

FRIENDS OF SUNSET PARK

A California nonprofit corporation of Sunset Park residents • Box 5823, Santa Monica, California 90409-5823 • (310) 358-7117

OCTOBER 2004 NEWSLETTER

Layout by Bill Josephs

Special Local Election Coverage...

As part of our continuing commitment to inform residents about local issues, we asked each of the candidates for the Santa Monica City Council and the Santa Monica College Board of Trustees to submit answers to a questionnaire. We received no

responses from some candidates and responses that were received after our newsletter deadline are only posted on our website. A few of the questions and answers have been reprinted here. We have also printed 500-word statements in support of and in opposition to

Measure S, the Santa Monica College \$135-million facilities bond measure.

We hope you find these informative.

City TV (channel 16 & 20) is also airing candidate forums. See www.smvote.org for the schedule.

Santa Monica City Council: Questions and Answers

In your opinion, is there a limit to the level of traffic congestion acceptable in Santa Monica?

Leticia Anderson No Response

Linda Armstrong No Response

Bill Bauer Yes, and we're darn close to the saturation point.

Richard Bloom Traffic problems have persisted and grown worse in Sunset Park for many years. Traffic was one of the issues that prompted me to join the Board of the newly formed Friends of Sunset Park in the late 80's—later becoming its President. The question is not whether there is an acceptable level of traffic—we are well beyond that point. The real issue is whether we can manage and reduce traffic. Some of the solutions are within our control, some are beyond our control and some resist reasonable control.

David Cole No Response

Matt Dinolfo Yes, but my concern is how that limit is determined, against what standard, and how it is upheld? Resident dissatisfaction, however genuine, will not be as powerful a tool to affect change as will objective, concrete measurements that prove traffic is beyond acceptable limits.

Mike Feinstein No Response

Ken Genser Yes. In many areas of town, we've reached it.

Patricia Hoffman No Response

Herb Katz Yes. As a practical matter, that limit depends on the infrastructure and character of each community. In Santa Monica,

Continued on page 2

Santa Monica College Board of Trustees: Questions and Answers

How would you address the issues that affect people living near the college?

Susan Aminoff Growth and traffic are outgrowths of the planning process. Representatives from the Sunset Park neighborhood should rightfully be part of the planning process.

Charlie Donaldson The college needs to engage in a planning process that recognizes the total environment in which it operates. Planning has not been evident. Decisions are made by the college CEO. One trustee cannot change that, but a trustee can keep the affected neighborhood organizations apprised of what the board is

Continued on page 4

Upcoming FOSP Meetings

Thursday, October 21, 7:30 PM — Airport Committee
Wednesday, November 3, 7:00 PM — Board/Membership
Wednesday, January 5, 7:00 PM — Board/Membership

Location: Mt. Olive Church, 14th & Ocean Park Blvd.

Santa Monica Airport News Flash

Airport staff has finally submitted its aircraft conformance program to the FAA on Sept. 8th. This long awaited proposed safety enhancement includes the elimination of safety inappropriate Class C and D aircraft (basically the larger ones) and a creation of runway safety areas. To learn more about this important proposal and how it will help protect airport neighbors, come to the FOSP Airport Committee Meeting Thursday, October 21, 7:30–9 PM, Mt. Olive Lutheran Church, Northwest corner of 14th and Ocean Park Blvd.

City Council, continued from page 1

I believe we are rapidly approaching our limit citywide and have already exceeded it in specific areas of the City, including Sunset Park. I think it is essential for the City to explore and implement measures that will help reduce that congestion. As a 41-year resident of Sunset Park, I am especially sensitive to traffic issues on the arterials and residential streets in my neighborhood and have consistently worked to find solutions to our traffic congestion problems here and throughout the City.

Maria Loya Yes. Our City is severely impacted by traffic congestion for several reasons that include people commuting to work in Santa Monica or people visiting our beautiful City and finally our reluctance to utilize public transportation. The issue of traffic is serious and it impacts our quality of life. The solution to traffic congestion for Santa Monica is a regional solution. If elected, I will work with the City of Los Angeles and the MTA to improve our bus system and implement a light rail or subway from east to west to elevate the traffic congestion in our City.

Jon Mann IMHO we have far surpassed that limit but our city government has other priorities.

Kathryn Morea First off, I'd like to commend you for the very professional video tape portraying the traffic around Sunset Park. I watched this online. I believe the traffic is very bad and getting worse. Some of the causes, as you point out, are within the control of City Council, and others (like Playa Vista) are outside of our control. Our current city leaders claim to favor slow growth or no growth—yet city hall is the biggest developer around! New affordable housing projects are springing up all over town, bringing hundreds of new families into Santa Monica. It isn't only our streets that suffer with this push to keep bringing new residents into Santa Monica—our schools, our police, our parks—are all being overwhelmed.

Bobby Shriver Yes, and we've reached it in many parts of the city.

The City is commencing an update of the land use and circulation elements of the General Plan. What is your position regarding the down-zoning of the industrial/commercial core bound by Lincoln Boulevard, the 10 Freeway, and Centinela, with the objective of limiting the amount of traffic that can be added to an already overburdened infrastructure?

Leticia Anderson No Response

Linda Armstrong No Response

Bill Bauer I think it's a good idea.

Richard Bloom The Land Use update will be a crucial focus for the next council. The idea of downzoning any area must be aired and carefully considered as implementation would likely carry both benefits and consequences. Full public discussion and debate of

this idea will be essential so that well-reasoned decision making can take place.

David Cole No Response

Matt Dinolfo I would need to study any of the traffic data that is now available for this area before I would be able to commit to a down-zoning proposal.

Mike Feinstein No Response

Ken Genser You describe a very large area that includes many zones. Some of the included area already only allows small development. My objectives, subject to the public discussions that will occur, include: (1) establish a realistic methodology for measuring traffic impacts of projects, (2) establishing clear standards with which commercial projects must comply that severely limit or prohibit neighborhood cut-through traffic, (3) concentrating whatever development that we allow in the downtown area to form the critical mass that makes transit effective, and (4) establishing a better bicycle route network.

Patricia Hoffman No Response

Herb Katz I believe any approach to down-zoning must balance the economic needs of the city—we need to generate revenue to pay for essential service, including police, fire, city support for our schools and other services—and the traffic impacts on our community. While we consider the effects of down-zoning, we must also explore reasonable, workable solutions that allow us to maintain the economic health of the city while meeting the needs of the affected neighborhoods, including mandated employee carpool programs, shuttle services, dedicated public transit at peak hours (paid for by the businesses that benefit) and other programs that reduce traffic.

Maria Loya As a resident of the Pico Neighborhood I am extremely concerned about this issue. We have an opportunity this coming year when reviewing the General Plan to study the possibility of down-zoning the industrial/commercial core to single and/or multi-family residential housing in order to increase affordable housing in Santa Monica.

Jon Mann Too Little and Too Late!

Continued on page 3

FOSP Board of Directors

Zina Josephs, President
Kathy Knight, Past President
Tom Cleys, Vice President
Karen Comegys, Secretary
John Reynolds, Treasurer

Board Members:
Susan Hartley
Emmalie Hodgins
Ellen Mark

City Council, continued from page 2

Kathryn Morea I agree that our infrastructure is already overburdened, especially in Sunset Park and downtown Santa Monica. Down-zoning may be necessary. I would also advocate for increased use of public transportation, shuttle services, safe bicycle and walking routes to encourage residents and commuters to use alternative means of getting around.

Bobby Shriver As I've been walking precincts in Sunset Park, I've gotten the message that more development in the industrial/commercial core translates into more "cut-through" traffic in Sunset Park. I need more time to study the current zoning and understand what that area would contain if it were built out, so I cannot yet give a definitive answer on downzoning. I can say that wherever possible I will promote redevelopment of existing buildings rather than new developments that take up our scarce open space. I will explore ways to encourage commercial uses in that area that require fewer employees per square foot. They will generate less traffic. I will find a way for the City to buy some of the open land in that area and convert it to park space or playing fields.

What steps would you take to speed up implementation of the Aircraft Conformance Program to prevent large jets from using Santa Monica Airport?

Leticia Anderson No Response

Linda Armstrong No Response

Bill Bauer The City Council can initiate this process at any time. I don't think the incumbents care. I would start the process, immediately.

Richard Bloom I have kept the pressure on city staff to move with all deliberate speed on implementing this program. The slow speed of implementation is frustrating. However, there are forces at work, including the FAA, that make it extremely important that the city not act hastily and err in the implementation process.

David Cole No Response

Matt Dinolfo I would support the city staff's position first proposed in 2002 which would prohibit larger Class C & D aircraft since they do not meet the airport's design standards. I would work with state and federal authorities to compel the FAA to implement this program.

Mike Feinstein No Response

Ken Genser I feel as frustrated at the length of time this is taking to implement as anybody. However, successfully working with (or around) the FAA is tricky and requires careful thought and strategy. I am committed to seeing the Conformance Program implemented.

Patricia Hoffman No Response

Herb Katz First, the City Council should enact stricter Airport noise

ordinance that would have the pragmatic effect of inhibiting use of the Airport by C and D class aircraft. We also need to establish a committee that will research our most effective approaches to the air pollution concerns. And we should make clear that commercial air passenger service should not be allowed at S.M. Airport.

Maria Loya The Santa Monica City Council needs to make the Conformance program a priority and direct resources to implement it. If I am elected I will ensure that the S.M. City Council develop a plan to implement the Conformance program.

Jon Mann Close Down The Airport!

Kathryn Morea We could start with increasing fees and penalties to those pilots and/or commercial aviation companies causing the abuse. Additionally, we could lobby other elected officials, such as our local Congress person or Senators, to get their help in working with the Federal agencies who have jurisdiction over the airport.

Bobby Shriver At this September's Airport Commission meeting, staff announced it had completed written answers about the large jets using Santa Monica Airport—answers the FAA had requested one year earlier. (The Program itself was passed by City Council almost a year before that.) What is the reason for this huge delay? Some leadership and commitment from the City Council is needed here. I would ask the City Manager to have staff move faster. Staff members must have gotten the message that the Council is not particularly serious about reducing noise and jet exhaust at the airport, or making take-offs and landings any safer, or staff would have made a lot more progress over the past two years.

When the 1984 Agreement expires in 2015, what do you propose for the future use of the Santa Monica Airport property?

Leticia Anderson No Response

Linda Armstrong No Response

Bill Bauer I personally don't think that the FAA is not going to give up the airport property. It is too important for defense and for use in emergencies. However, if the FAA relinquishes control of the site, I'd like to see a large park and limited low rise and low intensity mixed use development. The key for me would be to not allow anything that would contribute substantially to additional traffic, congestion and pollution. I would fight a Playa Vista-type development tooth and nail.

Richard Bloom The future use of the airport property is not for me, alone, to determine. I have successfully moved the council to instruct city staff to begin the development of a process to review options and engage the community in the discussion of what the future of the airport property will be. Virtually any option will have benefits and drawbacks. It is ultimately the community that must decide this important issue. Because Sunset Park is the neighborhood that will be most affected by the ultimate choice, it must be a key player in the process.

Continued on page 4

City Council, continued from page 3

David Cole No Response

Matt Dinolfo I believe it is unlikely that the FAA will allow closure of the airport unless scientifically proven health hazards are determined. Doing so is a priority. If the airport could be closed I would convert this area to parks and recreational space. If this does not occur I would support a redesign of the airport to optimize fuel particle dispersal patterns and minimize noise pollution. I would vigorously advocate for the removal of jet traffic.

Mike Feinstein No Response

Ken Genser Future use of the airport parcel must be the product of a meaningful public discussion. I am very, very unlikely to support continued operation of the airport beyond 2015 unless we are able to ban jet traffic.

Patricia Hoffman No Response

Herb Katz City staff, elected leaders and residents of adjacent neighborhoods should be working closely together NOW to outline the options that make sense for the community, maximize benefits of

future use and minimize negative impacts. Personally, I would like to see any plan include open space, parks and landscaping of which there is far too little in Santa Monica and which would benefit Sunset Park residents as well as residents of the entire city.

Maria Loya When the 1984 Agreement expires in 2015 we have an opportunity to increase open space and affordable housing in that area of our City.

Jon Mann CLOSE DOWN THE AIRPORT!

Kathryn Morea I think we should poll the residents and find out what the people of Santa Monica wish to do.

Bobby Shriver I would not propose anything without hearing from the community first. We need to begin a dialogue on that subject right away, because we may need to craft another agreement with the FAA that allows the City to continue controlling pollution from noise and jet fumes. Otherwise, the legal battles that resulted in the 1984 agreement may begin all over again. I know that the federal government will have a lot to say about the use of the airport after 2015, because it is part of our national transportation system.

College Trustees, continued from page 1

being asked to consider. The latest accreditation study has called for better college planning, but so have accreditation reports in the past. Planning is simply good business, and pressure needs to be maintained until the college management recognizes that.

Tonja McCoy No Response

Margaret Quinones No Response

Rob Rader As Chair of the Wilshire/Montana Neighborhood Coalition, I have led the fight to ensure that residents' concerns are met in my neighborhood. We regularly comment to the Planning Commission on all development going on in the neighborhood.

First, all College planning/development issues need to be presented to the neighborhood for its comments. This opportunity for meaningful input is the most important means to give voice to the neighborhood. Thus, I would institutionalize a process for the neighborhood to address the College's impact on the neighborhood. Second, my experience in my neighborhood group will give me the greatest sensitivity to issues that affect your neighborhood. I have already sought to protect Sunset Park from the College's growth by requesting the College respect Friends of Sunset Park's comments on the college bond issue. Third, I used to live two blocks from the Third Street Promenade. Thus, I am extremely familiar with how a large public institution can impose costs on its surrounding neighborhood. I struggled for years to get preferential parking for my neighborhood, including collecting signatures and lobbying the City Council and the California Coastal Commission and got involved in the Bayside District Corporation (which runs the Third

Street Promenade) to protect my neighborhood. I have personally collected signatures in the Sunset Park neighborhood, too (on 11th Street) and am therefore familiar with the way parking congestion has been pushed out through the Sunset Park neighborhood. I can bring this practical knowledge to my service on the College's board.

Susanne Trimbath We are at a critical juncture in the development of SMC. There is no "community college" without a "community" to support it. Perhaps the time for dialogue is over; now is the time for SMC to LISTEN. I'd like to initiate a forum to solicit positive solutions from the people who live there. I invite the members of FoSP to contact me (email Trimbath@Lycos.com or mail 2118 Wilshire Blvd., #596, Santa Monica, 90403) with their issues so that, win or lose, I can use my candidacy to promote the issues important to the neighborhood.

Doug Willis I've resided in the Pico neighborhood (on 17th and 20th Street) for 27 years and both residences are within a five-minute walk from the main campus, so I empathize with FOSP. I am keenly aware of the tremendous parking, traffic and other issues SMC generates. To consider capping the growth of Santa Monica College (SMC) Main Campus should be well thought-out. Your statistics are correct, there are 33,259 students however, SMC has 5 satellite campuses, hence not all the students are in one location. I feel the trustees and SMC administration should be more sensitive and responsive to the needs of the Pico/Sunset Park Neighborhoods. SMC has achieved a remarkable standard of services as shown by the following measures; more than 29,900 Santa Monica residents

Continued on page 5

College Trustees, continued from page 4

have taken academic courses during the past 10 years, more than 6,700 Santa Monica residents attended this past year and approximately 10,000 residents attend or participate in at least one cultural or recreational activity at SMC each year. SMC attributes more positives than negatives to our communities, however, there is room for improvement with neighborhoods. I would ensure collaboration and communication for improving relationships between SMC and neighborhoods.

Do you favor a cap on SMC enrollment?

Susan Aminoff No Response

Charlie Donaldson Yes, but it is not technically possible. The state, which may cap payments supporting enrollment, requires the community colleges to register any 18-year-old who applies. SMC needs to “manage” its enrollment through class offerings.

SMC could continue to “grow” if it could convert more part-time students to full time. The college is paid by the state for full-time equivalent students—which roughly means students with 30-unit-a-year loads. If SMC did a better job of educating and retaining its students, it could reflect greater “growth” with fewer students, and taxpayers would be getting their money’s worth. Right now about a third of each entering freshman classes disappears before the year is out. Another third end up on probation. A few changes in state law to create real matriculation could put SMC on the right path. With adequate course advisement, classroom support, and more campus jobs, Santa Monica College would have more full-time equivalent students while the number of students driving to and from the campus would be markedly reduced. The board seldom if ever talks about better education. It only talks about growth in numbers. That could be changed with more board members who knew what the hell was going on in the classrooms.

Tonja McCoy No Response

Margaret Quinones No Response

Rob Rader Again, theoretically, a cap on enrollment at each campus makes sense. Thus, Santa Monica College should be trying to fix the state funding scheme (as I describe in my answer to Question 2) so that this optimal enrollment size can be achieved without financially penalizing the College. Any cap should take into account the Full Time Equivalent Students as well as actual headcount of students. Naturally, any cap should be on a per campus basis.

Susanne Trimboth SMC has serious financial problems that we can’t grow out of this time. So enrollment needs to be tempered by what the existing facilities (including the neighborhood infrastructure) can accommodate. An absolute cap isn’t the answer, especially combined with the idea that other regional campuses could be utilized. But a cap relative to infrastructure could answer the concerns of the neighborhood without unforeseen consequences for the future.

Doug Willis I favor various considerations on capping enrollment. If the bond passes, the Malibu community will have a facility where

more courses can be offered. SMC will have five satellite campuses that favorably impact Pico/Sunset neighborhoods—less traffic and students. It is imperative that SMC administration/trustees maximize use of facilities, stagger class schedules to minimize traffic and parking congestion. Once again collaboration with SMC coordinating councils can debate and obtain studies/statistics regarding the merits of enrollment caps.

What is your position regarding the upcoming SMC bond measure? Why?

Susan Aminoff No Response

Charlie Donaldson I have never voted against a school bond issue in my life, but I have yet to find a valid reason to support the current SMC proposal. It is a stretch to consider the proposed spending educational as far as I can see.

Tonja McCoy No Response

Margaret Quinones No Response

Rob Rader I favor the bond measure. I believe the projects in the bond are worthy, particularly the Career Opportunity Center, the Early Childhood Development Lab/Replacement Childcare Center and the Replacement Health, Fitness and Physical Education Building. These are important needs for the College’s future plans. If we don’t accept this opportunity to improve students’ education and job placement, I think as a community we will regret it.

Furthermore, the costs of the proposed bond measure are approximately \$18 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation for owned property (and even less for renters), which seems reasonable, given the value these projects will have for the College and the community. As Finance Committee Chair of the Bayside District Corporation (which runs the Third Street Promenade), I have overseen the wise spending of public funds. I would be a prudent guardian of the bond funds.

I expect that most of the bond projects will not be located on the main campus to avoid exacerbating the crowding and traffic problems in Sunset Park.

Susanne Trimboth I’m opposed to Measure S. My position paper is available at www.SmartVoter.org/vote/Trimboth (courtesy of the League of Women Voters). In a nutshell, the bond is ill-timed, ill-conceived, and ill-defined.

Doug Willis I support the bond measure. I recognize there were only eight weeks from introduction of the bond measure to the trustee vote. I also understand the limited community input to “openly” discuss the measure and I also know that SMC placed a Bond Measure U for 160 million only two years ago, however, the projects this bond will cover includes site acquisition for the Malibu campus, upgrades on the athletic locker room facilities, soccer field acquisition, Early Childhood Development Lab and the Career Opportunity Center. I would be extremely hesitant to support any bond measures SMC administration proposes in the next few years if the current one passes.

Vote Yes on Measure S

The days of being able to get a good job with a high school diploma are over. Long over. Students need more technical training for a highly competitive job market.

What many do not know is that Santa Monica College is the number one job trainer for our community. Yet, SMC lacks many of the specialized facilities available to other communities that training for today's jobs requires.

That's why Santa Monica College needs Measure S, a \$135 million college bond measure on the November 2 local ballot.

Measure S will help Santa Monica College give students the job skills they need.

Measure S will build a new career opportunity center to teach jobs skills and provide counseling services to help students prepare for the work world. This facility will be designed to teach skills in emerging technologies, and help keep pace with advances in fields such as advanced transportation, healthcare, environmental technology, logistics (transport of goods), and biotechnology.

Measure S will build a new world-class music program and a 500-seat theater to support specialized training in the Applied Music program and to expand cultural opportunities for our community. It will enable SMC students to meet new admission standards in performing arts required by the University of California. Other community colleges have already secured public funding for similar performing arts complexes.

Measure S will build a Child Development Lab School that combines childcare with teacher training. It will provide childcare services to students and employees of SMC and Santa Monica community members and training for those seeking careers in early childhood education.

Measure S will enable SMC to renovate and replace obsolete Physical Education facilities and to acquire land for athletic fields in non-residential neighborhoods of Santa Monica for both college and community use.

Measure S will restore college programs to Malibu and meet community concerns.

No added facilities are expected to be built at the main SMC campus. Rather, Measure S will enable the college to provide services at sites elsewhere in the community, continuing its efforts to reduce reliance on the main SMC campus.

Estimated cost of Measure S: Average homeowner less than \$6.50 per month. Average renter less than \$1.25 per month.

While Measure S will allow Santa Monica College to substantially improve job-training programs for our local students, local taxpayers have a right to know that their investment is being well spent.

That's why Measure S includes tough fiscal oversight.

- Every penny raised by Measure S will be spent right here, to improve the quality of education in Santa Monica and Malibu. None of the money can be taken away by the state.
- By law, Measure S funds cannot be used for administrative salaries.
- Measure S creates an independent citizens bond committee that will oversee and audit the use of bond funds—and report to the public.

Measure S. Better education for our students. Better services for our community. Strong accountability for taxpayers.

Vote Yes on Measure S.

Denny Zane

"Yes on Measure S" campaign

Vote No on Measure S

The tax payers of Santa Monica and Malibu should not approve yet another bond issue for Santa Monica College (SMC).

- SMC is a state-funded educational institution. It advertises all over California, the country, and the world. Fully 75% of the 32,000 students do not even live in Santa Monica or Malibu. Why should local residents fund facilities for an institution that primarily serves non-local students. **IT IS NOT FAIR.**
- Santa Monica and Malibu residents already approved a \$160 million bond measure for SMC facilities just two years ago. We were told that after Measure U, there would not be another bond issue for decades. Two years is a short decade! **WE HAVE ALREADY PAID OUR FAIR SHARE.**
- SMC has spent only one-fourth of the bond money from Measure U. About \$120 million remain, and college administrators cannot tell us, in detail, what it will be used for. Why should voters approve measure S when funds are still available from the last bond measure? Measures U and S would total \$295 million, or about \$3,000 from each of the 96,000 residents of Santa Monica and Malibu. **USE UP THE MONEY YOU ALREADY HAVE BEFORE ASKING FOR MORE.**
- The funds from this bond measure will allow SMC to continue to grow and expand. West LA College has many acres of land that are under-utilized. Why expand an already large college, such as SMC, and draw students away from campuses closer to where they live? **GROW THE CAMPUSES CLOSER TO WHERE THE STUDENTS ARE.**
- Santa Monica's infrastructure is already overburdened. Our daytime population reaches 250,000 to 300,000 with all the office workers, tourists, and college students coming into town. Downtown and Sunset Park are often gridlocked. With this bond measure, the college will further expand and bring in more students, more traffic, more pollution, and more parking problems. Why are we doing this to ourselves? **DON'T KEEP IMPORTING MORE TRAFFIC, POLLUTION, AND PARKING PROBLEMS.**

You have to give credit to the SMC administrators. They have built an excellent educational institution which serves an ever-increasing segment of the Los Angeles area. Many of us have taken classes at the college. It's a great school. But the whole region should fund such a regional institution, not just the city in which it's located. The residents of Westwood do not fund UCLA. It's a state institution and gets its funding from the state. Community colleges are the first tier of higher education in the state college system, along with CSU and UC. Local bond measures are the wrong way to fund SMC.

SAY NO TO MEASURE S, don't support more traffic congestion, pollution, and parking problems in our City when most of the students can be better served by expanding campuses nearer to their homes.

SAY NO TO MEASURE S, combined with Measure U, it would place an unfair tax burden of \$3,000 on each Santa Monica and Malibu resident.

Vote NO on Measure S.

Regula K. Ziegler

33-year Sunset Park resident