



GENERAL BOARD MEETING Draft Minutes

MONDAY, June 26, 2017 / 6:00 pm
Hollywood City Hall, Small Conference Room
6501 Fountain Avenue (at Wilcox), Los Angeles, CA 90028
centralhollywoodnc2014@gmail.com
Post Office Box 93907, Hollywood, California 90093

(Please note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcription but include more discussion than usual.)

A. CALL TO ORDER: Board President, Elvina Beck, called the meeting to order at 6:05 pm.
B. ROLL CALL: 9 Present: Elvina Beck, Angie Aramayo, Duffy Culligan, Roger Davis, Rebecca Hirsch, Gayl Murphy, Michael Popwell, Ferris Wehbe and Charles Taylor. **0 Absent**

C. REPORT / COMMENTS from Government representatives in attendance: Prior to Josh giving his report, the Chair welcomed **Barbara Metzenbaum, Senior Librarian from the Samuel Goldwyn Library**, who thanked us for coming to the library for our special meeting on 06/22/2017. Board Secretary and PLUM Co-Chair, Roger Davis, thanked her and expressed gratitude for everything she did on behalf of us all.

Josh Kurpies, District Director for State Assemblyman, Richard Bloom, District 50, related that he holds office hours across the hall two hours prior to this meeting monthly. He gave a brief update on SB-562 Universal Single-Payer Health Care Bill, which, he stated, if passed in the Senate, would start the process for that; it has been sent to the Assembly. He noted that for now, we'll probably not vote on this healthcare bill in the State house this year, because if it were to fail in California, it would set the nation back for several years. Rebecca asked about funding for it. Josh explained that there's some hard dollars and if we can get a waiver for our Medicare and Medicaid allotment, we'd be asking the Federal government to give us that money. The theory of the bill would be to cover everybody in California.

D. ADMINISTRATIVE Items: 1. Approval of CHNC Draft Minutes from 05/22/17. Minutes were circulated with the agenda. **Moved** by Ferris; **seconded** by Roger; **9/0/0; Approved.**

E. GENERAL PUBLIC Comment on NON-Agenda items:

Alex Baramundi invited us to the Peru Village Festival 2017, "A Taste of Peru," July 30th 12:00 pm to 8:00 pm @ the Hollywood Recreation Center. He thanked the Board for donating funds for this festival, invited us to have an outreach booth and asked that we post the event.

Angela Babcock, with Suaya Properties/Activate Hollywood, invited us to "Old Hollywood Locals Night," a free annual event for the locals on Tuesday August 8th, 6:00pm; it starts at Janes House Plaza 6541 Hollywood Blvd., where you pick up booklets and utilize the bump outs on Hollywood Boulevard. She welcomed CHNC to come again, as we did for last year's

first event. See Eventbrite <https://www.eventbrite.com/e/old-hollywood-locals-night-summer-edition-tickets-36009018945> This is put on by the Hollywood Properties Owners Alliance (HPOA) and Stratiscope: <http://onlyinhollywood.org/localsnight/>

Gilbert Mora, Health Services Coordinator, does outreach on drugs and alcohol. He noted that the city has released a draft ordinance for commercialization of marijuana; encouraged everyone to read it, to voice your concerns about this and speak to your councilmembers.

F. MOTIONS & RESOLUTIONS:

1. Discussion and possible action to remove Rebecca Hirsch from the Board. (*This item was taken after other board business was completed*) Seeing that Rebecca Hirsch has surpassed the number of absences allowed by a Board Member in any twelve-month period, as per the Bylaws, the Council Presiding Officer is requesting a verification of the attendance record and immediate removal of Ms. Hirsch from the Board. Section 7: Absences reads: "Any Board member who misses... five (5) total Board meetings during any twelve (12) month period will be automatically removed from the Board." The record shows that Ms. Hirsch has been absent from five regularly scheduled board meetings in a twelve-month period: 5/25/16, 7/27/16, 9/26/16, 10/24/16, 5/22/17. The record also shows that on Nov 26, 2016, this Board voted to amend Bylaws to read: "Any board member who leaves a meeting prior to adjournment or arrives late missing 30 minutes or more of the meeting shall be titled tardy. Ms. Hirsch was tardy on 2/27/17 and 12/12/16, constituting six absences on record in a twelve-month period and an additional absence from the special meeting on 5/31/17.

Moved by Elvina; **Seconded** by Michael.

Elvina related that this is only about absences; nothing personal. She received an email from the City Attorney, who asked her to include that we will get verification of the findings based on minutes on this, from the City Attorney. Angie asked if we vote for her to leave, will that only be valid when the City Attorney verifies it. Elvina responded that we could see this again on the agenda if her math is not correct. Michael stated that he has reviewed the bylaws, which say if a member misses three regularly-scheduled consecutive council board meetings or optionally five total board meetings during any 12-month period they will be automatically removed from the board. He felt if that is it, he doesn't see what there is to vote on other than asking the City Attorney to verify. Elvina related that as to methods of removal in the bylaws, the absence one doesn't require the City Attorney's approval. Elvina related that she still wanted to agendize this, and that there was proper notification prior to the agenda being released. Elvina related that she has used this three times in the past, as she is very keen on absences. Ferris noted that it's not fair to include a special meeting. Elvina emphasized the importance of attendance, as "it's not fair to stakeholders if we don't have a quorum."

Rebecca began to respond, by way of introduction, that she noted similarities to what we just discussed with the prior gentleman, to be removed from PLUM. She didn't think being notified on Friday for Monday was enough notice. Looking at the minutes, she has noticed several discrepancies and stated that: "I don't think it's fair to be in a rush to get rid of me, after giving a year and a half on the board, and for the service that I have provided, and, even though you say I have left early; I reviewed the minutes and I have voted on all the things that needed voting if I had to leave early..." Elvina noted that leaving 30 minutes or more early wouldn't

work. Rebecca reported that Elvina changed the rules and removed the Bylaws committee, which she admitted is another discussion. Rebecca asked if Elvina compared the absences audit to anyone else's record, which Elvina replied that she did.

Rebecca began to read from a prepared statement of defense that she wanted on the record. While speaking on her first several points on her prepared statement, Elvina interjected, quite a few times, with "point of order" asking her to stick to the agenda, as to attendance.

Roger asked Lorenzo to help, to which Lorenzo responded, "you may want to hear what the board member has to say..."

Charles then read from Article V, Section 9, A 3 of the Bylaws which says: The Board member who is the subject of the removal action shall have the right to deliver to Board members a written statement about the matter and/or to speak at the Board meeting prior to the vote, but shall not be counted as part of the quorum, nor allowed to vote on the matter. Elvina gave Rebecca five minutes.

Rebecca read from her written statement, which is copied here in its entirety for the record:

“1. I care deeply about our city, which is why I'm here today. We're not serving the interests of our constituents by getting bogged down in these internal attacks, which only serve to diminish our reputation, and standing in the community.

2. We were elected to serve and help residents, so when we use public funds & resources to lie in wait, waiting for a board member to falter, we all lose. Instead of mentoring me, you think of ways to deprive me of my board seat. The community is watching-think of them as your children: we should be role models: using our time to better the lives of our neighbors, instead of what we are doing at this moment,

3. Turning to the motion to deprive me of my board seat, Ms. Elvina Beck, our President, has at least 2 mistakes in her motion (F) stating that I was absent 5/25/16 -a day in which there was no meeting held. See minutes for that month. In another instance, 12/12/16 she said I was tardy when I was not. I arrived at 7:30 and the meeting was not called to order until 7:47 p.m. Ms. Beck was waiting to have quorum because another member was running late. Where else has she made mistakes? We all make mistakes, so we should be a bit kinder, and more forgiving, focusing our energy into giving back to our most underserved and vulnerable constituents, instead of this quarrel.

4. When Ms. Beck got rid of the Bylaws Committee, which I chaired, it was the elimination of a chance we had to review or thoughtfully amend the 2015 Bylaws. She found a technicality that allowed her to make a motion to eliminate it, then rushed it to a vote, without the Board in full attendance. Since then, we have not had a chance to carefully review or thoughtfully amend them.

5. Ms. Beck also invested time in changing the bylaws herself. She alone- [without any input from the Dept. of Neighborhood Empowerment] revised the absences clause of the bylaws. (See Article V. Section 7 of the Bylaws.) She rushed it through a vote, and ever since then, there has been no formal review of the Bylaws.

6. Ms. Beck unilaterally changed the meaning of the word "tardy" which in English means "not punctual, or late" so that any Board member is marked tardy by virtue of leaving any meeting before adjournment, even though some meetings go from 6 to 10 p.m., so that if a board member leaves at 9:30 p.m., they are marked tardy. She makes no distinction between planned absences or "tardies." Do planned absences count? If so, let's compare the record of all the board.

7. With the new tardy changes made, any 2 tardies become an absence. (See Article V. Section 7 of the Bylaws.)

8. A board member doesn't get a clean slate at the start of a new calendar year or even a fiscal year. Ferris asked, on the record, that Ms. Beck clarify this last point. She never did. So I'm being penalized for a tardy that never occurred in May 2016, over a year later in late June 2017. It feels petty and absurd.

9. I'd like to find out when the amended bylaws were approved by BONC and whether the changes to the bylaws went into effect when the board passed the motion or **when BONC approved them. So when she audited my attendance record, which approval dates were used?** Was I singled out? If not, how does my attendance compare to every board member who served on the board since January 2016, my start date? For example, Maurice Hudson, whom I was sworn in with?

10. Most importantly, it **appears that no other NC has such an archaic and rigid policy for attendance, including automatic** removal such as in this instance. Therefore, there isn't enough notice and opportunity to respond or defend oneself in front of an **impartial** panel. That's a violation of the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment [1] of our U.S. Constitution. Everyone is entitled to their Constitutional rights, even in the admin setting, if they are to lose something of value, and a seat on this board, is certainly valuable to me. My term was set to expire in May of 2018. Thank you."

Elvina related if her math is wrong, the City Attorney will confirm, and therefore nothing happened. She opined to the board that "If you vote no, you're not following our bylaws."

Angie Aramayo suggested we table this until the City Attorney verifies this, because it will turn out messy... it's going to lead to really negative board right now." Elvina did not want to wait for verification, because "we'll have to talk about it all over again... we can't table this." Angie noted that if the City Attorney verifies this, then we'll have nothing else to discuss. Gayl noted that "you can't short circuit this stuff... Just get everything verified and then it's over."

Lorenzo Briceno, DONE Project Director, **recommended tabling until this is verified.** Angie stressed the need for verification.

Public Comment was taken: Cheri Smith provided general comment, including but not limited to: What if people are sick? People have a right to be sick. What if someone has an emergency? Why were the bylaws amended regarding tardies? You have to take all that into consideration. It seems very personal to me.

Tracy Green provided general comment, including but not limited to: This board seems very dysfunctional. It doesn't seem uplifting. The board is supposed to come together as a group. She referred to her experience working in law firms and different industries. "I have never seen a board like this before." "You have to bring everybody together; uplift them; you have to work with this group." "To me it looks like you're just attacking this person... One thing you kept repeating is 'if I'm right, I'm right.' That's personal. It has nothing to do with wrong or right. If you have bylaws, go with the bylaws or you can find another way of keeping the board together. You can't look at attendance. People have children. People get sick. People have accidents. There are so many things that can happen during the day. What is your procedure for a person – letting them know in advance – if they're not going to be at a board meeting because of an emergency? What is your procedure to help the board member that has something that they have to deal with in their home, in their work, other than the board – that you can help them get to the meeting? She related at her work they work the people who have problems with attendance. "We don't say we'll terminate this person... we never ever terminate them; we talk to them, we see what they need..."

Annie Gagen provided general comment, including but not limited to: "You have to be able to work with people instead of dumping them. Something is dysfunctional with the people who are running the board, that they haven't been able to work with the people. The way that you read this motion was painful to hear... It was cutting, it was hostile and... as an audience member out here, I felt you were going for the kill, and... it was really hard to hear, and it is very inappropriate and unprofessional for a head of a board like this to do that..." As to the way the motion was read, Annie continued, "just damn-well read it." It is not uplifting, it is not what this neighborhood council is supposed to be about. Annie concluded that "you are an elected official, and you have a responsibility to be professional. This is not professional..."

Leo Mosbrucker stated that he can't defend someone with this kind of attendance. He asked the president to make the numbers clear.

Monique Friedman spoke in favor of the motion, that she doesn't feel this is personal. "I don't come here to be uplifted; I'm sorry." (chuckles). This is volunteer... If you don't show or show up late, it's a big middle finger for those who take it seriously. "If you let people come at their leisure, then people aren't going to take it seriously; absence is absence. "The dysfunction is absences are tolerated... You're here or you're not here."

Steve Ducey asked if there is a motion needed when the bylaws read that someone who accrued this many absences in a 12-month period... "That's why I think it behooves the board to simply move on this tonight and simply verify the absence record is accurate, and if it is accurate... issue a letter to the offending member of the board, that they have violated this part of the bylaws... and you don't have to agendize it..." **End of public comment.**

Elvina responded that all people that were removed from the board missed board meetings that we could not have quorum on; "so as President, it's my job to keep this board together, so that again, stakeholders' time is not wasted; I said that at the beginning of the meeting, and why attendance is so important. So, it's not personal, as the stakeholder said; it's across the board; that was my only point. So, think about it: When we lost the people that weren't even

here, we gained people that are here; vice president; they have legal background; they have experiences; there's so many people that we were able to get on this board because actually wanted to be here, because they attended. So, saying that it's personal is offensive to me because all I was doing was trying to help the board by actually having people show up alongside left and right of me." (some applause)

Michael was recognized, and related that he counts his absences and breaks his bottom to get here sometimes. He opined that Rebecca has taken a victim stance and that she needs "to play by the rules." "Don't ask me to break the rules because of poor Rebecca. I don't do that... I didn't appreciate that you took that stance."

Angie stated that we shouldn't address Rebecca and we shouldn't address Elvina directly when it comes to this, because that's when things get really complicated, and we look bad in front of the constituents. She asked if this includes "excused" absences, to which Elvina noted that there are no excused absences. Charles asked if the tardies were before or after the bylaws change. Elvina responded it was after. She noted that we are setting a precedent: It's follow our bylaws or not follow our bylaws, and if you will choose not to do that, what makes one person better than anyone else?" Rebecca questioned a date to which Elvina responded, "then we'll see you next month. I have nothing personal. I'm just doing my job."

Elvina asked for a vote on what was on the agenda, as presented, "if the record is true, and if the record is false nothing happens." She re-read the motion in full, noting "requesting a verification of the attendance record..." "So, if verified...automatic removal." A vote was taken with **6 Yes**: Duffy, Gayl, Ferris, Elvina, Roger, Michael; and **3 No**: Rebecca, Charles & Angie; **0 abstentions**; motion **passed**.

Rebecca asked if she will be coming back next month. Lorenzo agreed to verify this within 30 days; if "the findings are incorrect then she's still on the board." Lorenzo noted that he is the one who is going to do this, and he will compare other board members' attendance records. Rebecca began to explain why she wanted to know if she is coming back next month, which was not heard, per Elvina, as "it's not on the agenda."

2. Discussion and possible action to establish the "Hollywood Neighborhood Council Alliance" also known as HNCA. The HNCA will be made up of one board member from each of the 6 Neighborhood Councils in Hollywood and an alternate to deliberate on Hollywood District Wide and Regional Issues. The HNCA will provide significant opportunities to work on addressing Hollywood District Wide and Regional issues, taking positions, and engaging their communities.

Ferris introduced this item, noting that we will be dealing with the Hollywood Community Plan, and will have a stronger voice on this by all six NCs, as well as on regional issues.

Moved by Elvina; **Seconded** by Ferris. **Public Comment**: **Monique** gave public comment as to power. **Gilbert** related that this is like the regional neighborhood council alliances. **Lorenzo** agreed with this analogy, e.g., WRAC, LANCC, VANC, HANC, etc. He noted that there was a Hollywood Alliance, which went dark and is coming back up. **Annie** would like more information. **Monique** asked if just informational; is concerned about being "vulnerable to

being twisted one way or another.” **Lorenzo** explained that these alliances are just advisory. **Gilbert** would have liked it if all these councils were involved in the Crossroads of the World meeting. **Kristina Chambers** spoke in favor of this alliance, noting that: “You are making big decisions and you’re only going to serve your stakeholders better, to help you make more informed decisions.”

Board discussion was held in which Michael wanted to make sure that CHNC can get out of any situation quickly if that advisory group were to turn into a life of its own, and that they may not use our name in any promotional or other type of communications. Ferris noted that we will be representing CHNC to provide them information on what CHNC is doing, not making any statements on behalf of CHNC. Angie asked if we can have two people from the Board. Michael asked about the structure and if it is only informational. Ferris answered that it’s mostly informational, to take back information to your board. Ferris has noted that the other NCs will agendize this. Vote was taken with **9 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions; passed**. Elvina appointed Ferris as the HNCA representative for CHNC, and she would like to be the alternate.

3. Discussion and possible action to the following City Council items: Gayl related that we’ll be discussing #1 & #2 only this evening; the two motions were going to be voted on together; however, #1 had an amendment, and the motions were moved separately after all.

1 - Council File 17-0002-S90, Trailer Bill Language No. 511 / Low-income Tenants / Sale Prices: Introduced on June 7, 2017, and referred to Rules, Elections, Intergovernmental Relations, and Neighborhoods Committee. This Resolution is requesting that the City of Los Angeles include in its 2017-18 State Legislative Program SUPPORT for Trailer Bill Language No. 511 implementing the California 2017-18 Budget that directs the Los Angeles County Assessor to assess properties sold by Caltrans at an affordable or reasonable price, at those sales prices, instead of the market rate, to allow the properties to be sold as intended to low-income current tenants. Council File:

<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=17-0002-S90> (← Corrected Council File number)

Gayl read background on this included from the council file; Michael asked if the homeowners will be required in the future, if they choose to sell or rent, to keep it affordable, noting that if not, that would allow for a double windfall; paying lower taxes for five years and a windfall when they sell out. He would like to maintain affordability in the future. Michael related that “if it’s an ongoing subsidy that has been recouped when it’s sold, it’s like taking equity...” Tax implications were discussed. Ferris would like this to be kept permanently. Gayl related that “one of the goals of the program is to provide opportunities for current tenants who will become affordable buyers, with the goal of gaining equity and transition from affordable housing to mainstream housing.” “I think it’s transitional housing.” Roger recommended a deed restriction written that for 50 years or whatever this house must remain affordable... so it then becomes a deeded covenant that goes with the property; he noted that Michael is bringing up a very good point: Someone could sell it five years down the road and pocket a lot of money.”

Ferris suggested that Michael could write something to the effect that “as long as these houses remain permanently affordable – or something.” Michael would like a 10-year

sunset. Roger asked Gayl to verify that that clause becomes part of the deed to the property “because once it’s in the deed there’s no messing around...” Angie suggested approving it now with the condition that Gayl does the research and that we’ll write it.

Main Motion Moved by Ferris; **Seconded** by Elvina.

Amendment: That Gayl will include, if necessary, language stating the board’s position that the home should remain affordable for a minimum of 10 years.

Moved by Michael; **Accepted** by Ferris and Elvina. **Public Comment**: Monique noted that it’s a question of being “in perpetuity” rather than 10 years.

Vote was taken with **9 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions; motion passed as amended**

2 - Council File 17-0002-S89, Early Earthquake Warning System / Elimination:

Introduced on June 7, 2017, and referred to Rules, Elections, Intergovernmental Relations, and Neighborhoods Committee. This Resolution is requesting that the City of Los Angeles include in its 2017-18 Federal Legislative Program OPPOSITION to any legislation or administrative action that would eliminate federal funding for California’s Earthquake Early Warning System. Council File:

<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=17-0002-S89>

Moved by Charles; **Seconded** by Angie. Michael feels that if there is a Federal cut, California should have their own funding to protect its own citizens.

Amendment: To direct the State to provide adequate state funding for continuation of the Early Earthquake Warning System program; **moved** by Michael; **Public Comment**:

Monique: It’s a matter of when. **Josh Kurpies** related that if you say, Trump isn’t going to pay for it; let Californians; Trump will choose Californians.: So we should make this stronger to say “Trump should pay for it or we fight like hell to get the money.”

9 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions; motion passed as amended.

3 - Council File 15-1138-S26, Comprehensive Homeless Strategy Quarterly

Performance Report / Fiscal Year 2016-17 Third Quarter: Introduced on June 2, 2017, and referred to Homelessness and Poverty Committee. The CAO’s report is the Fiscal Year 2016-17 third quarterly performance report on the City’s Strategy Committee. The report discusses the implementation of Proposition HHH, the County of Los Angeles’ Measure H budget allocation process, and key accomplishments for individual strategies. Council File:

<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=15-1138-S26> **NO ACTION**

4 - Council File 14-0366-S7, Cannabis Business Registry: Introduced on May 26, 2017, and referred to Rules, Elections, Intergovernmental Relations, and Neighborhoods Committee. This motion is instructing the City Office of Finance or other appropriate departments to create a Registry that would allow all categories of cannabis businesses the City intends to license as noted in Measure M to come forward and register with the City based on criteria noted in the motion. Council File:

<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=14-0366-S7> **NO ACTION**

G. BOARD REPORTS, including Discussion and possible action items, if listed.

1. **President, Elvina Beck** – Elvina reported that she attended Mitch O’Farrell’s swearing in; it was a very emotional amazing day.

2. **Vice-President, Ferris Wehbe** – None

3. **Secretary, Roger Davis** – None

4. **Treasurer, Angie Aramayo (Second Signer: Elvina Beck)**

1. **Discuss and make a motion to approve March, April and May MER** – Angie related that this is only for May and June as April was already approved.

Moved by Ferris; **Seconded** by Gayl; **9 Yes:** Elvina, Rebecca, Charles, Angie, Duffy, Ferris, Angie, Roger, Michael; **0 no; 0 abstentions; unanimously approved.**

2. **Discuss and make a motion to approve proposed budget for 2017-2018**

Angie related that Ferris sent her a proposed budget for \$37,000, and it is now \$42,000.

Ferris noted that we can always reallocate. Ferris based his figures on a year of spending.

Motion: To approve the 2017-2018 budget in the amount of \$42,000 budget broken up as: \$10,000 for operations, \$14,000 for outreach, \$10,000 for NPGs & \$8,000 for elections. If we don’t have elections, we’ll move those funds around; it’s just line-item.

Moved by Ferris; **Seconded** by Elvina; **9 Yes:** Elvina, Rebecca, Charles, Angie, Duffy, Ferris, Angie, Roger, Michael; **0 No; 0 abstentions; unanimously approved.**

Ferris asked that Angie get her trainings done so we can get the new credit card.

3. Discuss and make a motion to approve the Neighborhood Council Strategic Budget Package, Strategic Plan, Outreach Survey, Neighborhood Council Budget, and Council Self-Assessment for Fiscal Year 2017-2018 **Tabled to next month, okayed by Lorenzo Briceno.**

4. The Treasurer will purchase approved items for CHNC. Board members will not expect reimbursement.

H. COMMITTEES REPORT, including Discussion and possible action items, if listed.

1. **Safety Committee;** Duffy Culligan, Roger Davis: **None**

2. **Outreach Committee;** Angie Aramayo, Duffy Culligan and Gayl Murphy:

Ms. Linda Ricky related that the Outreach Committee meeting was cancelled without her knowing about it, and that two people came here from the Mayor’s office, to present on the LA Promise Zone, but there was no meeting. She’ll try to get them to reschedule. Angie took responsibility, she and Elvina recommended bringing them to the full board, and Linda also took responsibility since her email broke down at work.

3. **Budget and Finance Committee:** Elvina Beck: **None**

4. **Election Committee:** Rebecca Hirsch: **None as to this committee.**

5. **Legislative Action Committee:** Angie Aramayo and Charles Taylor: **None**

6. **PLUM Committee; Chairs** Roger Davis, Gayl Murphy

- a. **Case No ZA-2013-1485-MPA-PA1 Project Site:** 1680 N. Vine St. (aka the Taft Building)
 - APL restaurant **Project Description:** Tenant improvement of a vacant space to be converted into a full-service restaurant with alcohol sales; total of 85 indoor seats and 62 outdoor seats. Hours of operation 11:30am-2:00am. **Representative:** Laura Doerges
ACTION: Recommendation to the Board is to support the request as approved by the PLUM committee by **YES: 7 / No: 0.**
 - Ms. Laura Doerges, of Clarett West Development, representing the Taft Building at the corner of Hollywood and Vine, returned following their approval at the PLUM meeting. Chef/Restaurateur, Adam Perry Lang, introduced himself and his team: Sarah Kim and Saul Cooperstein. **Moved** by Ferris; **seconded** by Roger; **9/0/0; passed.**
- b. **Case No DIR-2014-2793-SPP-DI-M1 Project Site:** 1540 N Vine St 90028
 - **Project Description:** Camden USA Inc. (the “Applicant”) proposes an accessory use modification of the existing Project Permit Compliance Review (“PPCR”) to allow both a 150 sq. ft. tenant identification (“Equinox Sign”) and a grandfathered 300 sq. ft. Supergraphic sign to be located on the Project’s northern facade. **Representative:** John Hrovat (Camden) **ACTION:** Recommendation to the Board is to support the request as approved by the PLUM committee by **YES: 5 / No: 1.**
 - John Hrovat returned following their approval at the PLUM meeting. He reviewed compliance versus what was grandfathered, and described the significant reduction in size for the sign. They are going for a smaller sign, asking to allow 75 square feet and not 150 square feet for the sign.
Moved by Ferris; **seconded** by Rebecca; **8 yes; 1 no:** Gayl; **0 abstentions; passed.**
- c. **Case No CPC-2016-3750-VZC-HD-MCUP-ZAA-SPR Project Site:** 1600 N SCHRADER BLVD 90028 **Project Description:** The construction, use, and maintenance of a new 11-story commercial building with **168 (sic) [198]** guest rooms and a 4,028sf restaurant, totaling 63,457sf of floor area. **Representative:** Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, LLP **ACTION:** That The Board Approves The Vesting Zone Change Pursuant To Lamc Section 12.24 W.1, A Master Conditional Use Permit For The On-site Sale And Dispensing Of Alcoholic Beverages Incidental To A Proposed **168 (sic) [198]** - guestroom Hotel, Ground Floor Restaurant And Rooftop Terrace With A Total Of 334 Seats Pursuant To Lamc Section 16.05 – With The Following Conditions: Hours Of Operation Until Midnight On The Rooftop Daily; No Amplified Music; No Age Restriction; No Promoters; No Cover Charge; And Sound-proof Mitigation On The Rooftop. Okay to Have Live Music if It’s Piano, Guitar; No Amplified Music Whatsoever, And Provide Parking Validation for Locals – as approved by the PLUM committee by **YES: 4 / No: 2.**

Alfred Fraijo returned, noting that there is a correction in the above description. **It should be 198 guest rooms as opposed to 168.** He promised that construction noise concerns will be addressed. Ferris asked about community benefits. Alfred noted that the YMCA has been a partner; the Y is exploring re-stripping their parking lot (to allow more cars in). They have made a substantial contribution – a donation – to the Y. They want to make sure folks have access to the project, particularly the restaurant; and, they’re preserving the Spanish Revival building to continue to be an apartment building.

Board questions were asked and answered. Michael asked for clarification under “C”, as to the increase in FAR. Alfred related that the increase in FAR is from 2 to 3.14. He referenced the Community Plan Update which he noted “already proposes to increase it for a baseline of 3” and so they “will be increasing it by 1.1.” Gayl asked, and was told that the apartment building will continue to be an RSU building, subject to all the restrictions that currently apply. They are the new landlords, but all things are staying as is. She asked for commitment that if any of the apartments become vacant that they will not be incorporated into the hotel, that it will continue to sustain itself as 12 residential units. Mr. Fraijo related that the answer is Yes, as it is already governed by the existing Ellis Act, and the Rent Control Ordinance (RSO), so they will continue to operate the building subject to those rules. She thanked him for some of the changes they made, e.g., with regard to soundproof mitigation, and asked how they will execute providing parking validation for locals. Mr. Fraijo noted that the soundproofing and the orientation of the programming on the rooftop are all critical; they are continuing to work with Council office to meet their concerns about conditions as to operations, etc. They are still exploring piano/instrumental music so long as it is not amplified. He noted that there will be parking available for the community, they are committed to providing that, and to have bicycle parking, all accessible to the neighborhood. As to parking validation, they will include that, as it was a condition of the committee, which they are happy to accept. Gayl asked further as to end dates on them overseeing the apartment building, he replied that this is all subject to the Ellis Act, which they have no control over. Duffy asked if they’d be willing to put a shade structure in the park on Selma and Schrader to which Alfred responded that he’d be happy to discuss that. Asked about construction timeline, he noted that they’re six months out, would like to start in the first quarter of next year, and expect 18 months of construction.

Public Comment: **Steve Ducey & Annie Gagen** pointed out need for continued outreach to the tenants. Steve would like the tenants to be able to return to the units, if they leave, at the same rate. **Susan Hunter** pointed out that the city doesn’t have a way to check the vacancy rate, as to how many units are available to rent. She asked that this council take into consideration that we do not have a hard count vacancy rate. **Board Comments:** Gayl asked for assurance that the apartments will not be turned over to airBnB. Mr. Fraijo noted that they’re focused on making sure the tenants understand that they won’t be impacting their tenancy. They are concerned about temporary impacts, and the developer has committed to relocate the tenants during construction.
Moved by Roger; **Seconded** by Ferris; **8 yes; 1 no;** Gayl; **passed.**

- d. **Case No ZA-2017-1940-CU Project Site:** 6260 Santa Monica Blvd 90028 **Project Description:** Starbucks (the “Applicant”) proposes the development of a coffee house on the site of an existing dental office. A conditional use approval to extend the hours of operation to 5am to 12am, 7 days / week. (Normally, Mini-Shopping Center hours are 7am to 11pm - Sec.). **Representative:** Elizabeth Valerio (Valerio Architects) **ACTION:** To approve the request because between 5:00 am and 7:00 am and 11:00 pm and 12:00 pm parking would not be an issue – as approved by the PLUM committee by **YES: 6 / No: 6 (sic) [0 no]**
Moved by Roger; **Seconded** by Ferris; **8 yes; 1 no;** Rebecca; **0 abstentions; passed.**

- e. **Case No CPC-2016-3176 Project Site:** 6436 Hollywood Blvd 90028 **Project Description:** 6436 Hollywood Blvd LLC and 1624 Wilcox Ave LP1 (together, the “Applicant”) propose to develop a mixed-use project consisting of up to 260 multi-family residential dwelling units and approximately 17,800 square feet of community-serving retail and restaurant uses (the “Project”) on an approximately 1.4-acre site located in the Hollywood Community Plan area of the City of Los Angeles. The subject property is located at 6430-6440 Hollywood Boulevard and 1624-1648 Wilcox Avenue (the “Project Site”). Upon completion, the Project will include approximately 278,892 square feet of floor area for a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of up to 4.5 to 1. The Project will preserve the existing two-story, 9,000 square foot Attie Building, located at the corner of Hollywood Boulevard and Wilcox Avenue, and integrate the structure with new construction that will range from two to 15 stories with a maximum height of 160 feet. The Project Site is located within 1,000 ft. of a Selma Park, Goldwyn Library, and a Post Office. There will be approximately 420 parking spaces in two subterranean and three on- and above-grade parking levels. **NO ACTION**

Annie noted that the **deadline for comments has been extended** and noted that the address is incorrect on the above description. She stated that she has an official letter from the President of the Hollywood Heritage. Annie noted that **the correct address is: 6430-6440 W. Hollywood Blvd., 1624-1648 No. Wilcox Avenue.**

- f. **Case No ZA-2017-1798 Project Site:** 1076 Lillian Way – Sacred Fools Theater **Project Description:** PQD, LLC (the “Applicant”) proposes an interior tenant improvement to a 7,733 square-foot, 286-seat theater that will include a 1,070 square-foot, 36 seat bar area serving a full line of alcoholic beverages (the “Project”). Hours of operation 10am - 2am, 7 days a week. The minimum age for entry will be 21; the means of enforcement was not listed. The Project Site is located within 600 ft. of the Hollywood Recreation Center, 5 schools, and 2 municipal buildings. It has a total lot area of 8,400 sq. ft. There is no parking for this establishment. **Representative:** Margaret Taylor (Apex LA) **ACTION:** To recommend that the board support ZA 2017-1798 as presented to the PLUM Committee with modifications of LAPD recommendation #4, closing hours of midnight or 12:00 am Monday through Thursday and condition #30, security plan to be reviewed and approved by LAPD, in writing – as approved by the PLUM committee by **YES: 5 / No: 1.**

Sacred Fools Theater owners, Mr. Patrick Duffy & Mr. Padriac Duffy owners, along with Consultant, Ms. Margaret Taylor, with Apex LA, returned and presented their case. Ms. Taylor related that the only difference they’re asking for is Monday through Thursday hours of operation closing and hours of sales. The bar area is only there to support the theater operation. She noted that they have removed condition #30, because #26 already required a security plan, and they’re meeting with LAPD.

Motion: To support, with the modifications as written on our agenda, plus to change closing time to 1:00 am Monday to Thursday but the alcohol sales would close at midnight. **Moved** by Ferris; **seconded** by Roger; **9 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions; passed.** Gayl asked that they make sure to let people know there’s no parking in their literature. Ride-share vehicles was discussed.

- g. Discussion and possible action to purchase name signs for PLUM committee members - Duffy volunteered to make these.
- h. Per bylaws Section 3, Clause F, the Chair asks the President to remove any PLUM member who is not truly a stakeholder immediately. Section 3, Clause F states "Committee members may be removed in the same manner in which they were appointed" and Clause B states "...Committee members shall be appointed by the President and ratified by the Board. Standing Committees...may include any interested Stakeholders." <http://empowerla.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Code-of-Civility.pdf>

Roger related that one of the PLUM members is not a stakeholder, and per the Bylaws as well as the legal opinion by the City Attorney of DONE, he is asking that George Abrahams be removed at once.

Motion: Per the Bylaws Section 3, Clause F, to remove George Abrahams **moved** by Roger; **seconded** by Michael. Discussion was begun.

Rebecca asked what constitutes a stakeholder. Roger related per the bylaws, a stakeholder is someone who lives in, works in, or owns property in this CHNC district. Rebecca related that the language would include "has an interest in" to which Roger asked Lorenzo, and noted that he has gotten an opinion from Carmen Hawkins. Lorenzo noted that the Board can make that determination: if the board feels that such stakeholder does not have an ongoing interest, the stakeholder can be removed. The individual needs to present evidence. Gayl related that the Board has a history of other members not living here... Charles asked, and Roger related that Carmen Hawkins said our bylaws make it clear: live in, work in, or own property in this district. He noted that there is a whole series of other reasons that he feels this person needs to be removed; however, that is not on the agenda. Lorenzo noted that per the bylaws, ... committee members "serve at the will of the chair or board." Gayl opined that this is personal, and that she values both Roger and George. Roger responded that there are a couple of other people who behaved abominably at that meeting, and if he was going on that basis, there would be other people that he would ask to be removed; so this is not personal; that rules need to be followed.

Public Comment:

George Abrahams was given 5 minutes to respond. He related that Jay Handel addressed this and told him when he first came on to this committee that he is a stakeholder because he is a litigant in the Hollywood Community Plan and that also has standing in every neighborhood council in the Hollywood Community Plan area." This board is on notice of this. George thinks that this and any action would be a violation of the Brown Act because any motion has to have sufficient specificity for the public to know what the subject is. George reported that he came onto this committee in the first place, because two elections ago, the previous board was clueless, and asked him to come on as a PLUM Committee member with expertise on this issue to help put order and manage directly the PLUM committee which he did – out of the goodness of his

heart. George also referenced the Code of Civility, stating that he was personally attacked at the Special PLUM Meeting, and asked for an apology from Roger which he has not received and is asking for an apology at this time.

Susan Hunter related, on behalf of Los Angeles Tenants Union, she clarified that George absolutely is a stakeholder in this area; he has guided multiple LATU members. “He is interested in making sure that we preserve the quality of our neighborhood” She noted that we are on a slippery slope, “because if you allow personal decisions about who you don’t want to be on board, and start trying to make it about the rules, bending the rules to make it apply to your personal situations, then multiple members of this board are going to have targets on their backs, and that’s not what this board is supposed to be about, and the fact that you’ve gotten to this level says a lot about how much this board is allowing themselves to degrade and degrade the confidence of our community in all of you.”

Steve Ducey echoed George and Susan’s comments, and recognized the importance of the work of the PLUM committee. He felt that what took place at the meeting was ugly and soured the evening.

Travis Wester read the entire definition of what a stakeholder is, according to our own bylaws. He related that as a co-member with George, they’ve had disagreements but he does not doubt George’s dedication to serve this community. Travis agreed that the moment we witnessed at the special meeting was regrettable; he felt that this stemmed somewhat from a lack of clear policy as to how the co-secretaries and co-chairs within the Executive membership are to interact; referencing what took place at the special meeting. “You will notice if you were at the meeting that Gayl and George were both insisting on the point of the agenda that everyone thought was going to be included; unfortunately, due to administrative conundrums, it was not. I think if that was clarified, it would be to the benefit not only of the board but all the committees that serve on it.”

Annie Gagen agreed that George is a stakeholder: “He knows more about land use and law than any attorney with a degree.” “George is not your enemy, you need to work together.” “He represents us... You can’t just get rid of people because you have personality problems.”

Gilbert Mora: “I almost walked out of that meeting.”

Monique Friedman: “It’s on the City Attorney.” “...It’s principles before personalities.”

Cheri Smith: “Trying to get George off is just crazy. He’s here to help us. ...Let it drop. Just keep George.”

Tracy Green: You’re not always going to get along. The outcome was beautiful. She’d like us to reconsider to keep the board (committee) as is.

Board discussion was held. Roger related that there was a lot of chaos and that he was concerned the developer could have stopped the meeting. He related that when someone stands up and attacks him when he is starting the meeting, that is not tolerable. He related that there were serial emails, which amounted to a serial meeting, and that these were a violation of the Brown Act. He wants the bylaws enforced.

Angie recommended that any altercation should have been handled privately. "We should just get clarity on what a stakeholder is. George is not mentioned on the agenda at all." Ferris noted that George is a good guy; "we were trying to figure out how to allow the group to speak for half an hour legally; we figured it out." "The chair should set the agenda... As a committee, from now on, anybody who behaves and disrespects any of us, either you call the meeting off until people cool down, because it's not right that we disrespect one another; everybody is trying to do their best. For some reason there was mistrust, thinking we are plotting to stop a group from speaking, which was not the case at all."

Gayl spoke on the agenda problem at the time of the meeting, noting that when she got the agenda it wasn't even close to what we agreed to have; so when she saw Roger at the meeting... she said to him, "this is very disturbing; this is not what we agreed on; he said yes I know but we can't change it now." She set about to solve this problem, and they agreed to rearrange the agenda, three to four, and take comments at the end. She brought this to Roger. He asked if she wants to make the announcement, which she did, and gave the announcement that there are some changes. Gayl related that about an hour and a half into the meeting, Roger decided we're not doing that anymore, and that's when both George and she "stood up and said you can't change this... and that's when the gunfire started; it was humiliating; it was embarrassing; it made me proud in a certain kind of way because democracy isn't for the faint of heart – it's messy..." ... "We got through it..." She concluded that she doesn't support this motion, she believes this is personal and "don't believe that we did anything wrong."

Charles noted that it was rough but informative. He noted that we have the opinion from the City Attorney, which he hasn't read; he noted that nine attorneys in a room will disagree; opinions might differ. He asked the board to take this seriously and consider this carefully, as this would be equivalent to terminating someone from a job; there are very serious consequences.

Michael noted he wasn't at the meeting; he noted that there is a lack of decorum. People do not listen to the chair... There is a time to be subservient to the chair... You've got to follow the rules; otherwise, there is chaos. You don't always get what you want. He noted that not only among the board is there a lack of civility... but also in the audience there is a lack of knowledge of the board rules and there are interruptions that are permitted that should not be permitted, and there are interchanges that are taking place that should not be... It is incumbent on all of us... to get this into ship shape. Make people raise their hand, take their turn, have their say, keep within their time limit and go on and make the hard decisions that we need to.

Elvina read aloud from the email she was cc'd from Carmen, that procedures for removal are set forth in the CHNC Bylaws, Article 6, Committees and their Duties, Section 3. Roger responded that he wished that Gayl and he had been able to talk before being interrupted, so he could understand her point of view and she could understand his. "Unfortunately, George decided to interrupt that, and Gayl allowed that to happen, so I went back to run the meeting, which I felt was my responsibility, and I am genuinely appalled at what took place. It was a disgrace to have someone standing up and screaming – not only George but others – screaming at me while trying to run a meeting. Supposedly, I'm now anti-tenant." "All these emails and attacks... There were others who were subjected to this tirade, one after another, of all the things, that we are against, we are pro-developer and anti-tenant, and nothing could be further from the truth, and that is so grossly insulting, that to me it is a symbol of what happens when someone considers themselves an expert, is above the rules, and does whatever he wants, and I think that's got to stop."

Rebecca asked Lorenzo if the City Attorney's opinion is binding. Lorenzo cautioned that if you remove a committee member based on stakeholder status, allow that person to present whatever they have to show their stakeholder status. Angie asked, "everyone's been talking about what happened at the meeting, so I'm getting confused: Is this because of the altercation that happened between them or are we still talking about his status as stakeholder? Because, I haven't really gotten much information by him as stakeholder or based on what he said, but I haven't heard anything from Roger or PLUM or anyone who wrote this, saying that he isn't a stakeholder, and no one has really proven that he isn't." Elvina replied, "what you said earlier is not about George specifically too; it's about any committee member." Angie: "Well this specifically is talking about any committee member, but since the board has decided to specifically work on removing one individual..." Elvina: "But the motion doesn't state that though; does it? The motion on the table is saying this, right?" Angie: The motion from my understanding is just to talk about what a stakeholder is, but now all these comments that I'm hearing... just pertains to George and Roger."

Elvina noted that we should have had a point of order a while ago, while it was getting personal. Angie asked for clarification on what we're voting on. Elvina related that it's what's on the agenda. "We can't vote on anything more than that." Angie asked if we can eliminate naming George (for removal). Elvina noted that he wasn't named. Charles related that, "As an attorney, not for the board, but it is my personal opinion, I would have a problem – if the motion was to vote yes, removing George from this particular committee, it seems to me like that would create all sorts of legal implications that could cause problems for the board... It seems to me that this is kind of personal... maybe personal differences that have been elevated to a point... maybe this could have been resolved in a different way." Elvina asked Cathy to read the motion we are on now, which she did, noting that it was to remove George Abrahams as **moved** by Roger; **seconded** by Michael. Angie noted that this is why she was confused. Ferris recommended withdrawing the motion. **Motion:** To withdraw the above motion **moved** by Elvina; **seconded** by Charles. (Not voted on.)

Returning to the Original Motion: Per bylaws Section 3, Clause F, the Chair asks the President to remove any PLUM member who is not truly a stakeholder immediately. Section 3, Clause F states “Committee members may be removed in the same manner in which they were appointed “and Clause B states “...Committee members shall be appointed by the President and ratified by the Board. Standing Committees...may include any interested Stakeholders.” **Moved** by Ferris; **seconded** by Elvina. Gayl and Ferris clarified that we are voting on what already exists; we are affirming what is in our Bylaws.

Public Comment: **Annie Gagen** re-read the definition of a stakeholder.

George Abrahams: “This is not a re-affirmation of existing bylaws. You are asking for an entirely new action, and “as I mentioned, this action violates the Brown Act because you have to agendaize, and specify what the action is, taken against who, for what reason, so the public knows. So this language is very troublesome.”

Monique stated she is comfortable with the definition of stakeholder that Annie read.

Annie discussed her own stakeholder status, and noted she was present when George was given proof of his stakeholder status by Jay Handal.

Susan Hunter pointed out “that if your concern is more about the developer than the stakeholders, I would question your ability to be a stakeholder on that board as well.”

Gilbert agreed with George, “it’s asking for an action of removing somebody but in a vague way. You didn’t specify who it was and for what. So, if you’re going to make a motion, you’re just going to have to move that first line.”

Charles recommended tabling. Elvina suggested to just kill it, otherwise, it must come back.

Vote was taken on the original motion, as written, moved by Ferris and seconded by Elvina with **0 Yes: 8 No:** Rebecca, Charles, Duffy, Angie, Gayl, Elvina, Ferris, Michael; **1 abstention:** Roger. **Motion failed.**

New Motion: That George Abrahams be removed from the PLUM Committee for being uncivil according to the Civility Code and for violating the Brown Act by sending out serial emails condemning me and others of things we are not guilty of. **Moved** by Roger. Lorenzo noted we shouldn’t be motioning anything that isn’t properly agendaized.

8. Budget Advocates update; Michael Popwell and Charles Taylor

Budget Day update: Michael noted that the Budget Advocate worked with the different city departments, trying to refine the budget, looked for items of double-spending, and think of ideas to make more money for the city. They put out a white paper, correspond with the Mayor’s office. He didn’t attend Budget Day.

Charles Taylor attended the last part of Budget Day and related that the Central

Hollywood group gave input, with homelessness being one of their main concerns. Elvina noted sources of income for the city, including but not limited to property tax and transient occupancy taxes from airBnB, among other things.

I. The board is seeking members of the public to participate on all CHNC committees.

Interested members may contact elvina@chnc.org or attend the meeting. Possible action by the Board includes appointments to the committees. A maximum of two members from CHNC board can be members of each committee.

J. COMMENTS by Board Members - Board members may provide a brief statement of their activities or request that an item be placed on a future agenda item

Rebecca noted that the Board spent \$5,000 on her project, and she allocated every single dime of it and the project is now completed, with except for flyers. She doesn't know if this board still wants to go forward with the program. Charles helped her.

Rebecca passed around the flyer about her project. She has found the largest public interest law firm in the country to be a part of this, as this are dealing with community members that are underserved and under attack. She noted that Duffy has helped her with the layout of a banner, 4 x 8 feet. She displayed artwork for the promotional campaign, noting that the photos were donated, and not stock photos. Part of this is in Spanish. This project will inform the public of their constitutional and other rights, even if they are unauthorized/undocumented. It will be held at Mears Auditorium, which location we have used before. If we do it, Assemblyman Bloom will promote it on his newsletter and website. She will approach Congressman Adam Schiff, among others. Elvina asked, and Rebecca assured that there are consents of releases of photos of young children portrayed on the flyer. Rebecca noted that there will not be childcare provided but it is family friendly. They are now trying to get donations, since all the money is already allocated. The hall, catering and everything is paid for. Elvina stressed that this should have gone to outreach. Rebecca noted that it went to outreach in the beginning... Ferris recommended that we should pick this up; and that the Outreach Committee should be involved in this. **Saturday July 29, 2017 at 10:00 am at Mears Auditorium, 1760 North Gower Street, Hollywood, CA 90028.**

K. ADJOURNMENT: Moved by Michael; seconded by Elvina, and the meeting adjourned at 9:52 pm.