

ATTACHMENT "F.i."



westsidecouncils.com

Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Brentwood Community Council
Del Rey Neighborhood Council
Mar Vista Community Council
Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa
Pacific Palisades Community Council

Palms Neighborhood Council
South Robertson Neighborhoods Council
Venice Neighborhood Council
West LA-Sawtelle Neighborhood Council
Westside Neighborhood Council
Westwood Community Council
Westwood Neighborhood Council

Goal: Creating a truly transparent / public way to keep track of policy issues/measures and to keep them moving, including a definition of adequate notice for important measures and hearings.

Ideas:

The (valid) counter-argument to extended advance notice is that government sometimes has to act quickly, and a blanket 10 or 14 or 30 day rule for public notice would stretch even basic business out beyond what is practical.

What if the NCs, by submitting CISs, effectively "tag" a measure for extended notice? For example:

Once a measure under consideration has accumulated five Community Impact Statements, Neighborhood Councils must be given a minimum of 14 days notice before a public hearing or other legislative action on that item may occur.

Not perfect and certainly not bulletproof, but it's easy to understand, is based on measurable expressions of public concern, wouldn't slow everything down, and as a benefit might spur NCs to talk to other NCs ("we need you to pass a CIS!").

Another trigger idea might address significant changes to a measure. For example, on the Sign Ordinance, the PLUM Committee made such drastic changes that it was sent back to CPC. Could a trigger mechanism be built in when issues change so significantly that past submitted CIS statements are no longer valid (but still remain)? NC's should have a chance to review their positions and submit new statements.

Neighborhood Councils who have filed CISs must be notified within 72 hours if significant changes to a measure occur in a Council committee or Commission hearing. In the event Council files are renumbered or combined, extant CISs must be transferred to the new file.*

* Probably need to provide examples here.

Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC) Zoning Code Update - April 2, 2017

Title	Description	CPC Number	CF Number	Staff hrg	CPC date
Agricultural Incentive Zones	a checklist and application to utilize the County's tax benefits to use vacant land for urban agriculture.	CPC-2016-3161-CA	14-1378		10/13/2016
Animal Adoption Services	merge with Pet Store/Kennel ordinance to create criteria for pet adoption services in C Zones		17-0079		
Appeal Time Extension	Allow quasi-judicial appeals to have until the next available meeting to act (instead of 30 days).		16-0297	1/8/2017	
Batching and Community Plan Cycle	Mandate a requirement for privately-initiated GPA batching.	CPC-2017-1111-CA	16-0422	4/18/2017	
Bicycle Parking amendment	amend the existing bicycle parking ordinance to make standards more attainable	CPC-2016-4216-CA		11/17/2016	3/9/2017
Cannabis Regulation	land use regulations for the production, cultivation, and transport of recreational marijuana.		14-0366-S4	5/24/2017	6/22/2017
Collection Bins	establish criteria to ensure that material is not allowed to accumulate outside of Collection Bins and that they remain free of graffiti and blight.		15-0980/14-0611		
CRA reference removal	Amend Zoning Code when CRA is the lead agency for environmental review.				
Elderberry	add the Mexican Elderberry and the Toyon as protected shrubs		13-1339	1/20/2017	5/11/2017
Farmers Markets	permit farmers markets by CUP in R zones and as a Public Benefit in other zones	CPC-2011-1330-CA	10-1832	7/20/2011	9/22/2011
P and PB Zone Uses	An ordinance to amend the allowable uses, restrictions, and areas of P and PB Zones to those of the most restrictive adjacent zone.		16-0434		
Pet Stores/Kennels	create regulations for Pet Adoption Centers		11-0754		12/8/2016
RAS CUBs	Allow CUBs in RAS Zones and review the appropriateness of all uses in those zones. We might also want to include flexibility for above or below grade signage.		02-1240-S5		

Title	Description	CPC Number	CF Number	Staff hrg	CPC date
Ridgeline Protection	3 levels of development limitations for ridgelines.		16-0757		
Signs	amend the citywide sign regulations to develop parameters for allowing digital signs outside of Sign Districts.	CPC-2009-0008-CA	08-2020		10/22/2015
Solar Panel Requirement	require "solar installation" and "solar ready" for specified projects. Include opt in or opt out provision.				3/22/2017
Temporary Signs	limit temporary signs on temporary construction walls	CPC-2017-455-CA		3/8/2017	4/27/2017



Neighborhood Council Survey on Public Works Services

The City of Los Angeles is working to uncover ways to improve public works services for constituents. We are asking for feedback from you to assess the current level of service as part of our research.

Note: Your individual responses will be kept confidential and no identifying information is asked.

Neighborhood Council Name: _____

Who represents your neighborhood on City Council? _____

1. Please rate the quality of the following services on a scale of 1-10(best):
(Write N/A if does not apply)

2. Have these services improved over the past 5 years? (Yes/No)

Example – service **5**

Y

Sidewalk repair _____

Y/N

Street repair _____

Y/N

Street sweeping _____

Y/N

Tree trimming _____

Y/N

Street lighting _____

Y/N

Traffic signal timing _____

Y/N

Parking enforcement _____

Y/N

Trash collection _____

Y/N

Recycling _____

Y/N

Bulky item pick up _____

Y/N

Sewer services _____

Y/N

Illegal dumping _____

Y/N

Weed abatement _____

Y/N

Bridge maintenance _____

Y/N

LA311 _____

Y/N

Bike paths _____

Y/N

ADA accessibility ramps _____

Y/N

Striping of City crosswalks _____

Y/N

Striping of City streets _____

Y/N

Bus shelters _____

Y/N

Graffiti cleanup _____

Y/N

Potholes _____

Y/N

Walk signals _____

Y/N

Storm drains _____

Y/N

Other: _____

Y/N

(continued on back)

3. Of the services listed, which services would you want improved first?

1st service: _____

2nd service: _____

3rd service: _____

4. How easy is it to...

	Very Easy	Easy	Hard	Very Hard	Not Sure	N/A
...pay for a parking ticket?	1	2	3	4	5	0
...apply for a permit (construction, etc.)?	1	2	3	4	5	0
...apply for a rebate for sidewalk repairs?	1	2	3	4	5	0
...report an issue with City services (broken light, abandoned vehicles, etc.)?	1	2	3	4	5	0

5. How well would you rate the following aspects of Los Angeles:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Sure	N/A
Ease of travel by car on City streets	1	2	3	4	5	0
Ease of walking in Los Angeles	1	2	3	4	5	0
Cleanliness of Los Angeles	1	2	3	4	5	0
Responsiveness to constituent requests	1	2	3	4	5	0

6. Have you done any of these activities in the last 6 months:

Observed a code violation (weeds, graffiti, etc.)	Y	N
Followed a City Twitter account (LA Mayor, Sanitation, etc.)	Y	N
Used LA311 to report an issue with City services	Y	N
Contacted your Council member to report an issue with City services	Y	N
Visited the City's website	Y	N
Used public transportation instead of driving	Y	N
Followed a City Facebook account (LA Mayor, Fire, etc.)	Y	N

7. Additional Comments:

Thank you for your participation!

MEASURE M – LOCAL RETURN MONIES

The Metro Board of Directors placed a sales tax ballot measure, titled the Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan, on the November 8, 2016, ballot. On that November ballot voters were asked to support a commitment:

"To improve freeway traffic flow/safety; repair potholes/sidewalks; repave local streets; earthquake-retrofit bridges; synchronize signals; keep senior/disabled/student fares affordable; expand rail/subway/bus systems; improve job/school/airport connections; and create jobs; shall voters authorize a Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan through a ½ ¢ sales tax and continue the existing ½ ¢ traffic relief tax until voters decide to end it, with independent audits/oversight and funds controlled locally?"

LA County voters approved Measure M with 71.15% support.

When voters approved Measure M last November, they voted for a convenient and safe transit system in Los Angeles that will reduce traffic by getting people out of their cars. They were also voting to raise fund to be used to repair our highways, broken streets and sidewalks.

Part of the funds raised through Measure M (about 16 percent) is dedicated to "local return" to cities in Los Angeles County, which cities can use for local transportation projects and programs (see exact definition/language below). With an estimated \$50 million per year in local return for the City of Los Angeles expected, there are currently a number of proposals/options being discussed to determine how LA's local return funds will be used. The discussion leading up to any policy decision should involve the neighborhood councils from throughout the City.

The competing thoughts as of this writing are summarized below:

CF 16-0187 -- Joint Chief Legislative Analyst and City Administrative Officer report in response to Motion (Blumenfield - Koretz) relative to the development of a local return program for the proposed 2016 transportation ballot measure to ensure that the San Fernando Valley and all affected regions receive their fair share and related matters.

Passed in transportation. See report dated 2/28/17. (Also referred to the Budget and Finance Committee) 2/12/16

CF17-0166 –Blumenfield/Koretz—Equitable distribution of local return funds among all 15 Council Districts. 2/14/07

CF 16-0395 -- Joint City Administrative Officer/Chief Legislative Analyst report in response to Motion (Buscaino - Englander - Wesson - Bonin) relative to dedicating 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. **(Also referred to the Budget and Finance and Public Works and Gang Reduction Committees)**

Mike Bonin, Chair of the Council's Transportation Committee introduced a measure at the Committee's March 29th meeting to dedicate 60% of the local return funds to Vision Zero - LA's commitment to end traffic fatalities by 2025. Vision Zero seeks to eliminate traffic deaths by creating safer streets, and designing infrastructure to better protect pedestrians and bicyclists. The measure passed the Transportation Committee with Councilmembers Ryu and Koretz in opposition. Bonin's legislation was approved at the committee meeting, and the discussion will move to the Public Works Committee and then the Budget and Finance Committee, before being considered by the full Council.

Vision Zero info can be found at <http://visionzero.lacity.org/what-is-vision-zero-la/>,

At the April LANCC meeting the following motion was adopted for consideration by neighborhood councils:

- **LEGISLATIVE --- Note:** . (This is the draft motion without later introduced edits.)

The Los Angeles Neighborhood Council (LANCC) (XXXXXXX Neighborhood Council) opposes Mayor Eric Garcetti's proposal to close part of the City's \$250 million budget gap for next year by using an estimated \$50 million of Local Return money from Measure M, the permanent half cent increase in our sales tax that was approved by 71% of voters in November, 2016. We support that the funds be evenly distributed between the Council Districts to fix, pave, or repair our streets. We also support that the Neighborhood Councils have a more active role in the decisions of how the funds will be spent as they have considerable experience based on the Small Asphalt Repairs (SAR) Program

- **REPORTS**

From Measure M Language:
Page 1--Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan

PREAMBLE

Los Angeles County's comprehensive plan to improve transportation and ease traffic congestion through the following core goals:

- Improve freeway traffic flow; reduce bottlenecks and ease traffic congestion.
- Expand the rail and rapid transit system; accelerate rail construction and build new rail lines; enhance local, regional, and express bus service; and improve system connectivity.
- Repave local streets, repair potholes, synchronize signals; improve neighborhood streets and intersections, and enhance bike and pedestrian connections.
- Keep the transit and highway system safe; earthquake-retrofit bridges, enhance freeway and transit system safety, and keep the transportation system in good working condition.
- Make public transportation more accessible, convenient, and affordable for seniors, students, and the disabled and provide better mobility options for our aging population.
- Embrace technology and innovation; incorporate modern technology, new advancements, and emerging innovations into the local transportation system.
- Create jobs, reduce pollution, and generate local economic benefits; increase personal²⁶ quality time and overall quality of life.^{27 28} Provide accountability and transparency; protect and monitor the public's investments through independent audits and oversight.

Page 3-- "Local Return" means funds returned to the cities within Los Angeles and Los Angeles County, based on population, for eligible transportation-related uses as defined by the Local Return Guidelines to be developed in coordination with such cities and Los Angeles County and adopted by the Metro Board of Directors. Funds will be eligible for communities' transportation needs, including transit, streets and roads, storm drains, Green Streets, Active Transportation Projects, Complete Streets, public transit access to recreational facilities, Transit Oriented Community Investments, and other unmet transit needs.