



CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
CALIFORNIA

SILVER LAKE  
NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

- CO-CHAIRS**  
Heather Carson  
Anne-Marie Johnson
- VICE CHAIR**  
Jerome Courshon
- TREASURER**  
Patty Jausoro
- SECRETARY**  
Scott Plante



SILVER LAKE  
NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

Serving the Silver Lake  
Community Since 2003

EMAIL: [board@silverlakenc.org](mailto:board@silverlakenc.org)  
PHONE: (323) 413-SLNC (7562)  
URL: [www.silverlakenc.org](http://www.silverlakenc.org)

MAIL  
PO Box 26385, LA CA 90026

**SILVER LAKE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL BOARD MEMBERS**

**AT-LARGE REPS:** Heather Carson / Jerome Courshon / Glenn Harrell / Patty Jausoro/ Anne-Marie Johnson / Scott Plante / Antonio Stifano  
**REGIONAL:**(1) Jia Gu & Douglas J. Loewy (2) Barbara Ringuette & Elizabeth Torres (3) Adam Somilleda & Nicolas Somilleda  
(4) Rusty Millar & Tracey Woolfolk (5) Bob Lisauskas & Caroline Pham (6)Betsy Smith Isroelit & Taryn Poole (7)Stacey Boucher & Terrence Jackson

**GOVERNING BOARD AGENDA**

Wednesday, September 7, 2016, 7pm - 10pm

Ivanhoe Elementary

2828 Herkimer St

Los Angeles, CA 90039

Parking. Bicycle parking available. Metro Bus 92/96/201

As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assisted listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by contacting the SLNC Secretary, at (213) 375-8836, toll-free at 311, or e-mail [secretary@silverlakenc.org](mailto:secretary@silverlakenc.org).

In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the board in advance of a meeting, may be viewed at our website by clicking on the following link: [www.silverlakenc.org](http://www.silverlakenc.org), or at the scheduled meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact [secretary@silverlakenc.org](mailto:secretary@silverlakenc.org).

**TIMES ARE FOR REFERENCE ONLY. ITEMS MAY BE ADDRESSED OUT OF THE ORDER LISTED**

- |  |                |
|--|----------------|
| <b>1. Call to Order (1min)</b>   | <b>7:00 pm</b> |
| <b>2. Roll Call (2min)</b>   | <b>7:01pm</b>  |
| <b>3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS (12min)</b>   | <b>7:03 pm</b> |
| Public comment is limited to 2 minutes per speaker, unless adjusted by the presiding officer.  |                |
| <b>4. Special Presentations and Reports (20 min)</b>   | <b>7:15 pm</b> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Mitch O’Farrell, CD13 - Mary Rodriguez</li> <li>● David Ryu, CD4 - Adam Miller</li> <li>● Assembly Member Mike Gatto, District 43 - Eric Menjivar</li> <li>● Assembly Member Jimmy Gomez, District 51 - Stephanie Uy</li> <li>● Congress Member Adam Schiff, 28th District - Pam Marcel</li> <li>● Budget Representative</li> </ul> |                |
| <b>5. ADMINISTRATIVE (10min)</b>   | <b>7:35 pm</b> |

- 5.1. **Approval of August Board**  
[Minutes](http://silverlakenc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/SLNC-August-3-2016-Meeting-Minutes_DRAFT.pdf)[http://silverlakenc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/SLNC-August-3-2016-Meeting-Minutes\\_DRAFT.pdf](http://silverlakenc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/SLNC-August-3-2016-Meeting-Minutes_DRAFT.pdf)
- 5.2. **Sergeants-At-Arms** - per SR17 Stakeholder Sergeants-at-Arms "The Governing Board will ask for one or more stakeholder volunteers to regularly serve as Sergeant at Arms during Governing Board meetings. The Sergeants at Arms will maintain order, assist stakeholders in filling out and submitting Public Comment cards, and will perform other duties as prescribed by the Board."
- 6. FINANCE AND BUDGET (10 min) 7:45 pm**
- 6.1. **Discussion and Possible Action (Treasurer):** Approval of August 2016 MER (2min)
- 6.2. **Discussion and Possible Action (Treasurer):** Approval of revised Fiscal Year 2016-2017 budget. (3min)
- 7. OLD BUSINESS: None**
- 8. CONSENT: None**
- 9. NEW BUSINESS (45min) 7:55 pm**
- 9.1 **MOTION (Bylaws & Standing Rules Committee):** - Amendment to Bylaws Article XIII regarding amendments made by stakeholders to the SLNC Bylaws.
- 9.2. **Motion (Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee):** Revise the previously approved SR #10 regarding the location of regularly scheduled monthly governing board meetings
- 9.3. **Motion (Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee):** Revise the language in SR#4 regarding allocation of speakers time to correctly reflect what is stated on SLNC agenda templates.
- 9.4. **Motion (Urban Design and Preservation Advisory Committee)** Small Lot Project 738-742 Parkman Ave.
- 9.5. **Motion (Bellevue Park Advisory Board):** To provide funding in the amount of \$250.00 for Annual Halloween Celebration
- 9.6. **Motion (Treasurer):** Authorize a \$500.00 payment to Apple 1 regarding professional note taker.
- 9.7. **Motion (Treasurer):** Authorize a June/July payment in the amount of \$473.53 to Apple 1 for professional note taker.
- 9.8. **Motion (Johnson):** To authorize up to \$500.00 for copies of the Gas Leaf Blower Bilingual Informational Flyer.
- 9.9. **Motion (Carson):** Move that the Outreach Committee create guidelines and criteria for SLNC Newsletter submissions.
- 9.10. **Notification (Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee):**Amendments to Article X to increase the age of eligibility to run and vote.
- 10. REPORTS OF OFFICERS (10min) 8:40 pm**
- 10.1. **Co-Chairs**
- 10.2. **Vice-Chair**
- 10.3. **Secretary**
- 10.4. **Correspondence**
- 11. Committee Reports (15min) 8:50 pm**
- 11.1. Arts and Culture
- 11.2. Bylaws and Standing Rules
- 11.3. Elections
- 11.4. Green
- 11.5. Outreach
- 11.6. 50 Plus
- 11.7 Reservoir Complex
- 11.8. Urban Design and Preservation Advisory
- 11.9. History Collective
- 11.10. Governmental Affairs
- 12. REQUESTS/MOTIONS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (5min) 8:55 pm**

13. ANNOUNCEMENTS (10 min)

9:00 pm

14. ADJOURNMENT

9:10 pm

**PUBLIC INPUT AT NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL MEETINGS** – The public is requested to fill out a “Speaker Card” to address the Board/Committee on any agenda item before the Board/Committee takes an action on an item. Comments from the public on agenda items will be heard only when the respective item is being considered. Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the agenda that are within the Board’s jurisdiction will be heard during the General Public Comment period. Please note that under the Brown Act, the Board/Committee is prevented from acting on a matter that you bring to its attention during the General Public Comment period; however, the issue raised by a member of the public may become the subject of a future Board/Committee meeting. **Public comment is limited to 2 minutes per speaker, unless adjusted by the presiding officer.**

**PUBLIC POSTING OF AGENDAS** – Silver Lake Neighborhood Council agendas are posted for public review as follows:

- Mornings Nights Cafe, 1523 Griffith Park Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90026
- [www.SilverLakeNC.org](http://www.SilverLakeNC.org)
- You can also receive our agendas via email by subscribing to L.A. City’s Early Notification System at: <http://www.lacity.org/government/Subscriptions/NeighborhoodCouncils/index.htm>

**THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT** - As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and, upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices and other auxiliary aids and/or services, may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting you wish to attend by contacting the SLNC Secretary, at (213) 375-8836 or email [secretary@silverlakenc.org](mailto:secretary@silverlakenc.org).

**PUBLIC ACCESS OF RECORDS** – In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the board in advance of a meeting may be viewed at Mornings Nights Cafe, 1523 Griffith Park Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90026, at our website: [www.silverlakenc.org](http://www.silverlakenc.org) or at the scheduled meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact the SLNC Secretary, at (213) 375-8836 or email [secretary@silverlakenc.org](mailto:secretary@silverlakenc.org).

#### **RECONSIDERATION AND GRIEVANCE PROCESS**

For information on the Silver Lake Neighborhood Council’s process for board action reconsideration, stakeholder grievance policy, or any other procedural matters related to this Council, please consult the SLNC Bylaws. The Bylaws are available at our Board meetings and our website <http://silverlakenc.org/about/bylaws/>

#### **SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCION**

Si requiere servicios de traducción, favor de avisar al Concejo Vecinal 3 días de trabajo (72 horas) antes del evento. Por favor contacte a the SLNC Secretary, al (213) 375-8836 o por correo electrónico [secretary@silverlakenc.org](mailto:secretary@silverlakenc.org) para avisar al Concejo Vecinal.

## Item 9.1

**Date:** July 20th, 2016

**Committee/Requestor:** Bylaws & Standing Rules

**Text of Motion:** Move that the SLNC ByLaws Article XIII now read,

“Any Stakeholder may propose an Amendment, providing the Stakeholder has a petition signed by at least one hundred (100) Stakeholders supporting this Amendment. The Board may also propose Amendments by majority.

The Proposed Amendment must be in writing, provide supporting arguments, and be presented for placement on the agenda of the next regular Board or Special Board meeting for discussion.

The Amendment must be distributed at least fourteen (14) days before the meeting. The Secretary of the Board will prepare a summary of the discussion on the amendment for distribution to the Community. (strike this paragraph out)

New Language: The Board will make the proposed Amendment, together with a summary of the discussion on the amendment, available to the Community at least 14 days before a meeting to decide the matter. The amendment must be approved by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of members present at a duly noticed general or special board meeting.

Within fourteen (14) days after an Amendment is approved, a Bylaw Amendment Application must be submitted to the Department along with a copy of the existing Bylaw for review and approval by the Department.

Amendments shall not be valid, final or effective until approved by the Department. Once approved, any changes in the Bylaws shall become effective immediately.”

**Describe the event or project in detail: The goals of the Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee is to streamline and/or clarify aspects of both the SLNC’s Bylaws and Standing Rules. Providing clarifications reflected in the new language in Article XIII, will make the intent of the particular article clearer and more practicable. The new language is, “New Language: The Board will make the proposed Amendment, together with a summary of the discussion on the amendment, available to the Community at least 14 days before a meeting to decide the matter. The amendment must be approved by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of members present at a duly noticed general or special board meeting.**

Within fourteen (14) days after an Amendment is approved, a Bylaw Amendment Application must be submitted to the Department along with a copy of the existing Bylaw for review and approval by the Department.

Amendments shall not be valid, final or effective until approved by the Department. Once approved, any changes in the Bylaws shall become effective immediately.”

**What is the timeline for the project?**

**What is the total budget for the project? If this is a funding motion, please submit a completed Funding Request Form to the Treasurer at least 3 days before the Governing Board Meeting.**

BUDGET?N/A

**From which budget line(s) are the funds to be drawn? N/A**

## How will this motion be implemented, and by whom? SLNC Board

If the motion is supported by the SLNC, (INSERT ACTION HERE)

June 23rd, 2016 Bylaws Minutes:

Items 4:

Extensive debate regarding the amending of Article XIII amendments.

Motion was made and seconded to do amend the amendments as follows:

“Any Stakeholder may propose an Amendment, providing the Stakeholder has a petition signed by at least one hundred (100) Stakeholders supporting this Amendment. The Board may also propose Amendments by majority.

The Proposed Amendment must be in writing, provide supporting arguments, and be presented for placement on the agenda of the next regular Board or **Special** Board meeting for discussion.

The Amendment must be distributed at least fourteen (14) days before the meeting. The Secretary of the Board will prepare a summary of the discussion on the amendment for distribution to the Community. (strike this paragraph out)

**New Language: The Board will make the proposed Amendment, together with a summary of the discussion on the amendment, available to the Community at least 14 days before a meeting to decide the matter. The amendment must be approved by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of members present at a duly noticed general or special board meeting.**

**Within fourteen (14) days after an Amendment is approved, a Bylaw Amendment Application must be submitted to the Department along with a copy of the existing Bylaw for review and approval by the Department.**

**Amendments shall not be valid, final or effective until approved by the Department. Once approved, any changes in the Bylaws shall become effective immediately.”**

Motion to approve the new language was made by Barbara and seconded by Dacia.

Motion passed unanimously.

## Item 9.2

**Date:** August 29, 2016

**Committee/Requestor:** Bylaws and Standing Rules

**Text of Motion:** Move that the newly revised SLNC Standing Rules #10, regarding regular meeting locations be further clarified to specify the board will hold its regular meetings at Ivanhoe Elementary School for six consecutive months out of the year and Holy Virgin Mary Cathedral the remaining six consecutive months based on both locations availability.

**Committee Vote:** Yes

**Describe the event or project in detail:**

In order to create continuity and consistency, the newly revised Standing Rule #10 (revised in June 2016) would be clarified to read as the following: "The Regular meetings of the Silver Lake Neighborhood Council will take place the **first six (6) months of the year at Ivanhoe Elementary School** and the remaining **six (6) months at Holy Virgin Mary Cathedral Community Room**. If, at any point, **both** of these locations become temporarily and/or permanently unavailable, a special meeting of the governing board will be called in order to secure similar locations."

**What is the timeline for the project?** Upon approval of the board

**What is the total budget for the project? If this is a funding motion, please submit a completed Funding Request Form to the Treasurer at least 3 days before the Governing Board Meeting.**

BUDGET?

**From which budget line(s) are the funds to be drawn?** General Fund

**How will this motion be implemented, and by whom?** By The Board  
If the motion is supported by the SLNC, (INSERT ACTION HERE)

**August 29, 2016 Bylaws & Standing Rules Committee Draft Minutes:**

**Item C:** Motion was made and seconded (Jerome/Darcy). Brief discussion regarding continuity about meeting locations. All were very impressed with the turnout at both Ivanhoe and Holy Virgin Mary. Motion passed without objection.

## Item 9.3

**Date:** August 29, 2016

**Committee/Requestor:** Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee

**Text of Motion:** Moves to revise SLNC Standing Rule #4 to better reflect the standards set by the L.A. City Council, the DWP Commission and other city agencies with regard to allocation of speakers time. The revised language should read, "Public Comment is limited to two (2) minutes per speaker, unless adjusted by the presiding officer(s)."

**Committee Vote:** Yes

**Describe the event or project in detail:** Revising SLNC Standing Rule #4 to better reflect the standards set by the L.A. City Council, the DWP Commission and other city agencies with regard to allocation speakers time will not only assist co-chairs in the timely running of meetings, it will also eliminate unintentional confusion caused by the inconsistency in the SLNC Standing Rules and what is stated on SLNC 2016 agenda forms. Currently SR #4 reads, "During Public Comment, each speaker will be limited to two minutes. It is understood that the Board could extend the time of a speaker by action of the board. (Adopted Oct. 29, 2003)." The revised language will be consistent with language used by other Brown Act city agencies commissions and boards.

**What is the timeline for the project?** Immediately

**What is the total budget for the project? If this is a funding motion, please submit a completed Funding Request Form to the Treasurer at least 3 days before the Governing Board Meeting.**

BUDGET? N/A

**From which budget line(s) are the funds to be drawn?** N/A

**How will this motion be implemented, and by whom?** By the Board.

If the motion is supported by the SLNC, (INSERT ACTION HERE)

**August 29, 2016 Bylaws and SR's Draft Minutes:**

**Item d.** Revision of the SR's to reflect the instruction on our agenda templates regarding speakers time. M/S Jerome/Dacea. Committee agreed there is some confusion. Clarification was needed. Motion passes 5-0-1.

## Item 9.4

### REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM SEEKING APPROVAL OF LAND USE RECOMMENDATION

**Name/Committee:** Urban Design and Preservation Advisory Committee

**Case Number:** ENV-2016-1672-EAF

**Name/Location:** 738-742 Parkman

**Text of Motion:** The Silver Lake Urban Design and Preservation Advisory Committee moves that the Silver Lake Neighborhood Council (SLNC) recommend support for the vesting tentative tract map of a 9-unit small lot subdivision at 738-742 Parkman

**Vote:** Passed 7Y 3N 1A

How will this motion be implemented, and by whom? If the motion is supported by the SLNC, a letter in support will be forwarded to the Department of City Planning by the Chairs of the Urban Design and Preservation Advisory Committee.

Committee's discussion from the draft meeting minutes:

Kristin Lonner, representative:

She discussed some of the changes to the project based on community input from prior appearances before the Committee. These changes include the rooftop decks, which have been moved inward to allay neighbors' concerns.

Regarding concerns about the scale of the project, she noted that there is an 8 unit project behind this one on a lot that's half the size. The FAR is 3 to 1. However, the project is only proposing 1.27 to 1. That is significantly below what is allowed. Also, we're at 9 units, instead of 10.

She also discussed the height of the project and single family zone ordinances vs. multifamily ordinances. The maximum allowable height for this project is 36 ft plus a dog house. We're at 30 ft plus an 8 ft doghouse. This is nine separate buildings, 9 single family homes. We are 30 ft from alley line to roof line in height.

She said that the project has proposed green screens on all sides, a living wall. There is a river walk wall here. We will save that wall. We took to heart what was around us. There is modern Spanish design. We wanted the project to functionally look like the surrounding buildings. That's more in keeping with what is seen in the neighborhood.

In regards to a question about grass tree design, she said that the tree will be saved. Regarding concerns about the durability of the tiles, she said that custom.tiles.com is the company providing the tiles.

Eli Malkin, who owns a neighboring building, asked given the rising grade, what will one see from across the street? A Male Project Representative said that you would see some progression.

Malkin asked about trees. The Male Representative said there will be trees.

Terry Colitis, who resides at 646 Parkman, said that he's walked by that place daily for 40 years. The place has been terrible. I welcome this to the neighborhood. I am not opposed.

Christian Nova, who lives nearby, notes an omission on the project presentation media. Not shown is a single unit structure. There are 3 story structures next to one story structures.

A Woman named Christine, who lives on Occidental, asked does the height obstruct the views of some neighbors across the alley? Lonner replied yes.



A Man, who lives nearby, said the view now is very protected. What good will this bring to our community? Last week we saw that the Botanica restaurant and market project will take away a liquor store. Here I don't see any benefit for this project. It takes away land and endangers species. It doesn't provide affordable housing. It benefits the 1 percent. What do you say?

Lonner replied that the reality is that when we provide housing across a spectrum, we make housing more affordable for everyone. Providing more housing is a goal for the City. An increase in the housing supply is critically important.

Density guidelines allow us to build 10 units, we're only building 9. We could build up to 13 units with greater height. The goal is to provide more housing. We've worked hard to match design of the community. We've tried to be responsible. Regarding his concerns about bio life, Lonner said we'll take a look at it.

Christine asked about whether there would be any impact on taxes in neighborhood from the project. Another stakeholder replied that your properties are 1% of the purchase price you paid for your home so there would be no impact for you.

Barbara Ringuette, who spoke as a stakeholder, asked how many parking spaces will be lost? Also, if the City decides that the driveway can't be cut through the wall, what is plan b?

A Project Representative said the driveway is 20 ft. We're looking at the wall. Rosa Max asked have any of the adjustments changed? The Project Representative said we're adding greenery. That helps with value.

Bob Lisauskas said this is perhaps one of the most sensitive multi-family projects that we've seen at this Committee in years. He offered congratulations. To the assembly he said you guys should be so happy that a developer is coming in and listening to you and accommodating you. Any crappy developer could come in and build a crappy project. You should really consider that.

Nobody likes to lose their views. These developers have moved balconies and allowed light. That's a job well done. There are romantic views within the courtyard. Great job, said Lisauskas.

Rusty Millar said I'm going to echo that. He said that this is the best looking project that he's seen in 10 years. People aren't complaining about the architecture itself. Clearly you've addressed many of the neighbor's concerns. You're not guaranteed views in this town, he stressed.

Plante added that you're not entitled to your view under California law. This has been a consistent law for over 100 years. Los Angeles has no view protection ordinance. A M annotated the irony of the views provided by the roof top decks. Millar responded that the City is called that "open space".

Carol Cetrone referred to a letter written about the project. Can you discuss the last paragraph about separation? Lonner said that's the back-up aisle, which is required.

Cliff Towne said that he want to echo Lisauskas' sentiments. We really appreciate the changes you made for the neighbors. I feel your pain for loss of views for the neighbors. However, you guys have done much of what we asked for.

Anne-Marie Johnson said this is too large for the neighborhood. The loss of views doesn't impact my opinion. However, she said that she is troubled by the loss of views. She said that she is concerned that the financial plan drives design decisions. She said that she cannot support a small lot subdivision that's really a community plan. It's lovely but her first responsibility is to tenants and homeowners. Her priority is the uniqueness and quality of housing in Silver Lake. This doesn't do it.

Jerome Courshon said that he wanted to echo what Lisauskas and Towne have said. You've done a lot to accommodate the neighbors. The project is beautiful stylistically. It's a nice looking project. The issue is roof top decks. That is the trend.

He said he lives across the street from rooftop decks. There was a party 200 ft. from him recently. He heard everything. That's the problem with rooftop decks in Silver Lake. The more units that have these in Silver Lake, the more problems about that come to our Board all the time. He suggests losing the rooftop decks. Perhaps lose use of them after a certain hour.

Joe Ferrell asked the project representatives to discuss the rooftop decks. Lonner said there is a 10 ft setback for them now. This has cut the size of the decks in half. They are required open space. She said that she lives in a hillside community as well. However, she noted that loud parties can happen in back yards or homes too.

Plante asked would you consider having a rule prohibiting AirBnB type short rentals, which impacts housing costs? Lonner replied that we're not a condo. Ferrell asked can you put something in the plan about structures on the roof? People add things like canopies.

Christina noted that there is a 3 story apartment building next door to her. People have parties till 2am. The sound echos out. What if there are 3-4 parties going on at all times, she wondered.

Another Representative for the Project said there is a noise ordinance. If you call the neighborhood prosecutor and the LAPD Senior Lead Officer they will address the issue over time. Christina replied we're trying to prevent it from happening. We don't need the rooftop decks. You're creating the problem.

The Man who questioned the value of the project for the community noted that since last week, the balcony setback hasn't gotten smaller. The dog houses are unchanged. Why is this praise happening? We can do better. This is mediocrity. We shouldn't settle for it.

Plante told Lonner and the other project representatives that you guys have done a good job.

Barbara Ringuette spoke about letters received in packet. This is a big change for this community. There will be many changes for people who aren't even here. The primary goal of the community plan is to

preserve single and multi family neighborhoods, that's 1-2 story buildings, nothing higher: no dog houses or roof decks.

This kind of project sets a giant precedent for the neighborhood. There is nothing like this nearby. It's pretty but there is loss of 2 parking spaces. We can't be sure that everyone will park onsite. There is an error in the drawing. The setbacks aren't properly shown. You're proposing 20 ft setbacks. Other units have 29 ft and 32 ft setbacks. That's very different. This is inaccurate. The setback is actually 9ft. closer. The view from the street will be more massive.

Regarding affordable housing, Ringuette said that she met with planning and others as a Budget Advocate. There are units that aren't occupied that will be sold or rented downtown to the same types of people who'd like to buy here. Trickle down is a false concept.

She said that she is concerned for the entire neighborhood. This will set a precedent. I'd like to see downsizing. She has her own drawings that show the building is more massive than what has been described. Plante said that's not accurate.

Lonner said there is a 20 ft building line from the property line, from the sidewalk backwards. We can't build there. We are compliant. Responding to the Ringuette's density concern, Lonner said we are two lots, not one, so this is different. Directly behind us is an 8 unit project on one lot. It's 3-stories with dog houses directly behind us.

A Man said this looks right into his backyard. He said he's not happy. This will create the effect of a huge looming building next to someone's view.

Plante asked for a vote on the project, noting that nobody is ever going to be happy.

Plante made the motion. Millar seconded.

Straw Poll:

2 people in favor of the project 6 opposed to the project

Ringuette said that she wants a parking amendment. Plante said we can't entertain that at this point and not from Ringuette.

VOTE

7-3-1

PASSED

**Date:** August 10, 2016

**Committee/Requestor:** Bellevue Park Advisory Board

**Text of Motion:** The Bellevue Park Advisory Board recommends that the Silver Lake Neighborhood Council moves to provide up to \$250.00 to purchase granola bars to distribute at the Annual Halloween Celebration.

**Committee Vote:** No

**Describe the event or project in detail:** More than 800 community members attend this Annual Halloween Celebration October 31 from 4-8:00 p.m. Children under the age of 10 will visit the “Village” and receive their treat at various houses. As in the past two years, packaged granola bars will be distributed at the SLNC House.

**What is the timeline for the project?**

Granola bars will be purchased two weeks before the event. Labels with the SLNC logo will be affixed to each package. On October 31 from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. the treat will be handed to children at Bellevue Park.

**What is the total budget for the project? If this is a funding motion, please submit a completed Funding Request Form to the Treasurer at least 3 days before the Governing Board Meeting.**

Vendors reviewed: CVS—6 bars granola \$4.49; 365—6 bars granola \$3.99; Smart and Final—box of 48 \$12.79. Smart and Final has been used two past years with expenditure under \$160.00. To comply with DONE requirements, label with logo needs to be affixed to each bar. It is uncertain whether SLNC has available (600) labels with logo, if not, labels will need to be purchased.

**From which budget line(s) are the funds to be drawn?**

Outreach

**How will this motion be implemented, and by whom?**

If the motion is supported by the SLNC, the Treasurer will use the SLNC credit card and purchase the granola bars and labels. The Bellevue Park Advisory Board will affix labels on each bar. On October 31, volunteers from SLNC will assist in the distribution of the bars. In the event, SLNC members are unavailable; the PAB will recruit the volunteers. PAB will also create the cardboard house where the distribution will occur.

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM SEEKING APPROVAL OF FUNDING, PROGRAMS, OR EVENTS**

**Date:** August 13, 2016

**Name/Committee:** Patty Jausoro, Treasurer

**Text of Motion on the Agenda:** • Authorize payment to Apple One for up to \$500 per month for services ongoing for rest of current fiscal year.

**Describe the event/project in detail.** Payment for services for 4 meetings in June / July

**What is the total budget for the project?** \$500.00 per month

**What is the timeline for the project?** Asap

**From which budget line(s) are the funds to be drawn?** Outreach.

**How will this motion be implemented, and by whom?** The Treasurer pay on line.

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM SEEKING APPROVAL OF FUNDING, PROGRAMS, OR EVENTS**

**Date:** August 13, 2016

**Name/Committee:** Patty Jausoro, Treasurer

**Text of Motion on the Agenda:** • Authorize payment to Apple One for June July charges of \$473.55

**Describe the event/project in detail.** Payment for services for 4 meetings in June / July

**What is the total budget for the project?** \$473.55

**What is the timeline for the project?** Asap

**From which budget line(s) are the funds to be drawn?** Outreach.

**How will this motion be implemented, and by whom?** The Treasurer pay on line.

## MOTION REQUEST

**Date:** August 13, 2016

**Committee/Requestor:** Anne-Marie Johnson

**Text of Motion:** Moves that the Silver Lake Neighborhood Council spend up to **\$500.00** on copies of the Gas Leaf Blower Bilingual informational Flyer, approved by the board in 2013, to be distributed by all At-Large and Regional Reps on request from residents.

**Committee Vote:**

**Describe the event or project in detail:**

The use of leaf blowers powered by any form of petrol is against the law in Los Angeles County. (LAMC 112.04c). Informational flyers, provide by the SLNC, will assist residents in working with their fellow neighbor to educate and ultimately stop this illegal practice by both property homeowner and gardener. **\$500.00** should be a sufficient amount of funding to provide enough bilingual flyers for all 21 board members.

**What is the timeline for the project?**

As soon as the motion passes.

**What is the total budget for the project? If this is a funding motion, please submit a completed Funding Request Form to the Treasurer at least 3 days before the Governing Board Meeting.**

BUDGET? \$500.00

**From which budget line(s) are the funds to be drawn? Outreach**

**How will this motion be implemented, and by whom? The Board**

If the motion is supported by the SLNC, (INSERT ACTION HERE)

## REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM SEEKING APPROVAL

**Date:** August 31, 2016

**Name/Committee:** Heather Carson

**Text of Motion on the Agenda:** The maker moves that the SLNC Governing Board request the Outreach Committee to come up with guidelines regarding the criteria for Newsletter submissions to bring back to the Board for a vote and until such time accept submissions that fall under the Content and Posting Guidelines of the Social Media Policy.

### **Describe the event/project in detail.**

Whereas the Newsletter is a tool for both Board Members and Stakeholders to communicate items of interest to Silver Lakers, in the interest of full transparency we need to set some guidelines as to the criteria being used to decide what is or isn't being included.

Several items submitted were not included in the July Newsletter and I was either not given a reason why or told they were out of room and would have to push it to another issue, which did not happen.

- Flyer for a program sponsored by LA Rec and Parks providing free summer lunch for kids 1-18 years old.
- An art and literary event taking place at Silver Lake's Los Angeles County Store.
- a post about Mayor Garcetti's HIRE LA's Youth which provides career exploration opportunities to low-income youth.
- an urgent message from LA Animal Services about shelters filled to capacity after the 4th of July with tips to reunite you with your lost pet and a link with photos of found animals.
- an email from Mayor Garcetti about the new Metro Bike Share going live in downtown LA.
- a message from Councilmember Mitch O'Farrell about a reform initiative to streamline the way entrepreneurs obtain permits and other benefits to the small business community.
- an announcement from City Hall re the City's Minimum Wage Ordinance going into effect on July 1.
- an item about the comment period being extended for the Small Lot Code was initially rejected until I reiterated its importance.
- a request from Mitch O'Farrell's office to fill out a survey on home sharing by August 31st was met with 'we will take a look' but received no further follow up.

I believe as Board Members it's our job to help sift thru and disseminate the multitude of emails we receive from various city agencies to 'promote more citizen participation in government and make government more responsive to local needs' as per the City Charter. I have been forwarding issues that I feel are pertinent to Silver Lake Stakeholder concerns. Previously, the Outreach Committee did not reject items for the newsletter unless they were self-promotion or promoting an event for profit. The revamping of the Newsletter has been fantastic but I think we should clarify the criteria for submissions for all to see.

### **From the SLNC Website and Social Media Policy:**

#### **CONTENT AND POSTING GUIDELINE**

All content posted on behalf of the SLNC-related site is to comply with Brown Act Requirements, DONE's ethical guidelines and Code of Civility for neighborhood councils and any policies specified by the owners of such sites. Content on the website and social media sites should be categorized as relating to either committee meetings or community interests.

In addition, content posted by anyone on behalf of the SLNC shall not contain any of the following:

1. Opinion in support of or opposition of any items that may be agendized or have been agendized but not resolved by the board.
2. Content that is in opposition or contradictory to a position the board has taken on any subject.
3. Content endorsing any business or political candidate.
4. Profane, discriminatory or harassing language or content.
5. Content that violates federal, state or local laws.

**What is the total budget for the project?** N/A

**What is the timeline for the project?** Would be implemented upon being voted.

**From which budget line (s) are the funds to be drawn?** N/A

**How will this motion be implemented, and by whom?** Outreach

## Item 9.10

### MOTION REQUEST

Date: August 29, 2016

Committee/Requestor: Bylaws and Standing Rules

Text of Motion: Move to amend Bylaw Article X Section 3, and Attachment B, regarding the minimum age to be eligible to vote in the a SLNC governing elections be raised from fourteen (14) years of age to eighteen (18) years of age and to raise the age from fourteen (14) years of age to eighteen (18) years of age to be eligible to run for a SLNC board seat.

Committee Vote: Yes

Describe the event or project in detail:

Raising the age of an eligible SLNC governing board representative to eighteen (18) years of age from fourteen (14) years of age, will allow the candidate, once elected, to be able to vote on all funding and/or contract issues as long as the elected candidate takes and passes the required Ethics and Funding Training and be a more vested member of the board. Board members younger than the age of 18 are prohibited from voting on budget, funding or contract items, limiting their ability to be an engaged and productive board member. Raising the voting age from fourteen (14) years of age to eighteen (18) years of age will be more consistent with the eligible age to run for a SLNC representative seat. Currently, Attachment B states, "Eligibility to Run for a seat, Stakeholders who are 14 years or older." **Proposed new language: "Eligibility to Run for a seat, Stakeholders who are 18 years or older."** Currently Article X Section 3 states, "All Community Stakeholders aged fourteen (14) and above shall be entitled to vote in the SLNC's elections." **Proposed new language: "All Community Stakeholders aged eighteen (18) and above shall be entitled to vote in the in the SLNC's elections."**

What is the timeline for the project?

Once the motion is approved by the board.

What is the total budget for the project? If this is a funding motion, please submit a completed Funding Request Form to the Treasurer at least 3 days before the Governing Board Meeting. N/A

BUDGET? N/A

From which budget line(s) are the funds to be drawn? N/A

How will this motion be implemented, and by whom?

The governing board.

If the motion is supported by the SLNC, (INSERT ACTION HERE)

August 29, 2016 Bylaws and Standing Rules Draft Minutes:

Item 6: M/S Dacea/Betsy. Darcy expressed that younger teenagers could use the board experience as a good way to become engaged in local/community issues. Nina thought 16 yrs old was a more appropriate age. Jerome stated



that the NC's should not be used as a "training ground" for teen. NC business is serious business. Motion passes  
4-1-1

## Item 11.1

**Arts & Culture Committee** - held our meeting on August 8th at LA County Store which showcases items made by artists and is dedicated exclusively to artisanal goods and art made in Los Angeles. They also curate art exhibits by local artists year round. We elected new co-chairs - Renee Dawson and Jennifer Palmer Lacy - Congrats! Heather Carson and Susannah Tantemsapya step down after serving for 2 years since September 13, 2014 having grown the FB Arts & Culture Page 'likes' from 436 to 752 and increased the FB Arts & Culture Group from 276 members to over 1200 and helped over 16 Silver Lake Community Groups and stakeholders receive \$19,000 in support from the Neighborhood Council for art events such as the Silver Lake Picture Show, the art panels at King Middle School, Material & Applications Turf, a mini-golf project, and art installations such as Vincent Lamouroux's "Projection" which has attracted over 5500 visitors to date and Anne Hars' "Up" project which received press coverage as far away as the UK.

## Item 11.2

### Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee

The committee met on August 29th and discussed the following:

Article IV: Definition of Stakeholder's "substantial and ongoing participation within the Neighborhood Council's boundaries...: Will discuss further at a future meeting.

Voted on an amendment to Article X, noticed on the SLNC Sept agenda.

Passed two SR advisory motions placed on the SLNC Sept agenda..

### 2016 SLNC Post-Election Report

The Silver Lake Neighborhood Council (“SLNC”) Election Committee recently concluded its task of organizing and promoting the 2016 Silver Lake Neighborhood Council Election. 983 stakeholders cast their ballots in the election. 366 of these voters took advantage of early online voting, which was offered for the first time this year. With 34,675 residents in Silver Lake, this translates to a turnout of 2.83%, which is a 30% decline from the 2014 election. Although Silver Lake's turnout declined from 2016, SLNC still achieved the fourth highest total turnout, and seventh highest turnout percentage of the 89 neighborhood councils with elections in 2016. Silver Lake also had the second highest turnout percentage among the neighborhood councils in Region 7; only Elysian Valley with a population that is nearly a fifth of the size of Silver Lake's had a greater turnout percentage.

We achieved these results despite having only the 51st largest budget toward elections out of 75 neighborhood councils that reported budget figures, and well below the \$7,041.78 average budget neighborhood councils throughout Los Angeles spent toward elections. When compared to the other five neighborhood councils in Region 7, and Eagle Rock which we also reached out to, only Atwater Village, with a population less than half of Silver Lake's, had a smaller budget. Three of the other six neighborhood councils we analyzed - Eagle Rock, Rampart Village, Elysian Valley - had a higher budget than Silver Lake despite a smaller population. Silver Lake also had the lowest cost per voter out of all of the neighborhood councils in Region 7. A comparison of Silver Lake with the other neighborhood councils in Region 7 and Eagle Rock is below.

In the weeks following the election, the SLNC Election Committee conducted conversations about the election both internally and with members of the Eagle Rock, Echo Park and Los Feliz election committees. This report consists of the knowledge gleaned from those discussions.

#### **Raising Awareness**

We found that raising awareness of the election was one of the biggest challenges. The vast majority of the stakeholders that we came into contact with during the run-up to the election had either never heard of the Neighborhood Council or was not aware of what its purpose was.

We had a fair amount of success tabling at the Silver Lake Farmer's Market. We were there every weekend possible, handing out flyers about the election and educating stakeholders. We also managed to recruit several candidates from discussing the Neighborhood Council with stakeholders at the Farmer's Market. That said, we felt we ultimately devoted too many resources to maintaining a Farmer's Market presence on a weekly basis and not enough to other avenues of outreach.

Besides the Farmer's Market, we also were present at other community events such as the Visions and Goals Meeting, Spring Egg-stravaganza, GPACC Spring Faire, and the community LADWP meeting.

We had a heavy presence on Facebook and a good clickthrough rate to the SLNC website. Nonetheless, there was a general feeling on the committee that we should have had Social Media Advertising up earlier and more resources to devote to it.

We also sent out an email newsletter to the community, and sent e-mails to SLNC grant recipients and stakeholders who signed-up at our Farmer's Market table.

In addition, we printed up large banners and posters and hung them throughout the neighborhood. We did run into significant difficulties finding good locations for the posters and banners. Most local business owners were unwilling to advertise the election, which was disappointing.

The other committees that we talked with had similar experiences although Eagle Rock, in particular, came up with a couple of clever ways to raise awareness. They printed up 5,000 election postcards, which they mailed (US mail) to every address in Eagle Rock. They also gave the postcards to public schools around the area, which went home in the kids' folders.

Eagle Rock also created a video promoting the election featuring some local celebrities that was quite successful, the link of which is below.

## **Candidate Forum**

Our experience with the candidate forum that was held at the Holy Virgin Mary Cathedral on Saturday, May 7, a week before the election, was mixed. We handed out hundreds of flyers, posted heavily on Facebook to promote it, and hired a food truck to give out free food. Despite our efforts, only approximately 75 stakeholders attended. We also felt that the moderator was hindered from asking more interesting and varied questions due to DONE limitations that prevented her from asking candidates different questions.

Lastly, we made the decision to accept some audience questions written on index cards but only after filtering them to remove any pointed, biased or aggressive questions. This placed us in the uncomfortable position of censors and created some ill-will in the room. While it is important that stakeholders feel that the candidate forum is interactive, the next Election Committee should consider whether there is a better way to take stakeholder questions that would not create ill-will between the Election Committee and the stakeholders in attendance.

The other committees had similar experiences, although Atwater Village wound up having a very well-attended and successful forum, perhaps attributable to the quality of their food.

## **Election Day**

On Election Day itself, the Committee did an effective job in addressing concerns raised about parking at Micheltorena Elementary School, where the election has traditionally been held. Upon our investigation we realized that in past elections, there was confusion as to where voters could park. To address the parking issue, we a) received permission from St. Francis Church to use its parking lot as a back-up and b) we had committee volunteers on Micheltorena and in the parking lot on Golden Gate Avenue directing voters to available parking. These steps better ensured that Election Day went smoothly, and that stakeholders would be able to find parking to exercise their vote.

It should be noted that Micheltorena Elementary School was not the Board's first choice of a location for the election; the Holy Virgin Mary Cathedral was. The main concern with Micheltorena was with the parking. However, once the Election Committee was finally approved by the Board, we found out that the Holy Virgin Mary Cathedral was not available on May 14 to hold the election. The next Election Committee should consider whether it makes sense to hold the election at Holy Virgin Mary Cathedral, Micheltorena, or some other location in the future. And if a location other than Micheltorena is chosen, the Election Committee or the Board should book that location much earlier than was done this time.

## **Challenges**

Nearly everyone we talked to agreed that the biggest impediment to having successful elections was the City of Los Angeles and DONE. Those surveyed found them difficult to communicate with and a source of a lot of conflicting and confusing information. For example, at one point, DONE provided us with paper voter registration forms so we could register stakeholders by paper while we tabled. We found this to be an effective tool since no one on the Committee had a tablet to register stakeholders. However, when we turned the registration forms in, we found out that those who register by hand cannot vote online, and we were told not to register stakeholders using the paper forms again. On another occasion, after we provided DONE with ideas of places to set-up "pop-up voting" locations in response to DONE's request, we did not hear from DONE for days. When we did hear back, DONE picked a pop-up location (at a SLNC board meeting) that was not one of the locations that we suggested, and was not an effective location for registering new voters.

With paper forms not an option, we found it difficult to register stakeholders during our outreach efforts without having access to tablets or without DONE representatives who were willing to come with a tablet to register voters when we tabled. We received numerous complaints from stakeholders who encountered difficulties voting online after registering. DONE repeatedly assured us that there were no issues on its end but the frequency with which we heard complaints implied otherwise.

Our Committee also found that the SLNC bylaws and Standing Rules were both confusing and the source of other impediments. For example, the Bylaws are unclear as to whether they preclude Board Members from participating on the Election Committee, and whether only the seven members on the Committee could vote. Although Board Members informed us that Board Members could not serve on the Election Committee, nowhere is that expressly specified in the Bylaws or Standing Rules. Stakeholders communicated to us that they were turned off by the documentation requirements that the Bylaws mandate for stakeholders to vote. These documentation requirements also made it more challenging to register stakeholders on the fly because many do not carry around the requisite documentation on them. We also believe that these documentation requirements likely contributed to excessively long lines on Election Day.

There was also a lot of confusion over the difference between registering for City/State/National elections and registering for the Neighborhood Council elections. This was exacerbated by the fact that our Neighborhood Council election was on May 14, which was overshadowed by the more prominent California primary three weeks later. We did our best to educate stakeholders about this, but this still turned out to be an impediment.

Lastly, we wish we had had greater support from the SLNC board for Election Committee activities. Elections provide an opportunity for Neighborhood Councils to promote the role they play in their communities and to highlight their accomplishments. Board involvement is a crucial component of that. Aside from a couple of exceptions, there was an inability, an unwillingness (or both) from most of the Board when it came to assisting with the elections. This manifested itself mostly in the lack of manpower to help the Elections Committee execute its outreach activities.

Not having at least one board member serve as an active liaison between the Committee and the Board resulted in some confusion that hindered the Election Committee's outreach activities. For example, the Board allocated four election-specific newsletters that were to come out of the Outreach Committee's budget. The Election Committee provided content on several occasions for inclusion in the newsletter. However, instead of going toward an election-specific newsletter, this content was mixed into the SLNC general newsletter. We believe that having a board liaison actively working with the Election Committee could have helped clarify that the content we were creating should be set aside for the election-specific newsletters that were allocated for the Committee.

We understand that some of this hesitancy for the Board to get involved in helping the Election Committee was rooted in confusion over what was appropriate for Board Members to do in connection with the Election Committee. While there were well-intentioned concerns that the Election Committee should have independence from the Board to avoid any improper Board influence on the conducting of elections, that does not mean the Board is not able and should not support the Election Committee in the execution of its outreach activities. This is especially true for Board Members who are not running for re-election, where their involvement would not raise the same concerns about improper influence of the Board on the Election Committee.

## **The Future**

We have a number of recommendations that the Election Committee and the Board should consider to improve SLNC elections in the future.

### **Recommendations for Future Election Committees**

Face-to-face interactions seem to be the best technique to improve awareness of the elections. We recommend spending more time canvassing the neighborhood as opposed to focussing on a gathering spot like the Farmer's Market where we tended to see the same people (and the same type of people) each week.

Start the planning process earlier. We should have a full and active committee in place at least a month or two earlier, so that we could get earlier approval from the Board to operate as a Committee and begin collaborating with the Board, the Outreach Committee, and other committees. This will also enable the Committee to book the location for the election earlier, so SLNC can have the election at a preferred location. We also should have started outreach for the Candidate Forum earlier and focused on more targeted advertising for the forum to better leverage the presence of the food truck as a way to entice stakeholder attendance.

Assign a Committee member to be a Social Media Coordinator who is responsible for social media advertising. We could have done a better job of having a consistent and strategic social media presence. Having a committee member assigned responsibilities for this would ensure that we are not letting this outreach tool fall through the cracks.

Utilize the four election-specific newsletters allocated for the Election Committee to be e-mailed out to stakeholders.

Recommend that the Election Committee not disband until the next election, but stay active to assist the SLNC in implementing these changes and petitioning DONE to improve its practices. If this recommendation is implemented, we hope that the Committee will have stronger momentum to start planning for the next election much earlier.

### **Recommendations to the Governing Board**

We recommend doubling the budget of the election committee to \$8,000 to at least match the average spent by neighborhood councils in Los Angeles, and to not limit our outreach options. Specifically, this \$4,000 increase will allow the Election Committee to conduct a direct mail campaign, which the Eagle Rock Neighborhood Council said cost approximately \$4,000 for a neighborhood council with a similar population as Silver Lake.

We strongly feel that the Board leadership should encourage Board Members, or at least Board Members not running for re-election, to assist the Election Committee. In particular, the Board should require and enforce the requirement that there be one current Board Member be actively involved on the Election Committee and be a liaison to the Board. This was supposed to be in effect this year, but to little success.

The Neighborhood Council Bylaws and Standing Rules should be revised as follows:

Clarify in the Bylaws whether a Board member or an individual seeking election can be a voting or non-voting member of the Election Committee;

Broaden membership on the Election Committee to include more than just seven voting members;

Require that a Board member be assigned by the Board to serve as a non-voting advisor to the Election Committee;

Specify a process for replacing committee members who are no longer active on the Committee, and are the sole representative of his or her region; and

Specify a process by which the Election Committee can continue functioning in non-Election seasons, including specifying a process for appointing co-chairs and allowing the Election Committee to vote on positions internally during that period.

Revise the Neighborhood Council Bylaws to a) streamline the definition of stakeholders to mean “those who live, work, own real property, or attend school in the neighborhood;” and b) remove the current documentation requirements in order to register to vote. Many stakeholders communicated to the Election Committee that they were concerned with the documentation requirements for registering to vote, and the Election Committee agrees that to promote fair and open elections, voter registration should be changed to self-affirmation. The Committee also recognizes that to implement that change, it may be necessary to streamline the definition of stakeholder to those who “live, work, own property, or attend school” in Silver Lake, which are qualifiers that would be practicable to verify with self-affirmation.

#### **Recommendations to Petition DONE**

Petition DONE to allow online registration up to Election Day.

Petition DONE to allow stakeholders to register and vote via their mobile phones.

Petition DONE to extend the hours of voting at the polls to six hours on Election Day.

Petition DONE to consider scheduling neighborhood council elections at times that are not close in timing to other more prominent national, state, or local elections.

Petition DONE to coordinate with the state Secretary of State or L.A. County Registrar of Votes so that voters who are registered with the Secretary of State are automatically registered at that address for neighborhood council elections without any additional registration.

Petition DONE to provide tablets to neighborhood councils to register stakeholders and/or allow neighborhood councils to register stakeholder by paper to vote online or in-person.

Thank you for reading and we hope this report helps the 2018 Silver Lake Neighborhood Council election be an ever bigger success.

## Item 11.4

**The Green Committee** will be holding our September meeting on Monday, September 19, 6:30pm at the Silver Lake Library.

Green Committee Meetings have been scheduled and booked at the library for every third Monday of the month on an as needed basis.

## Item 11.5

**The Outreach Committee** is working to engage more Silver Lake residents and stakeholders, fulfilling the Silver Lake Neighborhood Council's mission to serve as a liaison between the community and city government. In August Outreach:

Elected Terry Jackson to serve as co-chair

Heard a presentation from Len Kendall, digital media expert, on how SLNC can leverage digital strategies and social media to engage more Silver Lake stakeholders, focusing on: **Simplicity, Growth and Technology**

Upgraded and streamlined the newsletter template to be easier to read and more accessible to mobile users, which are the majority of viewers

Increased newsletter distribution to two issues per month

Edited website content to reflect new committees, news, etc.

Continued to place a monthly column by Anne-Marie Johnson in the *Los Feliz Ledger*

Continued posts on social media

Responded to well over two hundred inquiries from community members; worked with council offices to resolve key concerns; referred stakeholders to appropriate city offices

The committee is currently:

Evaluating existing social channels with the idea of recommending consolidation or elimination of some channels

Reviewing options to manage email database

Considering proposals to produce standard SLNC posters that can be used at events and meetings and distributed at local businesses



## Item 11.6

### 50+ Committee

Met on August 27<sup>th</sup> at Library.

Have a few items we're working on:

1. Working with the AT Center and potentially the history collective to schedule a joint screening of a film important to the history of Gay and Lesbian community in Silverlake.
2. Working with Friends of King and AT Center to coordinate art project.
3. Working on interfacing with appropriate officials to craft innovative housing policies for older residents, especially regarding new development in the area.
4. Creating "I Took the Stairs" project – stay tuned.
5. Working with GPACC to support appropriate plans for DASH updated lines.

## Item 11.7

### RESERVOIR COMMITTEE AUGUST 25, 2106 MEETING RECAP

1. FOCUS OF MEETING WAS ON REACHING OUT TO BOTH CITY AGENCIES AND LOCAL VOLUNTEERS
2. JOE HARRIS , RECREATION CENTER DIRECTOR PROVIDED A RECAP OF CENTER PROGRAMS PLANNED FOR THE FUTURE AND THE AVAILABILITY OF THE RECREATION CENTER FOR NC COMMITTEE MEETINGS
3. ADAM MILLER , CD 4 REP, PROVIDED AN EMAIL REPORT OF HIS MEETING WITH THE LOS ANGELES CONSERVATION CORP AND THE PROJECTS AND AREAS AROUND THE RESERVOIR THAT NEED ATTENTION
4. CONTACTS ARE BEING ESTABLISHED WITH VOLUNTEERS AT THE DOG PARK AND THE MEADOW CLEAN UP AND NATIVE PLANT MAINTENANCE

## Item 11.8

### Urban Design and Preservation Advisory Committee

At our August meeting, we approved a 9-unit small lot project on Parkman. Our September meeting will be held September 14.

## Item 11.9

The History Collective held its regular meeting on August 4th. We interviewed the artists Bill Wheeler and Bob Glover at Mush on Silver Lake Blvd. where they launched their studios over 50 years ago. We screened the documentary "Shotgun Freeway" in conjunction with the library to an enthusiastic standing room only crowd on August 31st (in lieu of our September meeting). The History Collective will have a table at the USC Archives Bazaar on October 15th. Finally, we are partnering with the Silver Lake library again for the launch of Michael Locke and Vince Brook's new book "Silver Lake Bohemia" on December 5th.

## Item 11.10

Governmental Affairs Committee met on Monday, August 15, 2016. Many motions had been passed at the August meeting of Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Coalition (LANCC) and were brought to the Committee for discussion and possible action. The Committee passed three motions:

(1) requesting a survey of speeds on City streets, (2) asking the Governor to declare an emergency re homelessness , and (3) bringing City fines on illegal dumping in line with County and State fines.

These will be re-calendared with additional information available to the public on the agenda for a September meeting along with multiple items continued for further information. We look forward to an active Committee.