of Biology, California State University, Northridge; Brendan Huffman, No. on Prop. 37 Campaign; and Mary Landau, LA Chapter President of Women for Agriculture.

After the Panel Discussion on Prop. 37, which was held at Hamilton High School on September 6th and open to the community, the students were asked to decide how they would vote on the proposition and make a recommendation to the Green Team in the form of a motion. The Green Team would then consider whether or not to forward their recommendations on to the SoRo Board. Five members of the student team voted in favor of Proposition 37, one member voted against the proposition, and two members abstained.

Proposed Motion

The "Proposition 37 Hamilton High School Study Team" recommends that the Board of the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council write a letter to the City Council of Los Angeles in support of passage of Proposition 37 which would require mandatory labeling of some genetically engineered foods sold in California .

Their reasons Included (but were not limited to):

1. Labeling would not present an undue hardship on the food industry and growers because most food already requires labeling. Adding a simple GMO mention should not be difficult or costly. Many countries already require labeling.
2. Consumers have a right to know what is in their food and how it is produced, not only for potential health reasons but also because a consumer may not wish to support a product or an industry that promotes genetic modification that they consider as possibly injurious to the environment.
3. If food containing genetically modified organisms are indeed safe, then food processors, growers, and marketers should have no cause to be concerned about a label.
4. The importance of detailed labeling will encourage consumers to choose healthier foods that have not been processed or modified.

See letter attached.



Considerations

Committee review:
(highly recommended)

Votes For:5

Against:0

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

Arguments for:

See items 1 through 4 above under "Proposed Motion"

It is feared that GMO's can also adversely effect pollinating insects and other wildlife that depend on non-engineered plants for survival

More independent studies need to be conducted. A 2009 editorial in *Scientific American* "Do Seed Companies Control GM Crop Research?" asserts that much of the research is controlled by the companies that create the engineered products. The user agreements of agritech companies "...explicitly forbid the use of the seeds for any independent research. Under threat of litigation, scientists cannot test a seed to explore the different conditions under which it thrives or fails....And perhaps most important, they cannot examine whether the genetically modified crops lead to unintended environmental side effects."

The over reliance on a specific GMO crop modified to be herbicide resistant has led to a more herbicide resistant weed. Farmers now need to use stronger more problematic herbicides.

Arguments against:

A ballot initiative is a poor way to craft policy dealing with complex scientific issues . We need a consistent national food policy.

Costly labeling will lead to higher food prices further stressing folks going through tough economic times

There is little if any evidence that that bioengineered food is dangerous to consumers. Some foods have even been engineered to remove allergens.

If consumers want to avoid GMO's they can purchase products labeled "organic" or consult an online registry <http://truefoodnow.org/shoppers-guide/> listing GMO-free foods..

Enforcement would largely occur through lawsuits brought by members of the public who suspect grocers of selling unlabeled food, so the burden of proof for proper labeling falls on retailers which could be a hardship for small grocers.



Councilman Herb Wesson
LA City Council
200 N. Spring Street, Room
Los Angeles, CA 90012

18 October 2012

Re: Proposition 37: Mandatory Labeling of GMO Foods

Dear Los Angeles City Council Members:

The South Robertson City Council Board recommends that the City Council of Los Angeles support of passage of Proposition 37 which would require mandatory labeling of some genetically engineered foods sold in California .

First and foremost, consumers have the basic right to know what is in their food and how it is produced. It is important that this process be transparent not only for potential health reasons but also a consumer may not wish to support a product or an industry that they consider as possibly injurious to the environment.

Labeling would not present an undue hardship on the food industry and growers because most food already requires labeling. Adding a simple GMO mention should not be difficult or costly. Many countries already require labeling.

If food containing genetically modified organisms are indeed safe, then food processors, growers, and grocers should have no cause to be concerned about a label. The importance of detailed labeling will encourage consumers to choose healthier foods that have not been processed or modified.

Sincerely,

Doug Fitzsimmons, President
South Robertson Neighborhoods Council

Doug Fitzsimmons
President

Brian Kite
Vice-President

Terrence Gomes
Treasurer

Martin Epstein
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 add ethics training requirement for Board votes

Agenda Item: GB101812-7
Date: 18 October 2012
Proposed By: Doug Fitzsimmons

Full Proposal

While the Board is required by law to complete ethics training every two years, many Board members allow their certification to lapse or fail to complete it at all. This creates potential issues with financial and land use decisions made by the Board.

The Board of Neighborhood Commissioners and the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment strongly recommend limiting the voting ability of Board members who are not in compliance with the ethics training requirement.

Note that additions to the standing rules require a simple majority vote.

Proposed Motion

To add the following standing rule, **effective 15 November 2012:**

Board members must complete State-mandated Ethics training within one month of their election/selection/appointment and every two years after that. Board members who have not taken Ethics training or whose certification has lapsed must abstain from voting on all financial and land use matters before the Board.

Considerations

Committee review:
(highly recommended)

Votes For:

Against:

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

Arguments for:

Helps with the public credibility of Board decisions.

Creates a real incentive for Board members to be in compliance with state law.

Arguments against:

Limiting what Board members may vote for is contrary to their status as public representatives.

The current NC ethics training does not seem particularly relevant at times to the actual issues we face as a Board.

Doug Fitzsimmons
President

Brian Kite
Vice-President

Terrence Gomes
Treasurer

Martin Epstein
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 clarify term expiration for Board-appointed officers, chairs, and liaisons

Agenda Item: GB101812-8
Date: 18 October 2012
Proposed By: Doug Fitzsimmons

Full Proposal

Each newly-elected Board should be able to choose their own leadership. The SORO NC bylaws reflect that, specifying that the election of officers should happen as soon as the new Board is seated, and that those terms are for two years. Article VI of the bylaws states:

Section 3: Selection of Officers. Officer positions shall be filled every two (2) years at the first official Board meeting following their election or selection in Board election years, and at the subsequent second year anniversary mark of the Officers' election in Board non-election years. Officers are elected by simple majority vote by the Board members present. They may be removed in the same manner in which they were elected.

Section 4: Officer Terms. The Officers shall serve two (2) year terms and serve at the pleasure of the Board. They may stand for reelection every two (2) years.

The language does not address the issue of partial terms. In the case where an officer resigns early, it's not clear in the bylaws that the person who replaces him/her would be serving whatever remains of the original two-year term.

Nor do the bylaws address the length of terms for our committee chairs or representative liaison positions (DWP rep, CPAB rep, etc.). The same principle of new Board/new leadership should apply.

The last issue is that the Bylaws specify a two-year term for officers. As we see this year, changes to the election schedule can mean that the actual length of the term could be longer or shorter than 24 months--which is why the motion allows for flexibility via a pro tempore (temporary) extension.

The recommendation is to have that end point after the second meeting of the new Board. The thought is that this allows the Board to become familiar with each other and the committees and the outgoing executive team to smoothly run the election of the new officers.

Because of the proximity of our 2012 election, it may take a while for bylaws changes to be approved by DONE. The motion includes language for a temporary standing rule that complements the existing Bylaws language.

Note that changes to the bylaws require a two-thirds majority vote.

Proposed Motion

I. To amend Article VI, Section 3 to read:

Doug Fitzsimmons
President

Brian Kite
Vice-President

Terrence Gomes
Treasurer

Martin Epstein
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



- a. **Selection of Officers.**
Elections for all executive officer, committee chair and other Board-appointed NC representative liaison positions shall be held no later than the second official General Board meeting following a public Board election or selection. Officers, chairs and liaisons are appointed by simple majority vote by the Board members present. They serve at the pleasure of the Board and may be removed in the same manner in which they were appointed.

In the event of an officer, chair or liaison vacancy, the remaining portion of the term shall be filled by simple majority vote of the Board members present.

II. To amend Article VI, Section 4 to read:

- a. **Officer Terms.**
All executive officer, committee chair and other Board-appointed NC representative liaison positions shall hold office for a term of two (2) years, and if necessary, on a pro tempore basis until their successors are appointed. There are no term limits. Executive officer terms begin after the meeting at which they are appointed.

III. To add the following standing rule until the Bylaws change takes effect:

- a. All executive officer, committee chair and other Board-appointed NC representative liaison positions shall hold office for a term of two (2) years and if necessary, on a pro tempore basis until their successors are appointed. Elections for non-officer positions shall be held no later than the second official General Board meeting following a public Board election or selection. Executive officer terms begin after the meeting at which they are appointed. In the event of an officer, chair or liaison vacancy, the remaining portion of the term shall be filled by simple majority vote of the Board members present.

Considerations

Committee review:
(highly recommended)

Votes For:

Against:

Arguments for:

Each new Board should select its own leaders--and turnover in leadership also tends to empower and engage a greater number of Board members.

Gives us time for outgoing Committee chairs to organize a first meeting so that new members can understand what the Committees are about. Last election, the President Pro Tem created the agendas and ran many of those Committee meetings by default.

Arguments against:

It often takes a while for Boards to regain efficiency/effectiveness after changes in leadership.

The bylaws specify that executive officers are selected at the *first* meeting after an NC election. The short-term standing rule can't override that. (Although last election, we didn't fill all the executive seats until the third meeting).



Motion to amend Code of Civility to encourage Board engagement

Agenda Item: GB101812-9
Date: 18 October 2012
Proposed By: Doug Fitzsimmons

Full Proposal

While the SORO NC Code of Civility requires that Board members "make the best possible effort to understand the issues...[and do their] homework," an important part of being a Board member is staying on top of communications to the Board.

Some Board members do not regularly check their official SORO NC email, for example, and so miss important administrative announcements, City programs, emails from constituents, etc.

The motion amends the Code of Civility all Board members are obligated to abide by to include staying on top of NC communications. It does not reference email directly, as communication may also come by other means--and indeed, evolve over time.

Note that as part of the standing rules, additions and changes to the Code of Civility require a simple majority vote.

Proposed Motion

To change item 17 in the Code of Civility to read (new language in **bold**):

I owe it to my fellow board members, the public, and the decision-makers who we are trying to influence to make the best possible effort to understand the issues before me. I will **stay current on Board and neighborhood communications and** "do my homework."

Considerations

Committee review:
(highly recommended)

Votes For:

Against: 0

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

Arguments for:

While staying on top of communication should be a given, a number of Board members chronically miss important Board announcements.

Arguments against:

Not everyone checks email regularly.

Doug Fitzsimmons
President

Brian Kite
Vice-President

Terrence Gomes
Treasurer

Martin Epstein
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 for \$100 to Purchase Neighborhood Watch Kit(s) Materials

Agenda Item: GB101812-10

Date: October 18, 2012

Proposed By: Michael Lynn

Full Proposal

For the past year, the Public Safety Committee has been actively performing outreach to residents throughout SORO, to determine individual interest in SORO Neighborhood Watch and Emergency Preparedness programs. To date there are eight neighborhood groups (existing and forming) that are ready to hold meetings.

The Public Safety Committee Chair attended a Neighborhood Watch Training conference last October and received an information-packed "toolkit", containing handouts and CD's on how to form and operate a successful neighborhood watch group. Permission was granted to copy and/or share any of the material.

The Public Safety Committee would like to create a "SORO branded" toolkit to distribute to these neighborhood groups to use. The kit would consist of a folder (with the SORO logo) containing a few handout masters, copies of the Neighborhood Watch CD's and additional Emergency Preparedness information.

(Note: the PSC Chair would donate all folders, printing and duplication services.)

Proposed Motion

To approve up to \$100 to purchase Lightscribe DVD's and double-sided CD Plastic Sleeves, to create 25 SORO branded Neighborhood Watch/ Emergency Preparedness Kits for distribution to neighborhood groups.

Doug Fitzsimmons
President

Brian Kite
Vice-President

Terrence Gomes
Treasurer

Martin Epstein
Secretary

Considerations

Committee review:
(highly recommended)

Votes For: 2

Against: 0

Amount previously allocated in Committee's working budget:

\$ 0

(applies to funding motions only)

Arguments for:

Arguments against:

Providing a tangible kit to a group is much more meaningful than emailing "download instructions".

Materials are available for download from the Internet.

**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

