

EXHIBIT A

Venice Neighborhood Council Resolution Opposing Reduction of Public Parking in Marina Del Rey

Whereas, the County of Los Angeles has indicated its intent, pending California Coastal Commission (CCC) approval, to lease four County-owned parcels in Marina Del Rey currently used as public parking lots (an aggregate of 806 public parking spaces) and identified on County maps as Parcels OT, FF, GG/52 and NR (see Exhibit 1) for the purpose of residential and commercial development, *and*

Whereas, the Land Use Plan of the certified Marina Del Rey Local Coastal Program (LCP) requires that areas designated for public parking can be redeveloped only as public parking or a park (LUP Section A.2.e, Recreation & Visitor Serving Facilities, Policies & Actions #12), *and*

Whereas, on February 17, 2009, the Venice Neighborhood Council passed a resolution requesting "...that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors suspend issuance of development permits and entitlements for any and all land/projects located within Marina del Rey proper until a **comprehensive Environmental Impact Report (EIR)** complying in full with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is prepared by the County Department of Regional Planning, **covering all such proposed or anticipated developments and addressing their environmental impacts on adjacent communities within the City of Los Angeles**, [emphasis added] or, in the alternative, until a Comprehensive LCP Update consisting of all proposed or anticipated developments within Marina del Rey for purposes of the Project be prepared and submitted to the California Coastal Commission for consideration and approval (a process exempt from CEQA because it is considered to be the functional equivalent of a CEQA compliant EIR)," *and*

Whereas, Los Angeles County declined to prepare a comprehensive EIR or a comprehensive Local Coastal Program (LCP) update and instead elected to prepare a major LCP amendment covering 5 selected projects (subsequently reduced to four projects and known by the County as the "pipeline" projects) with review by the CCC anticipated in October of this year, *and*

Whereas, the community of Venice experiences severe public parking problems on summer weekend days that create traffic gridlock and limits coastal access, and the certified LCP acknowledges that consistent with Coastal Act policies §30210 and §30252, Marina Parking lots serve as additional coastal access to the Pacific shore at Venice Beach, while the pending LCP Amendment deletes this language altogether, (*LUP Section A.1.c. Shoreline Access - Research Analysis - LCPA p.1-5 shows strikeout*), *and*

Whereas, the California Coastal Commission denied a previous plan to convert parking lots OT and FF to non-parking uses, accepting the findings of its staff, "...these lots are less than one mile from Venice beach, that experiences over 6,000,000 visitors a year. The Commission finds that Section 30221 and 30222 of the Coastal Act require that ocean front land suitable for public recreation be reserved for that purpose unless both present and foreseeable future demand has been met. All the above land [MDR parcels OT and FF] is suitable for recreation and... is needed to satisfy present and future foreseeable demand for recreational use. The Commission finds conversion of publicly owned recreation support land to private uses without consideration of other public, higher priority uses inconsistent with sections 30221 and 30222 of the Coastal Act," (*from page 11 staff report TH6b on January 25, 1996*), *and*

Whereas, as part of the LCP Amendment offered by Los Angeles County for approval by the CCC, the County included the "Right-Sizing Parking Study for the Public Parking Lots of Marina del Rey," prepared by Raju Associates in June 2010; and Tim Haas, an independent parking consultant commissioned by "We Are Marina Del Rey" (a Marina Del Rey advocacy group) to review the study, concluded, in part, "Based on our initial review and analysis we have determined that the Study falls short of providing a comprehensive solution to the marina parking issues... We feel that the proposed development plans could risk seriously affecting the public parking supply and create a shortage," *and*

Whereas, the pending LCP Amendment would substantially reduce both the number of public parking lots (from fourteen in current use to "numerous") and the aggregate number of public parking spaces (from 3,138 to 2,773 or fewer; the amendment is unclear); while altering other provisions that could substantially affect the immediate and future supply of public parking. Such provisions include, but are not limited to:

- establishing a minimum of only 1,200 public parking spaces to be maintained in the Marina by allowing future conversion of public parking lots to privately controlled lots containing designated public parking spaces,
- elimination of the stipulation that all privately developed parcels include all required parking for their projects on site

These changes would give operational control of those public parking spaces to a leaseholder whose private tenants and patrons may have conflicting needs for those spaces [*LCPA section A.2.d. Recreation & Visitor Serving Facilities, Findings, p. 2-12*];

Therefore be it resolved,

1. The Venice Neighborhood Council recommends that the City of Los Angeles:
 - a. oppose the conversion of parcels OT, FF, GG/ 52 and NR in Marina Del Rey from their current use as public parking lots to other uses,
 - b. oppose any amendment of the Marina Del Rey LCP that reduces public parking in Marina Del Rey,
 - c. testify before the California Coastal Commission requesting that it deny the Marina Del Rey LCP Amendment proposed by Los Angeles County, **and**
2. This resolution shall be distributed to the Los Angeles City Council, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the California Coastal Commission, Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, Los Angeles City Councilmember Bill Rosendahl, the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, We Are Marina Del Rey, the Mar Vista Community Council, the Del Rey Neighborhood Council, the Westchester/Playa Neighborhood Council, the Western Regional Alliance of Councils, Congresswoman Janice Hahn, State Senator Ted Lieu and State Assembly Member Betsy Butler.

EXHIBIT B

Venice Neighborhood Council Resolution Rejecting Marina Del Rey Redevelopment Project Traffic Study and Opposing Local Coastal Plan Amendment

Whereas, as of February, 2011, seventeen development projects in Marina Del Rey (referred to as the "Marina Del Rey Redevelopment Project" in LA County documents) had either been permitted or were in the process of being permitted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (see appendix A), *and*

Whereas, on February 17, 2009, the Venice Neighborhood Council passed a resolution (see appendix B) requesting that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors suspend issuance of development permits and entitlements for any and all land/projects located within Marina del Rey proper until a **comprehensive Environmental Impact Report (EIR)** complying in full with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is prepared by the County Department of Regional Planning, **covering all such proposed or anticipated developments and addressing their environmental impacts on adjacent communities within the City of Los Angeles**, [emphasis added] or, in the alternative, until a Comprehensive LCP Update consisting of all proposed or anticipated developments within Marina del Rey for purposes of the Project be prepared and submitted to the California Coastal Commission for consideration and approval (a process exempt from CEQA because it is considered to be the functional equivalent of a CEQA compliant EIR), *and*

Whereas, Los Angeles County declined to prepare a comprehensive EIR or a comprehensive Local Coastal Program (LCP) update and instead elected to prepare an LCP amendment covering 5 selected projects (known as the pipeline projects), *and*

Whereas, as part of the LCP Amendment offered by Los Angeles County for approval by the California Coastal Commission, an April 2010 traffic study was conducted by Raju Associates Inc. that purported to be comprehensive in scope, but was limited to the area:

...bounded by Washington Boulevard on the north, Jefferson Boulevard on the south, Pacific Ocean on the west and Lincoln Boulevard on the east. These locations fall within the County of Los Angeles and City of Los Angeles. Also included are the intersections of SR 90 and Mindanao Way

therefore ignoring regional impacts north of Washington Blvd, south of Jefferson Blvd and east of Lincoln Blvd, and

Whereas, Tom Brohard P.E, a licensed, qualified traffic engineer hired by the independent group "We Are Marina Del Rey," reviewed the 2010 traffic study of Raju Associates Inc, as well as previous traffic studies of Marina del Rey prepared in 1991 and in 1994 by DKS Associates, and found the following deficiencies (see appendix C):

1. Baseline traffic counts require revision
2. Trip generation for related projects has not been disclosed
3. Some trip generation rates are either outdated or incorrect
4. Conclusions made based on comparisons between current and past traffic studies are irrelevant
5. Significant traffic impacts and mitigation measures are incomplete
6. Queuing analysis was not included
7. The County's "Traffic Mitigation Fee program" does not guarantee improvements will be timely, if made at all
8. All feasible mitigation measures have not been studied

and because of these serious deficiencies Mr. Brohard concluded:

there is 'substantial evidence' that the Proposed Project will have adverse traffic impacts (both inside the unincorporated Marina del Rey and in the neighboring cities that surround the Marina) that have not been properly disclosed, analyzed, and mitigated... each of the significant traffic impacts outside the County's jurisdiction must be considered "significant and unavoidable," and

Whereas, should the Marina Del Rey Redevelopment Project be completed as currently configured, the underestimated traffic impacts, the insufficient mitigation measures and the failure to analyze and mitigate regional traffic impacts will lead to significant adverse traffic conditions for the City of Los Angeles, Culver City and the communities of Venice, Mar Vista, Del Rey and Westchester in particular;

Therefore be it resolved,

1. The Venice Neighborhood Council recommends that until such a time that:
 - a. a comprehensive traffic study for the Marina Del Rey Development Project is conducted that cures the deficiencies found in the April 2010 traffic study, analyses the regional impacts ignored by the April 2010 traffic study and
 - b. all mitigation measures are evaluated by *both* Los Angeles County and the City of Los Angeles and included in the Marina Del Rey Redevelopment Project Plans

the City of Los Angeles request that Los Angeles County halt permitting activities for new Marina Del Rey Redevelopment Project construction, that Los Angeles County comply with the City's request, and that the California Coastal Commission reject the County's Local Coastal Plan Amendment.

2. This resolution shall be distributed to the Los Angeles City Council, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the California Coastal Commission, Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, Los Angeles City Councilmember Bill Rosendahl, the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, We Are Marina Del Rey, the Mar Vista Community Council, the Del Rey Neighborhood Council, the Westchester/Playa Neighborhood Council, the Western Regional Alliance of Councils, Congresswoman Janice Hahn, State Senator Ted Lieu and State Assembly Member Betsy Butler.

EXHIBIT C

Amendment to Bicycle Harassment Ordinance

To: Bill Rosendahl
Councilman / District 11

Bill - Last week I listened to you explain the new Bicyclist anti-harassment ordinance on local radio - I think it is entirely appropriate to propose fines and have the legal muscle in place for incidents of physical assault by either passengers or drivers against anyone riding on a bike - I was particularly interested in the Fine structure as described - what one caller labeled as being "asymmetrical" since it required ONLY the accused driver / passenger of the car to pay a fine of \$1000 [if found guilty] PLUS all court costs & Legal Fees that according to both sides of the broadcasted conversation could run \$4000 to \$6000 more - My sense is that this is all well & good for incidents of Physical Assaults - But the crux of the matter seems to focus on what exactly constitutes "verbal assaults" - Again, as stated, bike riders can sue a driver for the \$1000 fine as well as having legal representation / Court costs that the driver [if found guilty] would also have to pay for - In this area, I think you and we have a decided problem.

As a long time Venice / West Side resident, a supporting voting constituent, and neighborhood bike rider I have been witness to the strange & wondrous phenomenon of weekend bicyclists who swarm to the Beach area, happily peddling along Abbott Kinney, Main Street SM or streaming down PCH or Sunset - Geared up, and doing their best to create their own mini version of the Tour de France Peloton - For the majority of them, during the week these law abiding, car driving residents are content to motor to work, run errands and generally do the LA driving thing - But on weekends, low & behold, outfitted in spiffy biker togs on or just casual beach wear and flip flops, all rules of the road are off - You & I have both seen numerous incidents of bike riders casually running stop signs, zipping across cross walks or everyone's personal favorite, riding 3 to 4 abreast down Main Street while talking on cel phones - This is behavior that I would consider being clearly abusive if not downright moronic.

So, here's the problem with the Ordinance for Harassment - In the instance of verbal "harassment" I believe the Ordinance as written has the potential to be severely exploited & misused from it's original [and I believe your heartfelt] intent - It's my understanding from your on-air discussion last week, that a bike rider can bring suit against a driver who he / she believes verbally harassed or distracted them - They can sue for damages [\$1000 fine] & legal costs - So if bikers are behaving like jerks and you tell them so it seems that they can sue for harassment - With no downside to them if proven wrong.

And the driver who successfully defends themselves gets.....well, the satisfaction of proving a negative.

I very much think that more thought needs to be put in place to modify the verbal harassment portion of the Ordinance - Especially the payment of legal fees for only one party - Make it balanced so that baseless claims / claims without merit & their claimants are penalized accordingly with payment for court costs to the defendant if they lose.

Just seems like the right thing to do - Equal protection under the law for all sides considered.

As always, best regards
Joseph Shields 1621 Shell Ave.
Venice CA

EXHIBIT D

State Department of Agriculture to Regulate Medical Cannabis

WHEREAS it has been 15 years since California Health and Safety Code Section 11362.5 was put into effect which provides, in pertinent parts: (A) To ensure that seriously ill Californians have the right to obtain and use marijuana for medical purposes where that medical use is deemed appropriate ... (C) To encourage the federal and state governments to implement a plan to provide for the safe and affordable distribution of marijuana to all patients in medical need of marijuana

WHEREAS since the enactment of California Health and Safety Code Section 11362.5, medical cannabis is currently grown without any oversight or standard of quality control by any Federal, State, County or City agency and it will likely take months or years for changes to the agriculture code to take effect which is unacceptable for the health and safety for the citizens of Los Angeles

WHEREAS, Los Angeles City's medical marijuana ordinance 181704 was enacted as a public safety measure for the purposes of enabling safe access to medical marijuana, ... so as to protect qualified patients, the neighborhoods, and the larger community of Los Angeles from, among other ills, the distribution of tainted marijuana ...

WHEREAS The City of Los Angeles does not have it's own agricultural department but instead relies upon the County and State

WHEREAS when the State Department of Agriculture was questioned why they were not regulating medical cannabis as an agricultural product their reply was to the effect because it is a federally illegal substance and Governor Brown or the Assembly must authorize them to regulate it

WHEREAS Section 3 of the California Food and Agricultural code states: It is hereby declared, as a matter of legislative determination, that the provisions of this code are enacted in the exercise of the power of this state for the purposes of promoting and protecting the agricultural industry of the state and for the protection of the public health, safety, and welfare

WHEREAS section 23 of the California Food and Agricultural code states: (a) Inasmuch as the planned production of trees, vines, rose bushes, ornamental plants, floricultural crops, and other horticultural crops is distinguishable from the production of other products of the soil only in relation to the time elapsing before maturity, plants and floricultural crops that are being produced by nurseries, whether in open fields or in greenhouses, shall be considered to be "growing agricultural crops" for the purpose of any laws that pertain to the agricultural industry of the state, and those laws shall apply equally to greenhouses and open field nursery operations

WHEREAS section 52 of the California Food and Agricultural code states: (001) As used in this chapter, "field crop products" includes grain crops, dry bean crops, seeds, forage crops, fiber crops, and other field crops and the manufactured products and byproducts of such field crops. (002) The director shall do all of the following: (a) Establish, by regulation, uniform standards for field crop products which shall conform as closely as possible to those which are established by the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture

Therefore, the VNC hereby requests Bill Rosendahl to initiate a motion at City Council requesting Governor Jerry Brown and the State Assembly to immediately create quality control and safety standards for the production and distribution of medical cannabis through the State and County Departments of Agriculture.

The following motion was introduced at the meeting of the Venice Neighborhood Council on XXXXXX date and was passed by a vote of XXXXXX.

Linda Lucks, President VNC

CC:
City Councilman Bill Rosendahl, Councilman.Rosendahl@lacity.org
Field Deputy Len Nguyen, len.nguyen@lacity.org

Research

http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2008/08-0923-s7_ord_181704.pdf

http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2008%5C08-0923-s7_ord_181530.pdf

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=fac&group=00001-01000&file=1-51>

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=fac&group=52001-53000&file=52001-52006>

COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT TO BE ATTACHED TO COUNCIL FILE #: 181704

To: Office of the City Clerk
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring St., Rm 360
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Council File Number: 181704
Department: Department Case Number:

DATE:

BODY OF CIS: (Max 100 word summary of purpose and impact)

In order to reduce the black marketing of medical cannabis and to protect the health and safety of the community, Therefore, the VNC hereby requests Bill Rosendahl to initiate a motion at City Council requesting Governor Jerry Brown and the State Assembly to immediately create quality control and safety standards for the production and distribution of medical cannabis through the State and County Departments of Agriculture.

Sincerely,

President, Venice Neighborhood Council

CC: patrice.lattimore@lacity.org;
Secretary@VeniceNC.org;

EXHIBIT E

Use 3rd party agriculture inspectors to regulate medical cannabis

WHEREAS it has been 15 years since California Health and Safety Code Section 11362.5 was put into effect which provides, in pertinent parts: (A) To ensure that seriously ill Californians have the right to obtain and use marijuana for medical purposes where that medical use is deemed appropriate ... (C) To encourage the federal and state governments to implement a plan to provide for the safe and affordable distribution of marijuana to all patients in medical need of marijuana

WHEREAS since the enactment of California Health and Safety Code Section 11362.5, medical cannabis is currently grown without any oversight or standard of quality control by any Federal, State, County or City agency and it will likely take months or years for changes to the agriculture code to take effect which is unacceptable for the health and safety for the citizens of Los Angeles

WHEREAS, Los Angeles City's medical marijuana ordinance 181704 was enacted as a public safety measure for the purposes of enabling safe access to medical marijuana "... so as to protect qualified patients, the neighborhoods, and the larger community of Los Angeles from, among other ills, the distribution of tainted marijuana ..."

WHEREAS The City of Los Angeles does not have its own agricultural department but instead relies upon the County and State

WHEREAS when the State Department of Agriculture was questioned why they were not regulating medical cannabis as an agricultural product their reply was to the effect because it is a federally illegal substance and Governor Brown or the Assembly must authorize them to regulate it

WHEREAS medical cannabis is an agricultural crop, the same as crops regulated by the County and State Department of Agriculture such as tomatoes, citrus and like all crops requires sun, water, fertilizers, pesticides, etc. In the production of medical cannabis potentially and known toxic and poisonous substances including: fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, fungicides and other chemicals that when used by non-professionals without oversight or standard can be hurtful and lethal to seriously ill and non-seriously ill citizens of Los Angeles. It is unacceptable for the citizens of Los Angeles to allow one more day to go by and an immediate short term solution is needed

WHEREAS USDA third party agricultural certification is currently used to great success to regulate the oversight and standards of quality control of agricultural crops by the federal and State governments. The Mendocino County's Sheriff's Office already uses third party inspection companies that inspect medical cannabis for compliance to the County's requirements for permitted growers for their medical cannabis grower.

Therefore, the VNC hereby requests Bill Rosendahl to initiate a motion at City Council requesting Governor Jerry Brown and the State Assembly to explore using qualified third party agricultural certification companies as an immediate and short term solution for ensuring the quality control and safety standards for the production and distribution of medical cannabis in Los Angeles.

The following motion was introduced at the meeting of the Venice Neighborhood Council on XXXXXX date and was passed by a vote of XXXXXX.

Linda Lucks, President VNC

CC:
City Councilman Bill Rosendahl, Councilman.Rosendahl@lacity.org
Field Deputy Len Nguyen, len.nguyen@lacity.org

Research

http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2008/08-0923-s7_ord_181704.pdf

http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2008%5C08-0923-s7_ord_181530.pdf

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=hsc&group=11001-12000&file=11357-11362.9>

COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT TO BE ATTACHED TO COUNCIL FILE #: 181704

To: Office of the City Clerk
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring St., Rm 360
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Council File Number: 181704
Department: Department Case Number:

DATE:

BODY OF CIS: (Max 100 word summary of purpose and impact)

In order to reduce the black marketing of medical cannabis and to protect the health and safety of the community, the VNC hereby requests Bill Rosendahl to initiate a motion at City Council requesting Governor Jerry Brown and the State Assembly to explore using qualified third party agricultural certification companies as an immediate and short term solution for ensuring the quality control and safety standards for the production and distribution of medical cannabis in Los Angeles.

Sincerely,

President, Venice Neighborhood Council

CC: patrice.lattimore@lacity.org;
Secretary@VeniceNC.org;

EXHIBIT F

Motion to support Ocean Charter School

Los Angeles Unified School District
Board of Education
333 South Beaudry Avenue, 24th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Ocean Charter School was co-founded by several Venice and Mar Vista parents, is currently attended by 51 Venice families and 78 Mar Vista families, and is and has co-located in classrooms on the Venice-adjacent Walgrove Elementary campus in Mar Vista for the last 4.5 years granted them by the Los Angeles Unified School District.

While the Venice Neighborhood Council may or may not support any Charter school co-occupying the Walgrove campus, should it be mandated that a school be on that site, we support the continuation of Ocean Charter School's co-occupation. We are concerned about any disruption to the education of Venice children that may result from dislocating students from attending school on the Walgrove Elementary campus.

Sincerely,

Venice Neighborhood Council

EXHIBIT G

MISSION STATEMENT

VNC SANTA MONICA AIRPORT AD HOC COMMITTEE

The Santa Monica Airport Committee shall inform the VNC Board of the current operations of the Santa Monica Airport as it affects Venice neighborhoods. It will suggest actions and act as a liaison with other neighborhood groups sharing similar concerns.

VNC Santa Monica Airport Committee Report

The Committee held its first meeting February 12, 2010. This report highlights the activities and progress of the Committee since its inception. It also briefly summarizes possible actions on which we are seeking stakeholder input to make additional recommendations to the Board of the Venice Neighborhood Council. One of the first activities was to conduct a survey of Venice residents, collecting data regarding the impact of Santa Monica Airport air traffic over Venice. More than 300 residents responded. The concerns can probably be summed up to be those that arise from the noise, those that arise from other environmental hazards, such as the use of leaded gasoline by airplanes flying in and out of SMO, and those that arise from the safety issues.

We have had regular meetings with Councilman Rosendahl's staff regarding our issues. Norm Kulla, District Director and Senior Counsel for Councilperson Rosendahl's office, has been instrumental in helping us obtain the information needed to advance our concerns. One of the main challenges has been to wade through the jurisdictional issues. Federal agencies and politicians have said the issues we raise are local and the local politicians have historically said that there is nothing they can do, as the navigation of airspace is a federal issue. We have worked hard to get through that maze and Councilman Rosendahl and his staff have been very helpful in promoting the idea that Los Angeles should exercise more authority over what happens at Santa Monica Airport. We have met with Congressman Waxman, to discuss the federal component, and he says for him it is also a jurisdictional issue with the FAA. Waxman's 30th congressional district includes Santa Monica and West Los Angeles. We also participated in a meeting with Representative Jane Harman and U.S. EPA Western Regional Director Jared Blumenfeld. Additionally, we have met with candidate Janice Hahn, and plan to continue the dialogue with her as our representative in Congress. We also met with FAA – Western-Pacific Region Airports Division representatives and continue to exchange follow-up information.

An out of the box idea has been for the City of Los Angeles to explore bringing a lawsuit against the city of Santa Monica or the FAA, on behalf of the citizens of Los Angeles who are adversely affected by SMO. We met with City Attorney Trutanich to discuss this issue. He promised to put a team of interns on the issue and to report back to us. It appears that there has been some delay in getting this done, due to city budget issues. Trutanich explained that he did not think the City had the resources at this time to pursue a lawsuit, but that he thought it was worth the exercise to consider it and to determine what the obstacles might be.

Other activities included a rally held at SMO on Earth Day, 2011 to bring awareness about the use of leaded fuel by piston planes flying in and out of the airport. The point made was that the EPA banned leaded fuel from automobiles with the Clean Air Act of 1996. Yet, flight school operations, which account for half of all SMO operations, use aircraft that are fueled by aviation gasoline that contains lead. Other piston aircraft that are not part of flight school operations at SMO are also using leaded fuel today. We also sponsored an earlier protest at Rose and Lincoln during a temporary airport shut down. The "Peace and Quiet" vigil was designed to emphasize what life could be like without the noise from SMO. We supported and encouraged the City Council resolution to include in the City's 2011-2012 Federal Legislative Program support for legislation or administrative action that would (1) alter the departure path at Santa Monica Airport (SMO) to enhance safety and reduce air pollution, and (2) close the flight schools at SMO. Councilpersons Rosendahl and Hahn introduced the resolution and it was passed by the City Council.

We are currently undertaking a petition drive to close flight schools at SMO that use leaded fuel, have all aircraft departing the airport fly to the north instead of the south, stop the use of leaded fuel in propeller planes flying out of the airport, and to ban jets due to air pollution, noise and the threat of a catastrophic crash. In addition, we are reviewing environmental practices of airports throughout the world for additional background information, researching the number of schools and children affected by SMO noise pollution and other health risks, and preparing material that summarizes the health risks to residents surrounding the airport.

The current agreement between the FAA and the City of Santa Monica expires 2015. A major goal is to have a plan of action for proposals for how the city of Santa Monica deals with the expiration of this agreement and to explore the possibility of closing the airport or at least implementing additional mitigating procedures post 2015. We are also focusing on short term solutions. We have reached out to other groups who are working on common issues, such as Concerned Residents Against Airport Pollution and the Mar Vista Community Council Airport Committee. We are in the early stages of planning a joint town hall for additional community input and discussion. Some of the possible actions that we are seeking community input on are discussed below.

1.) Close Airport

(Possibly replace with park and Area Emergency Center)

What authority does Santa Monica have to close the airport? Santa Monica Airport sits in a densely populated area and the concerns are that the buffers and safety zones currently in place are not safe. Some residents surrounding SMO live as close as 250 feet away from the airport. Congressman Waxman recently attached an amendment to the FAA Reauthorization Bill of 2011 instructing the FAA to cooperate with the Santa Monica City Council in addressing the lack of runway safety at SMO.

2.) Ban Jets/Ban Some Classes of Jets

Current flight paths utilized at Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) and SMO cause jets at SMO to idle on the runways while waiting for clearance by LAX air traffic controllers. FAA officials say departing aircraft from Santa Monica and LAX have a three-mile separation requirement and jets leaving both airports must be in contact with air traffic controllers. While idling on the runways, these jet aircraft spew high concentrations of air emissions into neighboring West Los Angeles communities, such as Mar Vista and Palms. Separate studies by UCLA, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and a 1999 health risk assessment conducted by LAUSD have found evidence of very high levels of ultra-fine particles and black carbon linked to Santa Monica Airport. At SMO jets are using a runway that is shorter than the FAA normally requires. Airports with runways like SMO's (about 5,000 feet long) are usually required to have Runway Safety Areas (RSA) beyond the main runway. The FAA waived this requirement at SMO. The FAA has apparently volunteered to assist in the financing of installation of an Engineered Material Arresting System ("EMAS") on one or both runway ends. EMAS is a bed of porous concrete blocks that collapses under the weight of an aircraft's nose gear and is designed to slow the aircraft, helping prevent collateral fatalities. The problem with this proposed solution is that it is insufficient to stop large jets and to prevent overshoots involving smaller planes.

3.) Eliminate Flight Schools

Santa Monica currently has six flight schools. They practice what is called "touch and goes," in which student pilots take off from SMO and circle around to the south of the airport and then head east, returning to the airport to land and then take off again. They repeat the same procedure over and over again. On weekends they practice "taxi back" procedures which simply mean they land and then go to the end of the runway before starting the procedure over.

4.) Ban Leaded Fuel At SMO.

Leaded fuel is used in all propeller planes including those used by the flight schools at SMO. Jet fumes and dangerous particulates spew into neighboring communities during idling and take off. Noise pollution from both jets and propeller planes are known to contribute to high blood pressure,

heart disease and learning disabilities in children. Plans from SMO impact over 16 K-12 schools in Venice and Mar Vista alone and many more pre-schools.

- 5.) Ban Flight Training Procedures that Continuously Overfly Neighborhoods
(Specifically Touch & Goes, Stop & Goes, Taxi Backs)
- 6.) Require Limited Hours and Types of Operation
(For Example As Torrance Airport Does)
- 7.) Require Most Quiet Throttle Use For Take Offs

The maximum noise level for aircraft operating at SMO is 95 decibel single Event Noise Exposure Level (SENEL) as measured at two remote noise monitoring stations located 1,500 feet from either end of the runway. The placement of the noise monitors and the maximum allowable noise limit were established in Section 16 of the 1984 Santa Monica Airport Agreement between the City of Santa Monica and the FAA and was subsequently codified in Santa Monica's Municipal Code under Subchapter 10.04.04 (Aircraft Noise Abatement Code).

- 8.) All Departures Overfly Santa Monica/Fair Alternation Of Flight Departures Between Venice and Santa Monica/Limit Number of Flyovers

(For example monthly change turn from North to South as in Germany)

The SMO's recommended "visual flight rules (VFR) procedure for single engine aircraft departing Runway 21 are as follows: "Departures to the south are requested to turn left at Lincoln Boulevard (1 mile west) at or above 800 feet MSL" and continue their climb to 1,400 feet MSL. This so-called "Fly Neighborly Program" basically directs SMO's VFR departures to the west over Venice, and thus avoid disturbing Santa Monica residents.

The FAA tested a modification to the departure track for piston-powered aircraft departing from SMO under instrument flight rules (IFR). The FAA proposal routed piston-powered IFR departures on a heading of 250° immediately after departure which routed aircraft over the Sunset Park and Ocean Park neighborhoods of Santa Monica, rather than Venice. Santa Monica residents complained and through lobbying efforts by the City of Santa Monica along Congressperson Waxman, the FAA's proposal is now on hold.

- 9.) Increasing LA's Role In SMO Decision Making.

It appears the city of Los Angeles has no formal role in decisions concerning SMO.

- Airport Commission. We believe there is wide support for some sort of LA representation on the SMO Airport Commission. Most people seem to acknowledge that Santa Monica will not designate LA status as a fully voting member of the Santa Monica Airport Commission and that perhaps it is more realistic to expect an *ex officio* role.
- Raising issue as to the role LA can play in formulating the RAND study and other various consultant studies commissioned by the City of Santa Monica.
- Creation of a formal role for the City of Los Angeles in the planning process for SMO post 2015.
- Exploiting jurisdictional argument based on portions of SMO that are in Los Angeles city limits. An eastern section of SMO is in the City of Los Angeles and the property is leased by L.A. to Santa Monica.
- Increase Los Angeles federal lobbying efforts to advance interests of Los Angeles residents.

EXHIBIT H TREASURER'S REPORT



U.S. BANCORP SERVICE CENTER
P. O. Box 6343
Fargo, ND 58125-6343



CITY OF LA - DONE

ACCOUNT NUMBER XXXX-XXXX-XXXX-1949
STATEMENT DATE 07-21-11
TOTAL ACTIVITY \$ 1,515.84

000001815 1 MB 0.390 106481175492633 P
HUGH HARRISON
VENICE NC
2808 GRAYSON AVE
VENICE CA 90291-4648

"MEMO STATEMENT ONLY"
DO NOT REMIT PAYMENT

NEW ACCOUNT ACTIVITY					
POST DATE	TRAN DATE	TRANSACTION DESCRIPTION	REFERENCE NUMBER	MCC	AMOUNT
07-07	07-06	EIG*IPOWER 866-5392854 MA PUR ID: 26020530 TAX: 0.00	24351781187004731654643	5988	20.00
07-13	07-12	CTC*CONSTANTCONTACT.COM 866-2892101 MA PUR ID: 1101280714767 TAX: 0.00	24351781193049141323562	5988	30.00
07-14	07-13	EIG*IPOWER 866-5392854 MA PUR ID: 26175443 TAX: 0.00	24351781194054360322633	5988	16.95
07-14	07-12	OFFICE DEPOT #951 CULVER CITY CA PUR ID: 095120110712 TAX: 0.53	24445741194100205607928	5943	6.53
07-15	07-14	SMARTNFINAL33210303329 VENICE CA PUR ID: 281195611641081 TAX: 0.00	24164071195929090012327	5411	1,289.29
07-15	07-14	SMARTNFINAL33210303329 VENICE CA PUR ID: 001195614101168 TAX: 0.00	24164071195929090012335	5411	8.49
07-18	07-16	SMARTNFINAL33210303329 VENICE CA PUR ID: 001197673258582 TAX: 0.00	24164071198929110015677	5411	55.38
07-18	07-16	SMARTNFINAL33210303329 VENICE CA PUR ID: 001197768549078 TAX: 0.00	24164071198929140016689	5411	39.92
07-18	07-17	SMARTNFINAL33210303329 VENICE CA PUR ID: 081189006407053 TAX: 0.00	24164071198929170016054	5411	48.19
07-18	07-14	OFFICE DEPOT #951 CULVER CITY CA PUR ID: 095120110714 TAX: 0.09	24445741196100228522961	5943	1.09

WEB - Server
WEB - E-mail
WEB - Server
OFF - Copies
CIP - B69
CIP - B69
CIP - B69
CIP - B69
Cut - Refreshments
OFF Copies

Default Accounting Code:

CUSTOMER SERVICE CALL 800-344-5696	ACCOUNT NUMBER		ACCOUNT SUMMARY	
	XXXX-XXXX-XXXX-1949		PREVIOUS BALANCE \$.00	
SEND BILLING INQUIRIES TO: C/O U.S. BANCORP SERVICE CENTER, INC U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION ND P.O. BOX 6335 FARGO, ND 58125-6335	STATEMENT DATE	DISPUTED AMOUNT	PURCHASES & OTHER CHARGES \$1,515.84	
	07-21-11	\$.00	CASH ADVANCES \$.00	
	AMOUNT DUE		CASH ADVANCE FEE \$.00	
	\$ 0.00		CREDITS \$.00	
	DO NOT REMIT		TOTAL ACTIVITY \$1,515.84	

**2011 - 2012 Expenditures to Budget
July 1, 2011 - July 21, 2011**

	DONE Category	Current Yr Budget by Acct	% of Bdgt	Amt spent Current Month	Amt Spent Current Fiscal Year	Amt Available to Spend	% Budget Remain
Annual Allocation		\$40,500.00					
Rollover							
Sub Unallocated Budget		\$40,500.00					
Neighborhood Comm. Projects 10-11		16,000.00					
Total		56,500.00					

Budget

100 Operations

Office Supplies	OFF	\$500.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$500.00	100%
Copies	OFF	\$400.00		\$7.62	\$7.62	\$392.38	98%
Office Equipment	OFF	\$750.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$750.00	100%
Staffing/Apple One	TAC	\$250.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$250.00	100%
Telephone Expense	MIS	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	100%
Storage	FAC	\$400.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$400.00	100%
Board Retreat	EDU	\$400.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$400.00	100%
General Operations	MIS	\$1,000.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00	100%
sub Total Operations		\$3,700.00	7%	\$7.62	\$7.62	\$3,692.38	100%

200 Outreach

Copies / Printing	POS	\$500.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$500.00	100%
Facilities For Public	FAC	\$2,200.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,200.00	100%
Refreshments	EVE	\$400.00		\$48.19	\$48.19	\$351.81	88%
Web Site & e-mail	WEB	\$3,000.00		\$66.95	\$66.95	\$2,933.05	98%
Advertising & Promotions	ADV	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0%
Newsletter Production	NEW	\$1,030.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,030.00	100%
Newsletter Printing	NEW	\$3,800.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,800.00	100%
Newsletter Delivery	NEW	\$2,800.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,800.00	100%
Elections	ELE	\$440.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$440.00	100%
General Outreach	EVE	\$1,000.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00	100%
sub Total Outreach		\$15,170.00	27%	\$115.14	\$115.14	\$15,054.86	99%

300 Community Improvement

Venice Community BBQ	CIP	\$1,830.00		\$1,393.08	\$1,393.08	\$436.92	24%
Neighborhood Commun Proj 2011-12	CIP	\$13,200.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$13,200.00	100%
General Community Projects 2011-12	CIP	\$6,600.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,600.00	100%
sub Total Comm Improvement		\$21,630.00	38%	\$1,393.08	\$1,393.08	\$20,236.92	94%

Total		\$21,630.00		\$1,393.08	\$1,393.08	\$20,236.92	\$0.94
Neighborhood Commun Proj 2010 - 2011	CIP	\$16,000.00				\$16,000.00	