A) Call to Order:
Ms. Tippit, WNC Chair, 7:08 PM

Attendance:
Jae Wu (Seat 1)
Lisa Morocco (Seat 2)
Lisa Tabor (Seat 3)
Steve Spector (Seat 4)
Talia Nosrati (Seat 5-alternate)
Barbara Broide (Seat 7)
Terri Tippit (Seat 8)
Jeff Hronek (Seat 9-alternate)
Mary Kusnic (Seat 11)
Colleen Mason-Heller (Seat 12)
Francesca Beale-Rosano (Seat 13)
Shannon Burns (Seat 14)
Wendy Dox (Seat 16)
Aaron Rosenfield (Seat 17)

Seated After Start:
Stacey Antler (Seat 10)
Isaiah Pickens (Seat 16-alternate, replacing Ms. Dox)

Not in Attendance:
Sarah Shaw (Seat 6)
Eric Shabsis (Seat 15)

Ms. Tippit gave a welcome to the public, introduction and instructed people to sign up on the speakers list to speak under specific agenda items or public comment. She informed the public the meeting is a City meeting governed by City and State Laws. The members of the Board introduced themselves.

B) Public Comment:

Rich Cahalan, 2336 Greenfield Ave, lives adjacent to the property that used to be Norm’s Restaurant: We have had a number of problems with the restaurant. Graffiti, asbestos and a number of things since the building has been boarded up. People have camped inside the building, inside the barricades and people are now in tents outside the property. You have seen
homeless under the freeways, on Pico, on Sepulveda and now you are seeing it in front of single family residences. We wanted to ask the Neighborhood Council (NC) what they can do to help get people removed or linked to an appropriate facility, and whether any action can be taken. We would like something official from the NC about what can be done.

Sarah Fit-Simmons, 2350 Greenfield: On the Nexdoor site we heard about this. A realtor on the site said that Norms has been bought and then they ran into an asbestos problem. I did want to raise there is a problem with a site being bought, chemicals up in the air and then to have it abandoned.

Ms. Tippit: Council District 5 (CD5) is working on this issue. This is a pretty good sized lot and the people who own it did not reach out to us or CD5. That raises a red flag when developers do not reach out to the community. Usually developers do that, like the one tonight on the agenda who reached out even though they are building by right.

Jack Sripoona, LA City Council District 5 Representative: We are working with the City and neighborhood prosecutor to find the owner and get them to take care of the property.

Ms. Broide: The property has been bought by a group from Santa Monica. They did not have a permit when they did the asbestos work. Craig from our Board got AQMD to come out. The neighborhood prosecutor and CD5 is on it.

Mr. Sripoona: Building and Safety is the enforcement arm. We have asked them to go out there every single day and look for any violations to get them to keep the property maintained.

Ms. Tippit: We were told at our neighborhood watch event that anyone can sleep between 9 pm and 6 am in certain areas. LAPD says their hands are tied.

Ms. Broide: We have a committee on homelessness headed by Sean McMillan and we encourage people to get involved in this issue. If people are interested, please let us know.

Ileana Wachtel, Coalition To Preserve LA, wachtelileana@gmail.com. I am here on behalf of Measure S, continuing the work we started on the campaign. We obviously lost, but we won a lot of arguments. We are focusing on tracking and transparency with the City. On the General Plan, the City has already started the meetings and they have been private and are not transparent. On open space meetings, there have been four private meetings. The Mayor promised transparency. We are meeting with the Mayor next week to really push for transparency. Different NCs are being lumped together for the General Plans. All of the updates are around transit. I do have a motion that I would like to present for you to review at a different time.
The following motion and letter was presented to the WNC for review and discussion at a future meeting.

**Draft Motion:**

Whereas the city has for months been working on a plan behind closed doors for the overall vision and dreams for Los Angeles, the General Plan, which is to be presented to the public and Neighborhood Councils sometime this fall;

And whereas Mayor Garcetti has said, residents must have "a sense of ownership over the development of our communities," and City Councilman Jose Huizar, chair of the powerful PLUM committee, pledged to bring "accountability and transparency back into our General Plan and Community Plan processes";

And whereas Los Angeles is several years behind other Western U.S. cities in involving its citizens in a General Plan update process that starts from the ground up;

And whereas public money and public interest are major factors in the earliest decision-making on our General Plan Update process, strategies, and dreams;

And whereas it is widely agreed the public cannot fully participate in General Plan Updating meetings, hearings and debates that unfold during the day downtown;

And whereas closed-door meetings on the fundamental debates and decisions about our dreams and goals for updating of the General Plan can only create more distrust and dismay over the city's broken planning system;

We request that Planning Department Work Group meetings now underway about our shared ideas and ideals for the Los Angeles General Plan and its many Elements be made fully transparent, be set at evening and weekend hours; be open to the public as of now; invite a representative from each neighborhood alliance; and expand from the four meetings completed in closed-door sessions, to four additional meetings that follow the prescription in this paragraph.

We further request, in the same vein, that the Mayor's Planning Task Force and Transportation Infrastructure Steering Committee for the General Plan both be made fully transparent, be set at evening and weekend hours; be open to the public as of now; and expand their closed-door meetings to several additional meetings that follow the prescription in this paragraph.
Draft letter:

Dear Mayor Garcetti and Planning Director Bertoni:

The city has since February been working on plans behind closed doors for the overall vision and dreams for Los Angeles, the General Plan, which is to be presented to the public and Neighborhood Councils later on.

Yet as you, Mayor Garcetti, said in response to Measure S and other criticisms of non-transparency and the broken planning system at City Hall, L.A. residents must have "a sense of ownership over the development of our communities," and as City Councilman Jose Huizar, chairman of PLUM, pledged, City Hall will now act to bring "accountability and transparency back into our General Plan and Community Plan processes."

We agree. That is why these closed meetings about our shared ideas and ideals for the Los Angeles General Plan must be fully transparent, more inclusive, and open to the public now.

It has come to our attention that some of those invited to the Work Group Meetings for Open Space, including environmental stakeholders, cannot regularly attend the four scheduled meetings because they are set for the convenience of city planners at 2 to 4 p.m. downtown.

Moreover, it has come to our attention that a developer consultant sits on the Work Group Meeting for the Open Space Element of the General Plan, and is being described by city officials as an "open space expert."

Moreover, the "chapters" now online at the city's OurLA2040.org website describing the Open Space Element and the Conservation Element are woefully inadequate and do not include crucial issues that should be innovative and forward-thinking new Elements. One glaring omission is an Urban Forest Element that pursues the need to recreate and save our fast-vanishing urban tree canopy, which is crucial to fighting GHG and creating livable communities.

These are the many kinds of problems that fan the widespread distrust of the city planning system and the citywide debate over how to fix it -- these problems are created when the city reverts to closed-door meetings and selective choosing of who the experts should be, as it has so far this year.

Second, and in the very same vein, the mayor's Planning Task Force and Transportation Infrastructure Steering Committee for the General Plan should also be open to the public now. Key strategies for planning, shaping and reshaping Los Angeles are unfolding in these closed meetings.

Best practices demand that you, Mayor Garcetti, adopt a ground-up process for your Task Force and your Steering Committee, open to the public just as the Measure HHH Citizens and Administrative Advisory Committees and the Measure H Work Group meetings were devised: open to the public from the very beginning and including independent experts and thinkers, warts and all.

Attached is a motion our Council has approved, urging the above actions.

Sincerely,

ETC

Maria Doss, 2211 Veteran: The City repaved the street, but took away the speed bumps and we want them back.
Ms. Broide: We are on it. Phil Davis is here and we have been in touch with CD5. The City was informed before the paving and we will get them back.

C) Approval of the April 13, 2017 Minutes: The minutes were reviewed and discussed. Two changes were made: (1) Mr. Rosenfield had initially included a previous version of the WNC Budget Amendment Package and details in the original draft, which was different from the document that was disseminated at the meeting for approval and (2) There was a clarification that the ad hoc grievance committee is working with DONE to address the grievance, rather than hearing the grievance itself.

Motion by Mr. Rosenfield to approve the April 13, 2017 minutes.
Second: Mr. Spector
Votes in Favor: 1,2,3,4,7,8,12,13,14,16,17
Abstentions: 5,9,11
Not in attendance: 6,10,15
11-0-3
Passed

*Ms. Antler is seated.*

D) Ms. Tippit: LAPD is not here because they are in training tonight. We sponsor a West Los Angeles team in an annual Baker to Vegas run, and this year they won a mug. Mario Gonzales is retiring. He has been a SLO as long as I have known him.

How many have been to Pick Pico?

*Most of the audience raises their hands and cheers.*

Ms. Morocco gave a run down on the event this year. Pick Pico is a community fair sponsored by the WNC. We put a spotlight on business, artists and the community. We have 120 vendors attending. Pitfire Pizza will have a wood fire oven. We have a list of performances. It is May 21, 11am-3pm. City Plants is coming as well and will have five gallon trees you get for free if you have your driver’s license and LADWP bill; limited supply.

*The audience cheers and claps.*

Ms. Tippit: Ring will be at Pick Pico again and will be sold for $99. There will also be other gadgets that are related. Email ringinitiative@fowla.org if you want to order one. If you have kids, you should definitely come. There will be face painting, tie-die, a bouncy house.
Mr. Rosenfield recuses himself.

E) Proposed project located at 2600 Sepulveda Blvd. The new construction, operation, and maintenance of a residential building with 34 units, two levels of parking with 53 stalls, and 3,605 square feet of open space; 35% density bonus, 3 affordable units, and 2 incentives for increased height and reduced open space. Pursuant to 12.22.A.25, a density bonus to permit the construction of 34-unit residential building utilizing a 35% density bonus and AB744 parking option to include 11% very low income housing units or 3 units; two on-menu incentives for increased height and reduced open space. Housing data: 25base density, 31 market rate, 3 very low income (11%) and 34 total units.

Terri introduced Olivia and Dana Sayles, the project manager for the 2600 Sepulveda Project and also noted that the project site is located at Richland on the East side of the street, approximately one block South of Expo.

They described the current site for the project stating that it is encompassing four existing lots with 8 apartments on each. Noting the 35% density bonus and the AB744 parking option, described the new project will include 34 units, comprised of 6 studio units, 10 one bedroom units, 15 two bedroom units and three 3 bedroom units. It was stated there will be rear patios at the ground level a courtyard on the second floor and a roof deck on the top floor. She said the patios for the 4 units on the ground level have a 25 foot setback with setbacks for the rooftop terrace for privacy.

They noted that there are 53 parking spaces on two levels which is in excess of the requirement; and, while the project orientation is toward Sepulveda that Sepulveda is not the primary access for the project. They spoke of the landscaping elements which incorporate a bamboo hedge along the entire project with tall trees at the corner.

Showing illustrations and a color board of the project, they also described that the building will be in warm white stucco tones with metal trim on balconies. They added that the project is aesthetically pleasing, not a box like structure and it will have dimension, shape and charm, enhancing and blending into the neighborhood.

Speaking to the 11% affordable housing specification, they explained that 3 of the 34 units are restricted as affordable housing / low income units; and, in addition there are 5 more units for a total of 8 new project units which will be restricted as affordable housing. They noted this requirement is as a result of the 8 pre-existing rent control units that must be replaced and included in the new project. They added the rates range from $544 to $700 for these units. Barbara asked if any of the current residents have made application for the affordable new units. They said no, not at the present time, but all are invited to do so.
In discussion, it was noted that the HOA in the back of the project is Terri’s and that the group has met several times with the HOA addressing their concerns which resulted in improvements which have been made to the project and this improved plan. They also noted that deliveries will be made on Sepulveda and although there are 2 points of access, Richland is a narrow street with permit parking and there is not a signal there. There was also discussion on the residents future use of Bentley for project access.

They said that they have been working with CD5 and that they are in discussion working to refine and tighten up a few aspects of the project.

Colleen acknowledged and thanked Olivia and her team for their consideration in working with the HOA, addressing neighborhood concerns and also noting the architectural elements of the project, for ‘reimagining the historic LA style.’

Shannon addressed the setback to clarify the 25 foot no building zone; and, she also addressed the parking specifics for 4 units at grade which incorporated 11 spaces for residents and guests with 42 additional subterranean parking spaces.

Additionally, it was noted that there would not be any hearing for the project as it was by right.

Motion by Terri: That the Westside Neighborhood Council support the 2600 Sepulveda Project as presented, with the condition and requirement that the Project work with CD5 to address the HOA concerns regarding the future traffic on Bentley.
Second by Stacy.
Steve advised and clarified on discussion.
Motion Passed 13-0-1
For: Seat Numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16
Against: 0
Abstain: Seat Number 5
Not in attendance: 6,15,17

Ms. Dox leaves the meeting. Mr. Pickens is seated. Mr. Rosenfield is reseated.

F) Update on Proposed Expo Corridor Transit Neighborhood Plan by the Department of City Planning. Plan encompasses area within a half-mile of Expo Line Phase 2 stations, and includes new land use/zoning and development regulations for select properties, as well as urban design standards and streetscape plans. More info at: http://www.latnp.org/expo-line/expo-draft-plan/. Presented by: Lameese Chang, City Planner, lameese.chang@lacity.org, (213) 978-1178. David Olivo, City Planner, david.olivo@lacity.org, (213) 978-1205.
David Olivo – ECTNP Update: We are talking about a corridor that is part of Phase II of the Expo Plan. It covers five station areas from Culver City to Santa Monica. It is a half mile surrounding the stations. It does not include R1 and R2 properties. The changes cover 250 acres out of approximately 2000 acres in the plan area. We are doing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as part of this process. The project goals for the plan include creating opportunities for more jobs and housing near transit. It proposes a vibrant mix of uses within each station area. It increases access to a variety of mobility options for all; promotes safe, active, walkable streets, to link to transit and amenities. It is a link to transit for residents and visitors.

*Picture of the five station areas and the surrounding half-mile covered under the plan presented:*

We did a market study, looked at the best planning practices and we took into account public input.

The Planning context:

General Plan Framework, 1996 – We should be smart about growth. The city will continue to grow, so rather than spread out, we should target where growth should occur, like near transit. This plan accommodates housing and employment growth near transit. With that, we can preserve single family neighborhoods. We can improve the urban form and neighborhood design.

Industrial Land Use Policy, 2008 – 7-8% of land in the city is industrially zoned. It is shrinking every year, but we want to keep industrial land to the extent we can. The plan recommends new industrial zones tailored for West LA, such as high tech 21st century jobs.
West Los Angeles, Palms-Mar Vista, and West Adams Community Plan Areas – Regulations must be consistent with Community Plans.

Why plan near transit? We want to improve mobility options for residents, workers, visitors, etc. Foster complete neighborhoods and access amenities. Allow more residents and employees access to high quality public transit. Promote sustainable development patterns. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and auto dependence.

A 2013 study of Phase I of the Expo Line showed households that live within ½ mile of the Line tripled rail ridership, reduced daily driving by 40% and reduced vehicle miles traveled by 10-12 miles per day.

Since Phase 2 opened in May 2016, ridership on the Expo Line has continued to increase. Weekday ridership is 56,000, surpassing the project’s expectations. We are already at 88% of projections for 2030 (64,000). 70% of riders are new to Expo. 50% walk or bike to the station.

A market demand study showed there is strong demand for housing and jobs in the area. The Expo Corridor is an important jobs area. The estimated demand along the Expo Corridor for housing in 2035 will be an additional 3,800-6,400 dwelling units. 3 to 6 million square feet of non-residential use, which includes office (4.28 million sf), industrial, and retail. There is strong office potential around the Bundy and Sepulveda Stations and strong demand for housing and neighborhood-serving retail around Palms Station.

Maintaining land for jobs is important for the city to meet the demand for jobs in 2035, preserve the tax base to pay for essential city services, maintain the city’s competitiveness in growing industries, and to capture the share of job growth occurring.

Ms. Chang: The plan elements have 4 components: (1) Land Use and Zone Changes, (2) Public Benefits, (3) Urban Design Standards and (4) Streetscape Plans.

Ms. Chang summarized the existing zoning detailed in the following map:
Land use – Much of the area is light yellow and that is the single family zoning (referring to map above). The plan exempts single family zones. The orange color is multifamily, which is largely clustered near Palms. Near Bundy are the blue manufacturing zones. The orientation - major commercial corridors are on Venice, Motor, Pico, and Bundy. New zoning and land uses are proposed for certain parcels. 250 acres of 2000 acres or approximately 13% is proposed to change zones; concentrated near the stations. The green is public facilities zoning. The 10 and 405 freeways are considered public facilities zones, as well as parks, schools, the golf course. The rationale behind the zone changes is to encourage more mixed use and encourage land for jobs. Also we are looking at certain areas to create capacity for housing.

Ms. Chang summarized the proposed zoning in the following map:
Plan elements – There are four new zones. Three have “industry” in the name because they are intended to be an evolution of the manufacturing zone. These are the (1) new industry, (2) hybrid industrial jobs emphasis, (3) hybrid industrial residential emphasis and (4) mixed use commercial/residential.

Land Use/Zone Changes

Ms. Chang presented rezoning for the area found in the map below, which can be found on Page 2-8 of the DEIR at http://www.latnp.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Draft_Expo_TNP_May-2015_FULL-VERSION.pdf. Specifically she reviewed the zone changes in the WNC area.
Previously we had zone changes on Pico between Sepulveda and Overland, which has since been removed due to public input. We still think along Pico there are opportunities. The Mixed Use Zone for Commercial/Residential is at Pico and Westwood, the Westside Pavilion property.

Heights – There would be a maximum of 148 feet, 11 stories on Sepulveda. On Bentley it would go down to six stories, 83 feet. For practical purpose not more than 3 stories can occur on Pico between Overland and Westwood with exception of the hybrid zoning and Westside Pavilion. Parking does count as height if it is above ground. There are no changes along Exposition as initially proposed. Between Military and Sepulveda, in the Hybrid Industrial Residential Emphasis, 75% of a project is residential and 25% non residential. In the Hybrid Industrial Jobs Emphasis, 50% is residential, 50% non-residential.
**TABLE E: MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height Area (See Map E)</th>
<th>Maximum Height</th>
<th>Typical Height Range&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45 feet</td>
<td>2 to 4 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>3 to 4 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>58 feet</td>
<td>3 to 5 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>68 feet</td>
<td>3 to 6 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>78 feet</td>
<td>3 to 7 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>83 feet</td>
<td>4 to 6 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>96 feet (78 feet&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>3 to 7 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>96 feet</td>
<td>3 to 7 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>148 feet (118 feet&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>4 to 11 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>161 feet (128 feet&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>6 to 12 stories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Height range is shown for illustrative purposes only and represents the typical variety of building heights that could occur within a Project site, whether in a single building or across multiple buildings. The range does not represent a required minimum or maximum number of stories. However, buildings fronting certain streets may be subject to minimum street wall heights – see Section 5 for details.

2. Typical number of stories reflects the allowable mix of uses within each Height Area, with higher floor-to-floor heights assumed for non-residential uses on upper floors.

3. Applies to buildings with residential use above the ground floor.

Public Benefits – All proposed development within the new zones is required to provide baseline amenities, such as streetscape improvements (on-site); open space; public paseos; and parking management strategies, as relevant. To get bonus development, you have to do public benefits (as presented in the following two slides):
Urban design standards - Applied to make sure all new plan area development is pedestrian oriented, architectural features are appropriate, it is human scale, parking is tucked away in the back. Ensure ground floor of buildings is activated to create a safe and interesting pedestrian environment. Retail Streets – Ground floor to have retail uses, i.e. shops, restaurants, services. Active Streets – Ground floor to have active uses, i.e. lobbies, public spaces, residential entries, or retail.

Streetscape Plans – There are plans for Bundy, Sepulveda, Olympic, National and Palms. There is not a plan for Pico because that is in another streetscape plan called Livable Boulevards.
There is some overlap, but we are all headed in the same directions for these plans, called vision documents. Configure streets to accommodate multiple modes. Incorporate trees, landscaping and street furniture. Crosswalks, curb bulb outs are added. Ensure sufficient sidewalk widths. Incorporate bicycle facilities as appropriate. Maintain vehicular circulation. Street furniture and lighting and paving treatments are added.

Ms. Chang presented a map of where the streetscape plans were occurring in the area and showed a computer drawing of how Sepulveda might look.

Sepulveda currently lacks streetscape amenities and in the future would have sidewalks, new curbs, landscapes and larger right of ways.

Plan Elements Summary:
• Tiered Zoning (Base and Bonus FAR): Additional development rights in exchange for public benefits.
• Vehicle Trip Reduction: Commercial projects using Bonus FAR must reduce vehicle trips by 10%.
• Alternative Compliance: Flexibility on select sites to accommodate additional housing in exchange for public benefits.
• Live/Work Use: Allowed in New Industry and Hybrid Industrial zones to accommodate residential use when coupled with job use.
Plan Capacity by 2035: The plan accommodates the growth of an additional 9,454-14,334 jobs (above the existing 33,962) and an additional 4,422-6,042 housing units (above the 25,018 existing), which is inline with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) growth projections. It also falls within the market demand range. There will be mobility benefits with the proposed ETNP, resulting in a 3.1% decrease in VMT per capita by 2035 as a result of shorter vehicle trips, more non-vehicle trips, internationalization of trips (mixed use). By 2035, it is anticipated there will be a 17% increase in transit use, 11% increase in biking and 1% increase in walking.

Ms. Chang presented the following slide of Plan Capacity by 2035:

### Timeline – Current Status/Next Steps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing (2013)</th>
<th>Future (2035)*</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.5 million</td>
<td>11.5 million</td>
<td>+8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742,518</td>
<td>833,502</td>
<td>+12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) within West LA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total VMT</th>
<th>Service Population (Employees + Residents)</th>
<th>VMT per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing (2013)</td>
<td>10.5 million</td>
<td>742,518</td>
<td>14.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future (2035)*</td>
<td>11.5 million</td>
<td>833,502</td>
<td>13.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>+8.9%</td>
<td>+12.2%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Released DEIR and second draft of the plan, 4/6/17.
• Released revised streetscape plan, 5/2017.
• Open House and Public Hearing, 5/23/17
• Comment Period ends, 6/5/17
• Release Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), Summer 2017
• City Planning Commission and City Council Meetings, Fall 2017

Rich Cahalan, 2336 Greenfield Ave, For 3 story: Is the pedestrian district overlay guaranteed to be maintained?

Ms. Chang – As part of the plan we are not proposing to change it.

Mr. Cahalan: Regarding the things that got approved while plan has been developed, is there anything on Pico that goes beyond new plan?

Ms. Chang: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. Cahalan: Is there anything in the plan to enforce the speed limit in the area?

Ms. Chang: No.

Craig Rich, 2300 Camden: Thank you to the Planning Department for the presentation and thank you for listening to input over years. I support the new plan. I still do not understand how schools are going to be addressed? With new density, there should be an analysis on the impact to services in the community.

Ms. Chang: The DEIR does analyze the impact on the schools and capacity. It does not look at private schools. See chapter 4.

Steve Rogers, 2200 Pelham: I support the plan. I support the removal of Pico between Sepulveda and Overland from the zone changes.

Dee Millar, 2200 Pelham: I am glad Pico was taken out of the plan; that was right thing to do. There seems to be an emphasis on jobs. Pico is zoned for that and it’s not happening. I do not like the bonuses in exchange for public benefits.

Margaret Healy, 2370 Midvale, For 3 story: I think it was a good decision, thank you very much for listening to the community. There was one thing you said very quickly in the future for adding some capacity along Pico? Was that a rollback of the current plan? What was it you said?
Ms. Chang: I am not sure what you are referring to.

Ms. Healy: I heard some thing like that... To remind everyone it is really important to be there on the 23rd.

Phil Davis, 2127 Veteran, For 3 story: I support the removal of the Pico corridor. I have a question about the bonus. In return for public benefits, can they increase the size of development or is it just the mix?

Ms. Chang – It’s a bit of both. 2.5 FAR is the Base and a FAR of 4 comes with the Bonus. If you do a project of 2.5 FAR, you don’t have to do the public benefits. If you exceed 2.5, then public benefits are triggered. There is a point system, so you have to calculate how many public benefits points are generated and that is tied to size. I went through the max heights and you cannot go higher than that.

Pat Tobias, 1927 Thayer, Against 5 Story Buildings: I concur with what others have said.

Dianne Gregorn, 2237 Prosser, Against 5 Story Buildings: Our community has experienced and continues to experience significant development. Duplexes, triplexes and small buildings are being replaced by large apartments and condo buildings. The Casden Project will deposit 600 units on Sepulveda and Pico. The city does not need other special incentives for developers to build here. Special incentives only serve to destroy what is left of our residential and commercial properties and will kill local businesses. Thank you.

Lorna Edmond, 2235 Veteran, For 3 Story: There are too many unanswered questions. There is already gridlock, traffic, and parking problems. We are overloaded right now; today, without the development.

Peter Ocho, Veteran Ave, For 3 story: Thank you to the folks from City for coming out. I appreciate the removal of Pico. We have a number of severe problems that neither the City or County are addressing. We have a number of homeless and people speeding down streets. More and more apartments are not the answer. We all know the guise of affordable housing is a complete sham. I think we need to take a long hard look about what we want our community to be. I work Downtown and you can see what happening. I am not anti-development, but I am pro-community.

Nick Burns, Abundant Housing LA, http://www.abundanthousingla.org/, 2120 S Bentley, For 3 story: The housing crisis in LA is amongst the worst in the Nation. Everybody is sick of the piecemeal approval process. But Angelinos are not anti-growth and want to welcome new people. We want the ECTNP to be approved. It will accommodate the population and job
growth that LA needs to accommodate long term growth. We want more density along the corridors.

Riley O'Brien, Koreatown, For 3 story: I am here to support the ECTNP, because there are people coming to LA whether we like it or not and they have to live somewhere. People who live far away will be driving the Westside to work. The best way to prevent our local streets from being clogged with traffic is we need to increase our density and plan for more affordable housing. It seems like this transit plan is the right way to go.

Emilio Balingt, Koreatown, For 3 story: I want to echo my support for what Nick and Riley said. I hope we can increase the density and height requirements. There are a lot of studies that show increasing parking, increases driving. The tax payers just spent almost $1 billion on the Expo Line and there should not be parking requirements. Wherever you build more, there should not be more parking to go with it.

Thomas Abbot, Palms Area - 10160 Regent, For 3 story: I live in the Palms area and go to school at UCLA. A lot of us are newcomers to LA and the Westside is an expensive place to live in, and that really damages the institution of UCLA. When we have to make a decision between a quality education and finding a place to live, that is not tenable. It limits opportunity. I support increases in housing.

Sonia Suresh, 1540 S. Fairfax, UCLA Graduate Student, For 3 story: I want to echo Thomas, Emilio, Riley, and Nick. I think we should make living an opportunity for everybody who wants to live close to job centers.

Krystian Boreyko, 1508 S. Shenandoah, UCLA Student, For 3 story: I want to join my fellow UCLA students in supporting the Corridor Plan. It has been hard to find housing on the Westside. Many of us commute from far away. We are some of the more privileged, but there are people commuting miles away just to earn a living. We think this plan does go toward addressing that. While we know you can’t eliminate the minimum parking requirements, you do have political power and we do encourage you to put the word in with your Councilmember to lower the parking requirements. That makes it also more affordable for people who want to live in those units.

Joshua Baum, Westwood area - 740 Weyburn, UCLA Student, For 3-story: There is a tremendous housing shortage on the Westside. I am privileged to live in Westwood, I can afford it. But many people are having to go further and further away to find housing. They are going to be coming through your neighborhood. They are going to be driving a long time to get to school. Thank you for your time. Let’s all get home at some point. Thank you very much.
Roxi Asian, 10747 Wilshire, UCLA Urban Planning Graduate Student, For 3 story: I am a long term resident of West LA. I spent a long time living in a car. I want to see that changed. If we think about compassion and empathy and that we are one of the most progressive places in the World, then we should deal with the discomforts to help people. There are plenty of cities that do it. I think we need to increase density here.

Rafi Sands, 10982 Roebling, UCLA Undergraduate Student, For 3-story: I am at UCLA and am the President of the Student Association. We are strongly supportive of this plan and we wish it could do more. I pay $3800 for a two bed apartment. I know people in Manhattan that pay less. I will be graduating next year and have a Westside job. I want you to think about your kid and think about us. I don’t know how I can save because things are too expensive.

Alex Abramoff, 537 Landfair, For 3 story: My family has been here for a long while. Terri holds down the meeting a lot better than other NC meetings I have been to. My family has been here awhile and watched the city grow. We know it’s going to happen and the best thing we can do is accommodate it. I would urge you guys to set a good example for the future of Angelinos.

Brent Gaisford, Director Abundant Housing LA and Co-Founder of Upwell Real Estate Group, Palms - 3236 Hutchinson, For 3 story: I live in Palms and am strongly supportive of the plan. I lament the removal of Pico. I think that Pico could be a lot more than it is. I think there is not enough people to frequent those businesses. If more people lived on Pico, there would be more people to frequent them. Right now, we have twice as many jobs as houses, if we had as much housing as jobs, then people would not have to drive and turn Pico into a freeway. Pico is a street we want to walk and enjoy. I think we all want to live in a vibrant neighborhood and I think I would come to Pico more with such a plan.

Ms. Tippit: I want to thank everyone for coming tonight. We are not taking a vote on this, it was an update.

Mr. Pickens – I work at UCLA. I previously lived in NYC. We need transportation; that is part of who we are right now.

Ms. Broide: It is clearly important to rezone for additional housing and jobs, but I am worried about land disappearing that provides essential community services. For example, if we change the zoning on a lumberyard, we lose that. We lose animal kennels and body shops, then we have to drive for miles to find those services. How do we preserve land for those kinds of uses; where those kinds of businesses can still exist? How are we dealing with housing near the freeways within 500 ft?

Ms. Chang – Essential industrial uses are prohibited by the new zones. We have not rezoned some areas, so there will be some M2 zones still available. We hope to leave the traditional
industrial further from the stations. I am not saying it will be easy for a place like Anawalt to move. We looked into the 500 ft and 1000 ft from freeways, but we did not draw a hard line. It is department policy to look at that. Buildings have to have higher filtration systems and standards closer to freeways and we have built in design standards for properties that address location, open space, etc.

Ms. Beale-Rosana: I am for it!

Ms. Shannon Burns: As a UCLA graduate of the class of 1977...back then we did everything we could to get a good education, but we could not afford it either. I know students want to be north of Wilshire or north of Santa Monica if you can. But the truth is to get an education, you have to want it bad. To get a good education means you have to travel. My husband lived in a roach infested apartment, had a part time job and went to school full time. But to get a good education, that is what students have to do.

Mr. Nick Burns: The median rent is four times higher now.

Ms. Shannon Burns: Yes and its going to be much higher...

Mr. Nick Burns: I would also say from an Abundant Housing LA perspective on the issue of a lot of these units being luxury housing, that is something we completely recognize and it may seem counterintuitive that we would advocate for something that really contributes to luxury housing. But wealthy folks are going to live here no matter what. Either we build luxury housing for them or they take up the existing stock and drive up the prices for rent. So that is behind some of the reasoning on why we advocate for this.

Ms. Shannon Burns: I appreciate that and I appreciate everything everybody has said. I come from a different generation where we really take pride in the work we do. The other things I want to talk about...I understand the increase in density and the mobility. This fails to consider the aging and disabled citizens. The DASH does not get implemented at the same time as the plan; it always gets on the back burner. We cannot reduce vehicle trips without implementing cost effective public mobility vehicles. We need to study the roads in the entire area of the plan. If we are building in one place, we need to know how it impacts the entire study area.

Mr. Rosenfield: A quick thing, if and when the plan goes through, there will be market forces incentivizing Anawalt to move as the land will become much more valuable. But, under the new plan, they are not compelled to move right because they are grandfathered in?

Ms. Chang: That is correct.
Mr. Spector: I just would like to say that I appreciate the young people coming out and getting involved. I agree with a lot of the points. We need that more and more.

Ms. Morocco: The WNC spent considerable time to secure the $1.8 million grant from the Call For Projects. Some of the grant includes Sepulveda. Wherever we go with this, I want to make sure there is a place holder for what we have developed? For example, there is missing sidewalk on the northwest corner of Sepulveda near Pico, is that part of the scope?

Ms. Chang: We should talk more about the overlap.

Ms. Mason-Heller: Despite billions in investment, transit is down 10% and there are fewer people taking transit than 30 years ago. My concern with this plan is it is so residentially dense. I am seeing too much retail. I am seeing too much low paying, low ceiling jobs. We have lots of places that are underutilized and not being used. Also I am concerned about infrastructure. Our electric grids, sewers, etc are already overburdened.

Ms. Chang: The DEIR is the place where we discuss increased growth. We are looking at 4,000-6,000 more dwelling units. What is the impact of that on infrastructure? All those numbers are in those DEIR docs and I hope that you will find the answers to some of your questions. The focus of the plan is to try to get more jobs near stations and we are focusing more on that than housing.

Ms. Mason-Heller: There is a lot of retail.

Ms. Chang: Retail is limited in the new zones, so that is something we considered.

Ms. Antler: The idea that a developer will develop new buildings and reduce rents is ridiculous. The transit does not go north/south. I was born and raised here and I never thought I would live anywhere else, but I am ready to go. You keep adding more people and do not add infrastructure, I am talking Police and Fire, what is going to happen when there is an emergency? We are lucky we don’t have violent crime, but there is a lot of property crime and the police don’t come. In Mary’s building there was a fire. In another area the paramedics took too long to come resuscitate a child. It is crazy. Someone has got to put a stop to it.

Mr. Hrnoek: My concern is traffic. All this stuff is great, but a lot of people will own a car. The transit does work, but there is still a ton of traffic and this proposal is just adding to it.

Ms. Chang: We coordinate with Police and Fire to some extent. But they are responsible for their agencies.
Ms. Wu: I appreciate progression, change is bound to happen. I just hope and pray that it is logically put together. It seems like a lot of it has been. There needs to be, as you are doing, comment to make sure on the ground level it is heard. But definitely, I think the progression of how other cities have grown; you have studied that. And that it will be closely considered how the other cities are doing like Portland, San Francisco and how they are making industrial, businesses and residential all work together with transit.

Ms. Tippit – I want to thank you for coming. I really want to encourage people to go to the meeting on Tuesday night.

G) Motion by Ms. Tippit to approve Westside Pavilion meeting space located in the Westside Pavilion Meeting Room A at 10800 W. Pico Los Angeles, CA 90064 until further notice.
Second: Ms. Wu
Votes in Favor: 1,2,3,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,16,17
Abstentions: 4
Not in attendance: 6,15
14-0-1
Passed

H) Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC) report, Barbara Broide:

The following motion was made by Ms. Broide: The Westside Neighborhood Council supports creating a county wide stewardship program for the safe and convenient disposal of unwanted medicines from households. Ensuring easy access to collection sites providing secure and environmentally sound disposal of leftover medicines and sharps will reduce risks of medicine abuse and poisonings, help prevent dangerous and costly needle sticks, and protect our waterways and environment. We support the provisions of the 1/5/16 draft language, and strongly urge the county to adopt this legislation.
Second: Ms. Antler
Votes in Favor: 1,2,3,4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,16,17
Not in attendance: 6,15
15-0-0
Passed

Presented Background:
Please see the attached summary of the proposed LA County ordinance that would create a collection and safe disposal system for medication and sharp medical items.
The 1/5/2016 draft ordinance includes the following key provisions:
1. Residents throughout the county will have access to a secure collection system for all unwanted medications and sharps used in the home, with convenient collection sites distributed throughout the county, as well as options for prepaid mailers upon request.
2. All unwanted medications used in homes, for people and pets, will be accepted, both prescription and over-the-counter, and including prescription drugs that are controlled substances.

3. Manufacturers of medicines and sharps have the primary responsibility for secure collection and safe disposal of their products as a cost of doing business. Visible fees cannot be charged to consumers at point of purchase or at disposal. This approach recognizes that industry has a key role in managing the society impacts and end-of-life consequences of their products, and that externalizing all the costs onto other stakeholders and local governments is not fair or sustainable. Manufacturers can include the modest cost of a safe take-back program – a penny for every $10 prescribed as stipulated in the Alameda Supreme Court case – in the cost of medicines and sharps without significantly impacting consumers.

4. Security protections are required that will give consumers confidence that the take-back system for their leftover medications and sharps is safe and confidential.

5. Manufacturers must promote the stewardship program to residents and the health care community, and expressly discourage the stockpiling of unwanted pharmaceuticals/sharps and discourage disposal into the trash or by flushing into a sewer.

6. The ordinance requires secure handling and environmentally sound disposal of all collected pharmaceuticals and sharps in compliance with all relevant state and federal regulations.

7. The stewardship plan review process includes public comment opportunities and gives the county the option of forming a technical advisory committee to assist with plan review to ensure local stakeholders are heard in the planning process.

8. The ordinance has a clear definition for “Responsible Steward” that focuses responsibility on the manufacturer of the medicine or sharp, and also clearly defines who the county can hold responsible as the steward if the manufacturer cannot be identified.

1. Summary of Draft LA County Pharmaceutical and Sharps Collection and Disposal Stewardship Ordinance

What does the Draft Ordinance do?
LA County’s Pharmaceuticals and Sharps Collection and Disposal Stewardship ordinance has been created to address the problem of unwanted medicines and sharps through an Extended Producer Responsibility program. Unwanted medicines and sharps pose a growing risk to people’s health and safety when stored in homes, can pollute the environment when disposed as trash or flushed through the sewer system, and jeopardize the health of waste collection and recycling workers exposed to used sharps (needles).

The Ordinance establishes Pharmaceutical and Sharps Stewardship Plans that:
(1) Allow for the safe, convenient and sustainable collection and disposal of unwanted Drugs and Sharps by County residents, and
(2) Protect, maintain, restore and/or enhance the environment and its natural resources
The Stewardship Plans established under the ordinance will be designed, operated and funded by “Responsible Stewards”, with oversight by the Director of the County’s Department of Public Health.

Who is a Responsible Steward?
A Responsible Steward is defined by the Ordinance as– (a) A Person who Manufactures Covered Drugs or Sharps; or (b) If the Manufacturer is beyond the County's jurisdiction, the first Person who repackages
or distributes the Covered Drug or Sharps in or into the County, including but not limited to a Wholesaler or Repackager; or (c) if the Persons described in (a) and (b) are beyond the County's jurisdiction, the first Person who sells or offers for sale the Covered Drug or Sharps in or into the County.

What is a Covered Drug?
A Covered Drug includes prescription, nonprescription, brand name, and generic drugs sold or distributed for use in LA County.
Covered Drugs do not include vitamins or supplements, herbal-based and homeopathic remedies, and personal care products that are regulated as both cosmetics and nonprescription drugs by the Federal government.

What are Responsible Stewards required to do?
Mandatory participation is required by all Responsible Stewards, who must notify the Director of their intent to operate or participate in a Stewardship Plan within 6 months of the effective date of the Ordinance or 6 months after the Covered Drugs or Sharps are first sold. Responsible Stewards can participate in Stewardship Plans either by: (1) operating, individually or jointly with other Responsible Stewards; or (2) entering into an agreement with a Stewardship Organization.
A Responsible Steward must submit a Stewardship Plan within 9 months of the effective date of the ordinance or 9 months after the Covered Drugs or Sharps are first sold. Stewardship Plans must be approved by the Director and include contact information for an official point of contact for the plan. The Stewardship Plan must be implemented within 3 months of the Directors approval, and thereafter, any substantive changes made to the plan must be submitted to the Director at least every 3 years.

2. Within 6 months of the effective date of the Ordinance or 6 months after the Covered Drugs or Sharps are first sold and annually thereafter, Responsible Stewards are required to notify the following Persons, of the opportunity to participate in the Stewardship Plan by serving as Collectors:
   1. All retail Pharmacies, hospitals/clinics with on-site Pharmacies, and other Potential Authorized Collectors;
   2. Persons other than Potential Authorized Collectors, such as retail establishments, that could potentially host Collection Sites for Sharps; and
   3. All law enforcement agencies in the County.
Additionally, any Person who is not a Responsible Steward, such as a Person providing Covered Drugs or Sharps free of charge, can also participate in the Program. Such Person may operate individually, jointly with a Responsible Steward or group of Responsible Stewards, or through a Stewardship Organization. Any Responsible Steward, group of Responsible Stewards, or Stewardship Organization must in good faith consider allowing such Person to participate in its Stewardship Plan.

What must a Stewardship Plan consist of?
A Stewardship Plan must consist of the name of each Responsible Steward participating in the plan and the Covered Drug and type of Sharp manufactured or purchased by the Responsible Steward. The plan must have the contact information for an official Point of Contact to whom the Director can direct all inquiries regarding a Responsible Steward’s compliance. A Stewardship Plan must describe the collection
system designed to provide safe, convenient and continuous collection services for Covered Drugs and Sharps from County Residents. The description should include a list of - all collection methods, participating and potential collectors, and collection sites; a description of where and how periodic collection events will be held; and a description of how any Mail-Back Services will be provided to County Residents. The plan must also describe the handling and disposal system (including the person retained to transport the collected item and the Hazardous Waste Disposal Facility to be used). The plan must take into consideration: 1) the use of existing providers of waste pharmaceutical services; 2) separation of Covered Drugs and Sharps from packaging to reduce transportation and disposal cost; and 3) recycling of Drug and Sharp packaging to the extent possible.

A Stewardship Plan must ensure that any patient information appearing on Drug and Sharp packaging will be kept secure and promptly destroyed. It must also include a strategy (including short-term and long-term plans) to educate the public and promote the plan.

How are the Covered Drugs and Sharps Collected?
The ordinance does not require mandatory participation of any Person as a Collector. A Person can volunteer to be a Collector and may or may not be compensated by Responsible Stewards or a Stewardship Organization.

A Collection Plan must offer ongoing, convenient and equitable access for all County residents in the Service Area regardless of the racial, cultural, or socioeconomic composition of the neighborhoods within which the Collection Sites are located. In each participating Unincorporated Community and City with at least one Potential Authorized Collector, each Stewardship Plan shall provide at least one Collection Site for each Unwanted Covered Drugs and Unwanted Sharps.

For every 30,000 County residents at least one additional Collection Site should be provided for each Unwanted Covered Drugs and Unwanted Sharps.

Collection sites must be geographically distributed to ensure that every resident within the Service Area is within 2.5 miles of a Collection Site for each Unwanted Covered Drugs and Unwanted Sharps. Additionally, there must be at least 10 collection sites for each Unwanted Covered Drugs and Unwanted Sharps in each County Supervisorial District. In areas, where a collection system with the above requirements cannot be met, Responsible

3. Stewards or the Stewardship Organization must provide monthly collection events and/or Mailers to be distributed to consumers. The Mailers and Mail-Back Services, should be provided free of charge, to residents in the Service Area upon request through the Stewardship Plan’s 24-hour, toll-free phone number and website.

Collection systems must maintain patient confidentiality by destroying patient information on packaging. Responsible Stewards must also provide for distribution of FDA-compliant Sharps containers for the safe handling of Sharps to the consumer free of charge, preferably at the point of sale of the injectable Drug or at the time the consumer otherwise receives the Sharps for usage. Additionally, Responsible Stewards or the Stewardship Organization should provide FDA-compliant Sharps collection receptacles to any hosts of Collection Sites for Sharps.

How are the collected Covered Drugs and Sharps Disposed of?
Covered Drugs collected under a Stewardship Plan must be disposed of at a permitted Hazardous Waste Disposal Facility. Sharps collected under a Stewardship Plan must be
disposed of in accordance with California Health and Safety Code Section 118286 or any successor legislation. If the Director deems the use of a Hazardous Waste Disposal Facility to be infeasible for the Stewardship Plan based on cost, logistics, or other considerations, the Director may grant approval for a Stewardship Plan to dispose of some or all collected Covered Drugs at a permitted large municipal waste combustor.

Alternatively, a Stewardship Plan may petition the Director for approval to use final disposal technologies that provide superior environmental and human health protection, by providing superior expectations in—(1) monitoring of any emissions or waste; (2) worker health and safety; (3) reduction or elimination of air, water or land emissions contributing to persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic pollution; and (4) overall impact on the environment and human health.

Who bears the cost of the Stewardship Program?
Each Responsible Steward, group of Responsible Stewards or Stewardship Organization participating in a Stewardship Plan must pay for the preparation and implementation of their Stewardship Plan. Responsible Stewards are not required to pay for costs of staff time at Collection Sites provided by Collectors volunteering to participate in a Stewardship Plan. Responsible Stewards or Stewardship Organizations are prohibited by the Ordinance from charging customers a point-of-sale fee or a specific point-of-sale collection fee, to recoup the cost of the Stewardship Plan.

4. What are the penalties of non-compliance or violating the Ordinance?
A Person found in non-compliance or violation of the Ordinance would be notified by the Director, and has 45 days after the date of mailing to come into compliance or correct the violation. Any Person who knowingly and willfully violates the requirements of the Ordinance is guilty of a misdemeanor and is punishable by a fine between fifty dollars ($50) and one thousand dollars ($1,000) for each day per violation, or by imprisonment for a period not to exceed six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Additionally, any Person in violation of the Ordinance shall be liable to the County for a civil penalty of a maximum of one thousand dollars ($1,000) per day per violation. Each day in which the violation continues shall constitute a separate violation. The appropriate penalty is determined by the Director depending on the extent of harm caused by the violation, the nature and persistence of the violation, the frequency of past violations, any action taken to mitigate the violation, and the financial burden to the violator. County Counsel, the District Attorney, and any applicable City Attorney can also bring a civil action against a Person found in violations or out of compliance with the Ordinance.

How will the Public be educated about this Program?
Any Person selling Covered Drugs or Sharps to the public has to post display materials approved by the Director explaining how and where members of the public may safely and lawfully dispose of Unwanted Covered Drugs and Unwanted Sharps at no cost to the consumer. These materials shall be legible and easily understandable by the average person and can be in English, Spanish, and any other language as determined by the Department of Public Health. Stewardship Plans are also required to establish a 24-hour, toll-free phone number and single website where information can be obtained regarding collection options and current locations of Collection Sites. Stewardship Plans are required to develop a
The system of promotion, outreach and public education.
The system must promote the collection options provided under the plan to residents and the health
care community through educational and outreach materials that include- (1) promoting safe storage
practices of drugs and sharps, (2) describing where and how unwanted drugs and sharps should be
returned, (3) discouraging stockpiling of drugs and sharps, and, (4) discouraging disposal of unwanted
drugs and sharps through trash or a plumbing or septic system.
The education and outreach materials must be provided to Pharmacies, retailers of Covered Drugs and
Sharps, health care practitioners, health care facilities, veterinary facilities, and other prescribers for
their own education as well as for dissemination to residents. Responsible Stewards or Stewardship
Organizations must work with Collectors to develop clear, standardized instructions, signage and
promotional materials for residents on the use of collection receptacles and a readily-recognizable,
consistent design of collection receptacles.

Within six months of the effective date of the Ordinance and biennially thereafter Responsible Stewards
and Stewardship Organizations are required to conduct a survey of residents, pharmacists,
veternarians, retailers, and health professionals who interact with patients on the use of Drugs and
Sharps after the first full year of operation of the plans. These surveys should include questions that - (1)
assess the awareness of the County’s Stewardship Program, the Stewardship Plans in operation, and the
location of all available Collection Sites; (2) assess to what extent Collection Sites and other collection
methods are safe, convenient, easy to use, and utilized by residents; and (3) assess knowledge and
attitudes about risks of abuse, poisonings and overdoses from prescription and nonprescription Drugs
used in the home.

The following motion was made by Ms. Tippit: Motion to retain $50 million of Measure M funds
for potholes and sidewalk repairs with at least two-thirds of the City’s share of future Local
Return funding towards the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the City’s streets that are in D
and F condition and related matters.
Second: Ms. Antler
Votes in Favor: 1,2,3,4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,16,17
Not in attendance: 6,15
15-0-0
Passed

I) Chair, Terri Tippit - Update on project located at Exposition and Sepulveda, west side of
street, formerly referred to as The Casden Project: I met with the new developer and they are
interested in working with us. We were talking about mitigations as Casden allotted $990,000
to DOT for them. A lot of those mitigations were already done by other projects so the
mitigations are done and there is still $550,000 left. More conversation needs to happen with
CDS about what can be done with the money.

Ms. Broide: Some of that money should be saved until after the project is built, so that we can
see what additional mitigations are necessary.
Jasmine Elbarbary, DONE: Are people getting their monthly profiles? I want remind people that doing the ethics and budget trainings is necessary. I also want to alert you to three funding deadlines 6/1, 6/7 and 6/11, as the fiscal year is concluding.

Mr. Hronek and Ms. Antler left the meeting.

J) Treasurer, Shannon Burns - Monthly Treasurer’s report on WNC’s Funding Program account, including review and approval of Purchase Card’s monthly statement—MER. Ms. Burns presented the MER as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>INDEX NUMBER</th>
<th>APPROVAL CODE</th>
<th>DATE / DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>BUDGET CATEGORY</th>
<th>OUT OF STATE VENDOR</th>
<th>1099 Reportable</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>FNWLA</td>
<td>Officer Uniforms</td>
<td>4/1/2017 - Outreach</td>
<td>OUTREACH</td>
<td>$98.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>FOWLA</td>
<td>Officer - Baker to Vegas Event</td>
<td>4/1/2017</td>
<td>NPG</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>ANLA</td>
<td>Supplies for Homeless Court Night</td>
<td>NPG</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>FOWLA</td>
<td>Pick Pops - Chase Parking</td>
<td>NPG</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pick Pops - Bake Sale</td>
<td>NPG</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pick Pops - Bake Sale</td>
<td>NPG</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pick Pops - Bake Sale</td>
<td>NPG</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pick Pops - Bake Sale</td>
<td>NPG</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MS. BURNS PRESENTED THE MER AS FOLLOWS:
Motion by Ms. Burns to approve the Purchase Card’s monthly statement MER for April 2017 as presented.
Second: Ms. Kusnic
Votes in Favor: 1,2,3,4,7,8,10,12,13,14,17
Not eligible: 5,16
Not in attendance: 6,9,11,15
11-0-0
Passed

Motion by Ms. Morocco to approve funding for Valley Crest Tree Care to replace, trim, maintain, clean tree wells on Pico and replace with Decomposed Granite up to $13,000.00. Second: Ms. Wu
Votes in Favor: 1,2,3,4,7,8,10,12,13,14,17
Not eligible: 5,16
Not in attendance: 6,9,11,15
11-0-0
Passed

Motion by Ms. Tippit to approve $1000 in funding for Palms-Rancho Park Branch Library as follows: Adult Technical Computer Books: $400.00, Young Adult Summer Reading Program: $250.00, Japanese Juvenile books and Cultural Program: $350.00.
Second: Ms. Wu
Votes in Favor: 1,2,3,4,7,8,10,12,13,14,17
Not eligible: 5,16
Not in attendance: 6,9,11,15
11-0-0
Passed

The following info was disseminated at the meeting:
Motion by Ms. Tippit to approve Office Supplies as outlined by the following expenditures:

- Ink-Staples $345.74
- Miscellaneous $599.42
- Trolley-Amazon $54.84

TOTAL $1,000.00

Second: Ms. Kusnic
Votes in Favor: 1,2,3,4,7,8,10,12,13,14,17
Not eligible: 5,16
Not in attendance: 6,9,11,15
11-0-0
Passed
Motion by Ms. Morocco to approve funding for materials to be distributed at the WNC Emergency Preparedness Community Meeting (date and location to be announced) -- up to $500.00.
Second: Mr. Rosenfield
Votes in Favor: 1,2,3,4,7,8,10,12,13,14,17
Not eligible: 5,16
Not in attendance: 6,9,11,15
11-0-0
Passed

More info that was presented on the matter:
To: The Westside Neighborhood Council:
From: Cynthia Saffir
May 5, 2017

re: Proposal for the WNC to sponsor emergency preparedness training and/or to purchase emergency preparedness handbooks to hand out at Pick Pico.
As you know, the neighborhood watch training sponsored by the WNC was an unqualified success with well over 100 community members attending. The comments I heard following the training were all very positive and attendees seemed to very appreciative that they were given the opportunity to attend.

During check-in at the neighborhood watch training, I asked a sampling of people whether they would be interested in attending emergency preparedness training. I posed the same question via a short survey on Nextdoor. There was quite a bit of interest expressed in attending such a training. At least 25 community members responded positively to the idea of a 2-4 hour training, preferably on a weekend afternoon.

I am proposing that the WNC sponsor an emergency preparedness training event (most likely to be held mid-August shortly after the fall school term begins.)

I spoke with the firefighter who taught the CERT course I recently completed, and she gave me the name of the person who oversees CERT training and who would be the person to arrange for a firefighter to do the training. I also spoke to the owner of SOS Emergency Supplies in the Valley who said he frequently gives free emergency preparedness training courses for groups of around 25 or more people (which he promises are not a sales pitch). The training could, therefore, have 2, or possibly 3, instructors. (I believe DWP also has a program where they provide speakers to community groups.)

I am proposing that the WNC sponsor the training and, in doing so, assist in securing a venue for the training and provide funding of around $300-$500 to cover materials and refreshments. I doubt we would have the same level of attendance for the emergency preparedness training as we did for the neighborhood watch training (although I definitely underestimated the number of people who would turn out for that) so it’s possible the financial need would be less than $500.
Thank you very much for your consideration.
Cynthia Saffir
(P.S. The WNC previously some discussed the possibility of purchasing Emergency Preparedness Booklets and passing them out at Pick Pico. I mention that in case it is something the WNC is still interesting in doing so booklets could be ordered in time for the event.)

K) Pick Pico Update: Ms. Morocco and Ms. Wu gave a run down of the Pick Pico event coming up May 21 from 11 am – 3 pm on the corner of Overland and Pico and requested full participation from the Board on the day of the event to staff the street fair and help with outreach.

Motion to adjourn 10:25 PM
Unanimous

Submitted: By Aaron Rosenfield, Co-Secretary and Mary Kusnic, Co-Secretary

Voting note regarding how abstentions are counted: Section 3 of the WNCs By-Laws state: “Except as otherwise specifically provided, an affirmative vote of a majority of those voting, not including abstentions, shall be required to pass motions.”