

## Neighborhood Council's 2020 City Council candidate questionnaire

The questionnaire was emailed to all the candidates for the 4-year term. (Kristin McCowan is running unopposed for the 2-year term, so she was not included.)

The responses to each question are in alphabetical order from all the candidates who responded. (The different colored fonts were used only to make it easier to compile the responses, so feel free to convert all of them to one color.)

- a) Phil Brock
- b) Tom Ciszek
- c) Gleam Davis
- d) Oscar de la Torre
- e) Mario Fonda-Bonardi
- f) Ana Maria Jara
- g) Jon Mann
- h) Todd Mentch
- i) Christine Parra
- j) Terry O'Day
- k) Ted Winterer

\*\*\*\*\*

### Citywide questions:

1) **9 bad bills** -- The State is putting pressure on Cities to provide more housing. Recent legislative bills SB-902, SB-1120, AB-725, and AB-340 reflect these efforts. Unfortunately, these bills benefit developers while destroying the character of Santa Monica's R-1 residential neighborhoods. They also do NOT require affordable housing or any infrastructure improvements that would be required for the resulting increased density.

**What actions will you take to preserve the character of R-1 neighborhoods?**

a) Phil Brock -- None of the bills mentioned above would have brought any benefit to our community. Each of the legislative bills separately and cumulatively would have been destructive to Santa Monica. We know that the real benefactors of the passage of these bills would have been big developers. Our objective is simple. Align Santa Monica with neighboring cities that want to maintain their quality of life, as we do. Litigate if necessary, to protect our residents from unwanted intrusion into our zoning. Appoint Planning Commissioners and hire city staff who believe in protecting our residential neighborhoods religiously. There is no other choice. Santa Monica must participate in the fight to preserve our neighborhoods, not sit idly by, and consent to unreasonable legislation.

b) **Tom Ciszek** -- We might consider allowing subdivisions of existing homes in R1 neighborhoods. We need to know how many permitted ADUs there are in the city and provide updated guidelines for adding ADU square footage to existing homes (e.g. above garages). We must balance growth with sustainability goals, particularly regarding our water resources. In development, the city must seek to preserve existing massing, height, setbacks and floor area ratios, and look to expand benefits for preservation and expansion of historical neighborhood conservation.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- I do not support placing large apartment buildings in R-1 zones. But, under California law, three separate households can live on an R-1 parcel: in the “main house”, an accessory dwelling unit (ADU), and a junior ADU. It also is important to remember that R-1 zoning in Santa Monica is the legacy of exclusionary covenants that discriminated against Blacks and other people of color. This intentional past discrimination requires that we take intentional remedial action in our present. For that reason, I am open to looking for ways to make housing in our R-1 neighborhoods more affordable and more diverse.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** – These 9 housing bills are misguided and only work to worsen the housing crisis by incentivizing the construction of moderate and market rate housing, which only works to create more market pressures that results in increased rents and displacement of long term renters. This is clearly a giveaway to developers at the cost of low-income renters and homeowners. We have an affordability issue that will not be solved by constructing more moderate rate and market rate housing especially in R-1 neighborhoods. As a Council member, I would maintain the zoning rules that protect the character of R-1 neighborhoods.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** – The nine bad bills are just the latest manifestation of a 3 year attempt to gut local control for the benefit of big developers. Apart from many emails, I have called 25 Assembly members in the successful stalling of SB1120, but they will be back next year. I will make alliances with other cities to fight these new bad bills and support statewide candidates to vote out the State representatives who failed to protect their districts by supporting such bad bills. I will appoint Planning Commissioners that share my views about protecting the R-1 zones (and other zoning) that will be exposed to these relentless assaults. I will publicly refute the development myths that are being continually foisted on the public to justify bad bills.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- I support affordable housing. That said – I respect our zoning regulations that have worked to protect all neighborhoods in the City. As a City, for the last few months, we have been monitoring these bills very closely. I’m not certain any of those bills passed this Legislative Session. I will act very cautiously when zoning

changes threaten any neighborhood because I think we can be creative and find the space available to accommodate affordable housing. In addition, I'm looking forward to attending the League of CA Cities to find solutions at the regional level.

g) **Jon Mann** -- Limit building to low income housing for seniors, living wage workers in Santa Monica, and victims of the Ellis Act!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- File a lawsuit to stop these pro-developer bills from being implemented. That being said, there are some R-1 areas with multiple housing units already. I think a compromise would be to selectively re-zone certain R-1 communities. VERY selectively.

i) **Christine Parra** -- The current Santa Monica City Council failed the residents of our city by taking no action to oppose proposed legislation to take over local control of local zoning and planning. These pressures are not going away. When elected to Santa Monica City Council I will work with my colleagues on the Council to communicate with the state our opposition to their efforts to overturn local control. Additionally, the resulting increased density will bring upheaval to our neighborhoods, diminishing our quality of life. I would vehemently fight any project that infringes upon our neighborhoods.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- By developing land use plans that direct density to the commercial boulevards and office areas, we can relieve pressure on the R1 neighborhoods. We cannot stop growth, but we can direct it to areas that improve our quality life by providing neighborhood services, increased pedestrian safety, and historic preservation.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- I met often with Bob Posek and others about their concerns regarding mansionization in our R-1 neighborhoods and enthusiastically supported the changes to our zoning which reduced the buildable envelope in our single family neighborhoods. I have opposed the one-size-fits all State bills which take away local control over zoning and let our two legislators know my thoughts. In particular, I think the new State regs for ADUs are sufficient for housing production in single family homes – and it makes little sense given our challenges with climate change to incentivize greater density in areas which are not transit-adjacent.

2) **SCAG** -- The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) sets Regional Housing Needs Assessments (RHNA) and has allocated Santa Monica a target of **8,874** new housing units by 2029, with **70%** of them required to be affordable. Rather than **appeal** the target as unattainable and environmentally unsustainable, the City Council has **streamlined** the city's permitting process. **What would you do?**

a) **Phil Brock** -- Appeal. Appeal. Appeal. Again, many cities are fighting these ridiculous goals of the Southern California Association of Governments. We must join in the fight

to stop developer takeovers in our town and throughout the state. Our city needs a comprehensive master plan that will layout the rules and regulations for all of our zoning and goals as a city. We need to stop spot zoning and have a holistic approach to the needs of our town.

b) **Tom Ciszek** -- I think it unlikely an appeal would ultimately succeed and would only delay the inevitable. I believe, however, that the location of this housing must maintain intact residential neighborhoods. That would narrow the focus of possible locations. From there, a comprehensive design for all the proposed housing should be developed with input from appropriate stakeholders. This would include a thorough evaluation of infrastructure for the proposed housing and impacted areas into the future.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- I voted to streamline the permitting process because I believe Santa Monica needs to build more housing, particularly affordable housing. The westside of Los Angeles County is jobs rich and we only can address climate change and regional traffic concerns if we create opportunities for workers to live closer to their jobs. We can do this without displacing current residents if we allow more housing to be built on our commercial boulevards and in the formerly industrial east side of Santa Monica.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** – The current pandemic and financial crisis will result in a top down review of downtown land-use assumptions (the levels of retail, office, hotels and yes, housing) that our city planners have used to guide our future. Essentially, using the financial and housing crisis to incentivize the erosion of rent control units and replacing them with moderate rate housing. But the RHNA (“Regional Housing Needs Assessment”) housing allocation for Santa Monica is unattainable over the next RHNA 8-year cycle. The RHNA directive does not recognize or credit our affordable housing production over five prior RHNA cycles. I would vote to appeal!

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- The fraudulent SCAG numbers are wrong for so many reasons that I have already spoken and written about. Eventually we will need a statewide proposition to keep the State out of local zoning issues. I will join with like minded cities to oppose the SCAG numbers and advocate for such a proposition.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- We need to look at places to build the affordable housing on industrial and surplus land. As a Councilmember I have requested that City staff provide us with a list of any city and state owned empty lots so we can determine the feasibility of developing there first. This is a State mandate and every city needs to do their fair share of creating affordable housing including Santa Monica. I would also work to protect residential neighborhoods.

g) **Jon Mann** -- Low income housing only, no more luxury apartment complexes, condos or hotels!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- What is a reasonable figure? A vibrant community provides housing for all income levels. I want to work to streamline the permitting process even more (all digital) AND RAISE fees for permits (especially on large projects). Also means test the permit process: a long time resident on a fixed income who wants to build a second unit on their property for income should not pay the same as an LLC. That's ridiculous.

i) **Christine Parra** -- Without resources to upgrade infrastructure to support 8,874 new housing units, the city cannot comply with this requirement. I would appeal the target like other California cities have done. The current City Council has slowly eroded resident input into new development in order to speed up the process and the results have been disastrous. We need only look at the canyon of dense housing on Lincoln Blvd. to see what could happen all over our city. We need to restore community input and slow the pace of development in our city to be sure it is truly sustainable and livable.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- RHNA exists under state law to address the undersupply of housing in California. It is necessary to comply with it to restore health to our housing market – if we do not, then the state will continue to impose bills like those mentioned in point #1. The SCAG allocation to Santa Monica reflects the city's role as an “infill” community, it's jobs-housing imbalance, and strong transit accessibility. By prioritizing those factors in setting the allocation for Santa Monica and other communities in its jurisdiction, SCAG prioritized environmental sustainability and cost of living. We should continue to achieve these objectives, which will require substantial and immediate effort by the city. By doing so, we attack the housing crisis head-on, address structural racism in housing policy, reduce our environmental footprint, reduce the cost of living in California, and improve our quality of life.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- Clearly as a Councilmember I did not appeal the RHNA allocation and approved streamlining of housing projects to conform with the State Housing Accountability Act, which requires approval of all zoning compliant housing.

Regarding an appeal, the likelihood of success would have been minimal:

[https://www.surfsantamonica.com/ssm\\_site/the\\_lookout/news/News-2019/December-2019/12\\_20\\_2019\\_Housing\\_Targets\\_Would\\_Be\\_Difficult\\_to\\_Contest.html](https://www.surfsantamonica.com/ssm_site/the_lookout/news/News-2019/December-2019/12_20_2019_Housing_Targets_Would_Be_Difficult_to_Contest.html)

Since I believe the State Legislature will ultimately realize one-size-fits all housing incentive bills are a flop and instead seek to punish cities which resist housing production, Santa Monica is better off playing by the rules so we retain local control.

3) The “**Plaza at Santa Monica**” is a proposed 11-story hotel/office project on publicly owned land at 4<sup>th</sup>/5<sup>th</sup> & Arizona that would generate 5,000 daily car trips.

Do you favor this type of high density development, with little benefit to the public, or an alternative that would include more open space for our park-poor city?

a) **Phil Brock** -- This is OUR public land. I will never favor a behemoth project of this type within the city on private or public land. Any project that is detrimental to the needs of our residents must be opposed. This "Plaza" couldn't be more misnamed. My grandmother would call it a monstrosity. I served as the Chair of the Recreation and Parks Commission and have been a member of SMart for seven years. I have made my position clear. We need more open space, and with the effects of the pandemic becoming apparent, parks are essential, more than ever. One further note, the streets adjacent to this public land were paved in 1875. They were not designed for the traffic they are bearing today, let alone 5,000 more daily car trips.

b) **Tod Ciszek** -- I do not favor this example of willy-nilly development without consideration of its impact on Santa Monicans, both positively and negatively. Maintenance of residents’ quality of life, I believe, takes precedence over purely economic development. Though realizing how critical tourism is to our economy, what seems to me a project such as this ON PUBLIC LAND is not advisable.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- The Plaza project as currently proposed includes a broad community benefit package, including a significant amount of street level open space as well as public open space on the second and higher floors. This open space will provide a vital civic gathering place as well as a permanent home for our beloved winter ice rink. Also, when Council elected to continue negotiating with the current applicant, I specifically asked for less built out space and more open space on the ground level.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** – This project uses scarce public land for a huge private project that does not provide adequate benefits to our community. I believe that public land should provide maximum benefit to our residents. Rather than direct staff to work with the community to develop concepts for an expansion of green/public space, resident entrepreneurship, cultural space and affordable housing, the Council continued to prioritize special interests and ignored residents by moving forward with the project as is. The current project fails to meet any of these needs that have been expressed repeatedly in various Well Being community meetings.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- The Plaza is another big development rip off of our public land, for an unneeded unsustainable building in the wrong place and at the wrong time. I will terminate the developer negotiations and start planning for an urban park when the funding becomes available.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- The City spent over \$65 million to aggregate land to create a project that would deliver revenue to the City. The project has a great deal of open space and community activities and the revenue benefit to the City alone can enable us to finance additional open space opportunities. In addition, as a councilmember, I supported and voted on directing staff to look into the possibility of closing down Arizona between 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> in order to provide more open space, which is something our residents suggested.

g) **Jon Mann** -- Absolutely not! We have already lost too much open space!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- No, I do not favor that type of high density development. I cannot stand that project. Just what downtown doesn't need, another high priced hotel. That being said, I also think calling Santa Monica "park poor" is a stretch. A stretch about as long and wide as the Pacific Ocean. Everyone who lives in this city is 15 minutes or less from the beach, on foot or on a Big Blue Bus. Which I want to be a free ride for all residents.

i) **Christine Parra** -- I do not support the "Plaza at Santa Monica." That land belongs to the people of Santa Monica and should be used to benefit them. I am in complete favor of open space and/or affordable housing, which is what the residents have called for and have a right to. Public land should be for public use.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- Yes this project has substantial public benefits. First, it generates millions for affordable housing (see previous answers re housing). Second, it is dedicated to curated, programmed open space. Third, it provides the opportunity to remove above-ground parking garages that the city owns and replace them with housing. Fourth, it provides the opportunity to eliminate car traffic from Arizona Boulevard, opening the street to pedestrians, bikes, street faires, and more, as we do on Farmers' Market days. Furthermore, it will have world-class design. Although this package of benefits is not fully negotiated, I still believe in this vision.

k) **Ted Winterer** – We polled residents about a parks bond and the results showed that voters don't care to pay for more parks. Even prior to the current recession, we were challenged to fund the expansions of Memorial and Airport Parks. So we really can't fund a park at 4<sup>th</sup>/5<sup>th</sup> and Arizona and, no, underground parking won't pay for it. Also, Palisades, Tongva and Reed Parks and the new sports field at the Civic Center are all within a short walk for downtown residents. So it makes sense to continue with negotiations over the Plaza project which may pay for services our residents value. It remains to be seen whether the ground lease, TOT and other revenues from the project and the public access to upper story open space make the project a good deal for us.



4) **City employee salaries and pensions** - The cost per resident of city employee salaries and pensions is much higher than that of other cities in the area.

**What would your approach be to dealing with the many city employee bargaining units?**

a) **Phil Brock** -- We will establish the tone by managing the "at-will" employees in City Hall. Those employees are not part of a bargaining unit and, by and large, are upper-level supervisors. We will set an example by our hiring practices. Our salary schedule should be comparable to the median salaries in California cities, plus a 20% bump because of the cost-of-living in Santa Monica. Never higher. By setting compensation equal to but not more than other cities, we can turn to the bargaining units and negotiate in good faith for adequate salary and benefits packages that reign in our runaway spending. This policy will also attract employees who want to be integrated members of our community, not just here because of their fat compensation package or their desire to increase their pension.

b) **Tod Ciszek** -- I would attempt to simplify the negotiations by streamlining contracts; e.g. negotiating health/pension and other benefits that would be uniform among all employees. But to reach a starting point in negotiations, I would evaluate DATA from other municipalities with similar demographics, cost-of-living, etc. This information, as well as relatively long-term contracts would make the budget process more predictable.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- In the 11 years that I have been on the City Council, most employee raises have been very modest: 1-2% per year. Also, as City revenues went down due to the pandemic, employees in the Executive Pay Plan and in employee bargaining units agreed to take pay cuts or forego raises and other benefits to help reduce the need for layoffs. If re-elected, I will continue to support a fiscally-responsible approach to dealing with our public employee unions

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- My 18 years of experience in negotiations with SMMUSD bargaining units will serve me well on the City Council. We have to be realistic, honest and transparent in negotiations. Ultimately, we have to live within our means and at the same time provide fair compensation and benefits to our workforce. The problem in Santa Monica is that our Council has allowed excessive salaries at the top. I would like to conduct a salary study/audit to ensure we are not over paying for services.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- The City pays too much in salaries in comparison to other cities. A number of about 20% more for comparable positions. I would challenge the myth we need to continue doing this. But the real test is challenging these high paid staff to be more productive: can they be 20% more productive than the workers in comparable



positions. In other words doing more with less. The staffs know who is productive and where savings can be found. Lets bring that out into the open.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- We have made deep cuts to City Staff., and unfortunately cutting staff has meant less services for residents. According to the Charter City Council cannot make agreements with any of the bargaining units directly. Therefore, we need to have a balance and ensure that services are still provided to residents, especially the most in need.

g) **Jon Mann** -- Terminate non essential employees making six figures and over! Heads must roll! City, county, state and federal coalitions, public employees, commission and institutions, for profit and non profit corporations, Citizens United, al special interest networks, etc., should not be allowed to endorse, influence or contribute to political candidates! It's a conflict of interest!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- I already brought this up in my interview with the firefighters' association. I asked them if the subject of means testing of current and future retirement benefits even came up, and if it did, how angry the push back would be. This is a subject that BOTH sides have to compromise.

i) **Christine Parra** -- Santa Monica has one of the highest staff per resident ratios in the state and the pension debt is crushing us. The City is responsible for inflated salaries/pensions at the top and should have used salary surveys to inform appropriate pay scales. However, given the fiscal crisis our city now faces, we need to take a close look at all positions, especially upper management positions. According to Transparent California, the City Attorney's Office has 30+ attorneys on staff. This is excessive and wasteful. In conversations with bargaining units, I recommend focusing on making changes to pay/pensions for new hires.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- Assessing the aggregate pay and dividing it per capita is a flawed. We residents benefit from substantial revenues from our tourist and employment tax base that allows us to invest in significant levels of services. Any measure by per capita in our city must be balanced by understanding that we have three times as many people here during the day versus the night. We have been very consistent as a city in maintaining a top notch staff team by providing compensation at the upper half of the range of comparable cities.

k) **Ted Winterer** – For several years Council has negotiated contract renewals which provide for COLA adjustments below the rate of inflation. We also eliminated a costly “PERS on PERS” pension benefit previously provided to all bargaining units. Since the fiscal impacts of COVID-19 we have negotiated new contracts which reduce costs and provide for either no COLA adjustments or pay cuts. And we eliminated many upper

management positions and cut salaries for the remaining executives by 5-20%. We are the only city in LA County that has its own police and fire, municipal pier, cemetery, airport and a beach to maintain. Also, while the costs of enterprise funds such as the Beach and Airport are covered by revenues other than taxes, they are counted in our annual budget and thus inflate a cost per resident calculation.

5) **City budget** -- With the pandemic, the City had to cut 40% of its budget -- both the operational budget and the capital improvement program.

If and when City revenues increase, what approach and which stakeholders' requirements would you focus on?

a) **Phil Brock** -- We are NOT broke. We are spending at an appropriate level for 2020, as our previous budgetary process was out of control. Santa Monica still spends 3x as much per resident as the LA does. The city has chosen to make the vast majority of the budget cuts hurt seniors, teens, and kids. By making the cuts visible, they hope to justify new taxes and fees. This philosophy is dead wrong! We can restore services that our residents rely on. In using common sense to govern as we move into the future, we must make every possible effort to decrease the vast pension liabilities that Santa Monica is responsible for. Rather than build more grandiose projects that will compost the staff's waste products, let's concentrate on governing our town with care.

b) **Tom Cizek** -- For the foreseeable (at least in terms of budgetary time) future, the primary focus of our government leaders is the SAFETY of Santa Monicans. This then dictates budgetary priorities. The support of our first responders, police and fire departments, EMS workers, and their support staff would be paramount. Priority 1A would be ensuring the HEALTH of our residents. That includes enforcing strict COVID-19 guidelines, and developing a detailed plan for businesses to safely reopen and remain open. This plan should ALWAYS be based on the best scientific data and should include the availability free coronavirus testing. Beyond those critical components, mental health and Social Services are critical in dealing with this crisis.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- When City revenues rebound, I would like to see the City focus on restoring core public services such as street cleaning, libraries, and programs that serve vulnerable populations such as seniors and youth. Over the long term, I think the City needs to continue to invest in keeping current residents in their home, creating more affordable housing, and reducing the number of unhoused people on our streets.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- I would first focus on public safety to ensure we have adequate resources invested to ensure our residents are safe and protected. Essential services such as sanitation, infrastructure, senior and youth services must be adequately funded. The

budget crisis provides us an opportunity to re organize and reflect on how we create a budget that prioritizes residents needs.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** – Our City gets a lot of income but spends way more than it can afford. The City budget is exactly where it was in 2013 and the pension overhang is the same size as it was in 2013 (approx \$448M per 2018 numbers). We need to aggressively reduce this debt, before it starts compromising City services. Stop any unnecessary projects, freeze hiring, and start paying down this debt. If there are any budget surpluses after the aggressive pay down, they should go to public services that pay for direct services Citizens need: crime prevention, reestablish crossing guards, reopen libraries etc.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- Covid-19 has dealt a blow to many cities, counties and States. When we begin to recover I would first look to restore programs that the community has relied on but were put on ‘hold’. I would seek community input on priorities.

g) **Jon Mann** -- Audit the budget online by residents in a virtual Town Hall forum on the city website! Do not let the city audit itself!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- I'm a resident. That's the side I am going to favor. I am also sympathetic to those who lost jobs because of the pandemic, and I have pledged to work hard to save as many as possible. What services can the city do better than private, for profit corporations will be a focus of mine.

i) **Christine Parra** -- The city had a budget problem long before the pandemic. As noted in recent articles, Santa Monica does not have a budget problem, we have a spending problem. Santa Monica is within the top 5% of California cities in tax revenues. If elected I would re-instate a financial oversight committee to help with transparency and ensure that the city is not overspending and to review the existing budget with staff to determine and prioritize needed projects.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- City revenues will increase, but it would be wrong to assume this is a foregone conclusion, or that we will be back soon. This is a major economic disruption and we have only begun to feel the impacts. This fall, employers that took federal funding will begin layoffs, as the terms of that funding expire. The tourists that fund our government are not coming back in the same way we were accustomed to. In any case, prioritizing economic recovery is critical. Public safety must remain our top priority, then investments that improve these factors and our quality of life.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- Actually our budget was cut a little under 25%:

[https://surfsantamonica.com/ssm\\_site/the\\_lookout/news/News-2020/June-2020/06\\_26\\_2020\\_Council\\_Approves\\_Drastically\\_Reduced\\_Budget.html](https://surfsantamonica.com/ssm_site/the_lookout/news/News-2020/June-2020/06_26_2020_Council_Approves_Drastically_Reduced_Budget.html)

While we expect the economic recovery to be slow and don't anticipate full restoration of pre-COVID revenues for several years, as funds become available I would seek to bring back resident-serving services: library hours; after school activities; programs for at-risk youth; crossing guards; recreational facility hours; etc.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Neighborhood-specific questions**

#### **Friends of Sunset Park (FOSP):**

1) **Santa Monica Airport** -- The 2017 Consent Decree with the FAA allows the City of Santa Monica to close the Santa Monica Airport in 2029.

Do you support the vision of transforming the Airport land into park and recreational space for the benefit of park-poor Santa Monica, 60% of which lies within 2 miles of the Airport? If not, why not? If so, how will you lead the City in achieving that goal?

a) **Phil Brock** -- In 2014 Measure LC passed. It paved the way to close SMO and honor resident wishes. The runway is condensed, the interim open space in use and an extension of Airport Park designed. The outline of a Great Park at SMO will begin to form. Simple will be better. Let's do what Chicago residents did to Meigs Field. Make sure the ground is safe and sprinkle a lot of grass seed. Our parks in Santa Monica have undergone too much planning, and the costs have been astronomical. Let's use common sense in creating the Great Park at SMO. I served on the Recreation and Parks Commission for fourteen years. It will be my honor to shepherd our new multi-use park connecting our existing Clover Park to Airport Park.

b) **Tom Cizek** -- The conversion of the Santa Monica Airport grounds into park and recreational space would not constitute the highest and best use of this prime real estate. I've never thought of our city as "park-poor" and this space hosts a 4 acre park (and APX is 12 more acres) - with lighted fields, over 100 parking spaces, the largest of our four off leash dog parks. Park utilization should be measured. To the extent that a portion of the Santa Monica Airport land is transformed into parks or something else, it should be done with voter approval. I support expansion of these existing parks to accommodate the recreational needs of residents in those new units.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- I support converting the airport into a park. In order to reduce pressures to use the airport land for other purposes, I think that the City needs to conduct a regional plan for the airport that includes the airport land and other nearby properties. This inclusive planning process hopefully will allow important needs such as housing and neighborhood-serving commercial to be placed near the airport but not on actual airport land.

d) **Oscar de le Torre** -- Yes, I support expanding green space at the Santa Monica Airport. I would also move to prohibit jets from flying out of the SM Airport. I would like to see cleaner and quieter technologies to eliminate the noise and air pollution emanating from the airport.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- I fully believe a regional park needs to be built and funded when the airport is closed. The park's roads can also be productively used to reduce the traffic gridlock at the south east corner of Sunset Park relieving Pico, Ocean Park, Bundy and 23rd street. The park planning should involve a robust community process including differentiated park activities, a unifying theme, funding sources, environmental cleanup if required and a credible timeline."

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- I support a great park at the former Airport. It is an opportunity for a landmark multi-purpose use and open space. It will not be 'cheap' ...but we must not lose the opportunity.

g) **Jon Mann** -- I was the first candidate for City Council to advocate for closing the Airport in 2015 when the lease expired in 2015 and to use the property as a park as was originally envisioned by the 1906 bond! If elected I will fight for residents to make all decisions about the park, and block attempts by scurrilous developers!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- YES! I voted for that Measure LC in 2014. And I agree that this quadrant of SM is truly "park poor-ish" We need to remember the location: more Los Angeles city residents will use that park than Santa Monica residents. How can we ensure that the SM taxpayer is represented well by services provided at the future park? Can we partner with LA in funding open space creation?

i) **Christine Parra** -- I fully support the vision of transforming the Airport land into a park and recreational space. I also think it would be a perfect location for a combined Senior and Child Care Center. But at the end of the day, I am in full support of what the residents want.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- The vision to transform our park into a great regional park for the westside is one of the most compelling reasons to continue to serve on the council. We need to start now with planning, architecture and civic engagement.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- Yes, of course. When I first ran for Council in 2008 Jon Mann and I were the only candidates advocating for SMO closure and one of the few endorsements I received then was from CRAAP. To prepare for SMO closure on 1/1/29 the City will as soon as our reduced staffing allows develop a plan for the Great Park and financing tools to build it (revenues from existing leases no longer allocated to airport operations; possibly bonding against that revenue stream; State and County grants; private philanthropy, etc.).

2) **Sunset Park Neighborhood Traffic Management Program** -- In June 2016, the City Council approved \$400,000 for a Sunset Park Neighborhood Traffic Management Program to address concerns about safety (such as the dangerous intersection of 23rd/Airport/Walgrove) and cut-through traffic congestion. In June 2017, the city's Parking & Traffic Manager presented this PowerPoint at the FOSP Annual Meeting: <https://tinyurl.com/yyyhdz6o> Planning and implementation of Phase 1 and 2 were scheduled for completion by **Spring 2019**, but the process went into "limbo" for years. Speed and traffic volume studies were completed, and some temporary Phase 1 mitigations were installed. But, during the city's restructuring, the remaining funds were deleted from the CIP budget and completion of Phases 1 and 2 were suspended indefinitely. Meanwhile a new Ocean Park neighborhood traffic study has been funded to the tune of \$150,000.

**What steps would you take to ensure that the Sunset Park Neighborhood Traffic Management Program is re-funded and completed?**

a) **Phil Brock** -- Standing on 23rd Street at Pier in July 2015, I filmed a Brock on Your Block ([https://youtu.be/\\_8GmzxWxRxE](https://youtu.be/_8GmzxWxRxE)) episode about the traffic conditions in Sunset Park. It is insane to think that the residents of Sunset Park have still had no satisfaction in mitigating the daily effects of gridlock upon their neighborhood. We do not need another study. We'll fund the existing plan and implement it asap without fail.

b) **Tom Ciszek** -- I commend Sunset Park's approach for a Comprehensive Neighborhood Traffic Plan advocate for safer streets for all and reducing cars and congestion in Santa Monica. After a thorough review of findings and data completed under the Program, and as part of a COVID-response plan I would propose we measure increases in traffic citywide near-term. Traffic issues facing Sunset Park today may be fundamentally different from the issues it will have in 2028-2029, especially if we enter a Green New Deal. Additionally, many issues in Santa Monica Airport's area can be mitigated through developer exactions and need not be included in the CIP budget.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- When the City's budget is restored, I think the City needs to find a way to give each neighborhood an opportunity to prioritize spending in the neighborhood. If the Sunset Park Neighborhood Traffic Management Program is the highest priority for the neighborhood, then it should be funded.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- The issue of public safety is a very important issue to me. The increase in unmitigated traffic poses a threat to the mobility of residents. There have been many "pet projects" that have been funded by our public funds that have very little impact on the livelihoods of residents. If elected to the Santa Monica City Council, I will prioritize projects that enhance public safety for our residents such as the Sunset Park Neighborhood Traffic Management Program.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** – There is no real solution for the Sunset Park area traffic until the airport, which crams the traffic in specific overloaded streets (Ocean Park, Pico, 23rd etc) and overloads the adjacent residential arteries, is closed. In the development of the park (see above), streets should be added to the Park so that they solve Sunset Park's grid lock. Where and size of those park streets will require very careful planning and LA City cooperation. Most big parks (Golden Gate Park SF, Central Park NY) all have carefully inserted major streets. Till then we will need to complete the traffic study but I'm not sure that any low budget tweaks it offers are ultimately anything but bandaids. I'm certainly willing to be proved wrong.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- Given the pandemic impacts on the city's budget we will have to be creative and look into types of funding. If this is a priority for Sunset Park I am happy to look into this further. Safety is a priority for me.

g) **Jon Mann** -- Start with an online forum on the city website for residents impacted to reach consensus on this and other neighborhood issues!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- Why wasn't this done? I'll work to get that money back into the SP neighborhood.

i) **Christine Parra** -- The Sunset Park Traffic Management Program should have been funded as promised to residents by the City. Sunset Park traffic and dangerous intersections put residents at risk. If elected, I will make this a priority to re-fund and complete.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- For two decades before I joined the council, Sunset Park was the focus of substantial traffic management investment. We have the opportunity to build a new, modern approach to traffic and prioritize pedestrian and bike safety. To fund this studies and do the work, we must recover this economy. Then we can begin to invest in such improvements.



k) **Ted Winterer** -- First, I'm not so sure the Ocean Park study has been funded. I recall telling OPA there was no money in our budget for a study when they asked for it and yesterday I confirmed with the Mobility division that such a study was not funded. Regardless, all capital improvement projects which have been postponed including the Sunset Park improvements will be funded as City revenues recover.

3) **Santa Monica College** -- Through a series of ballot measures, property owners in Santa Monica and Malibu are now responsible for the following SMC facilities bonds:

1992 -- Measure T -- \$23 million -- will be paid off in 2022  
2002 -- Measure U -- \$160 million -- will be paid off in 2032  
2004 -- Measure S -- \$135 Million -- will be paid off in 2034  
2008 -- Measure AA -- \$295 million -- will be paid off in 2038  
2016 -- Measure V -- \$345 million -- will be paid off in 2046

From the Measure V ballot language: *"The District estimates, based on current assumptions that total debt service on the Measure V bonds would be \$722,483,675."*

The total commitment from all the SMC facilities bonds adds up to **\$958 million**, which will ultimately cost Santa Monica and Malibu property owners an astonishing **\$2 billion** to pay off. Meanwhile, only 4% of SMC students list Santa Monica High School as the last high school they attended. Additionally, in recent years, out of approximately 30,000 SMC students, about 3,000 were international students, and about 2,000 were from out-of-state.

Given the investment that Santa Monica and Malibu property owners have made in the College, and the fact that very few SMC students are residents of Santa Monica or Malibu, **would you support additional SMC facilities bond measures in the near future? If so, why?**

a) **Phil Brock** -- No. An emphatic No. Santa Monica College was conceived as a community college. They lost their way and decided that international students were the money ticket. The international gravy train has disappeared. The college will have to mitigate the harmful effects on the neighborhoods. One thing has irked me. You pay for your residential parking permits close to the college. That's wrong. SMC should have paid for the cost of permits. They caused the problem through unbridled growth. Let's change that!

b) **Tod Cizek** -- No, not in the next 2-4 years based on the current economic situation.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- I view affordable education as a crucial component of Black Lives Matter and other efforts to overcome intentional and historical discrimination as well as

poverty. I, therefore, would support SMC bonds that fund necessary capital improvements that facilitate providing a quality education to SMC students.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- I think we have enough bonds for SMC and our focus should be on building SMMUSD facilities where more than 80% of the students are residents. I am a supporter of public education and I believe that SMC has positioned itself to be a beneficial tool for advancement. Although Santa Monica residents are saddled with a growing debt, SMC has failed to fully engage and maintain enrollment for Santa Monica students. Until SMC starts to increase the enrollment, retention and graduation of Santa Monica students I will not support another bond.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- Santa Monica College is a cash burden on the City's residents while being a regional resource. No new bonds should be entertained until previous bonds have been retired. Again this is an institution that needs to live within its means and eventually do more with less.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- I work at Santa Monica College and as a renter I too contribute towards these bonds like all Santa Monica renters do. I will always weigh the pros and cons of proposed bond and ballot measures that impact residents' financial health.

g) **Jon Mann** -- This city is primarily renter and they pass these measures because it doesn't come out of their pockets. Enough is enough! Again I reiterate: Residents must be empowered to reach consensus and online oversight through a virtual Town Hall platform on the city website, to prevent City Council from enabling special interests controlling the narrative!

h) **Tod Mentch** -- NOPE! And I disliked these measures over the years for the exact reasons stated above. And now we have a world class set of empty boxes. we should have been investing in digital the past decade.

i) **Christine Parra** -- I would not support any additional bond measures unless there is a resident/community benefit attached to it. Before I decided to run for City Council, I registered at SMC to take some classes and every class was full and there wasn't a waiting list available. This is unacceptable and I would work hard to get priority registration for Santa Monica residents. I am also concerned that such a low percentage of Santa Monica children attend SMC.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- If the bond measure improves service delivery and provides benefits to the community, I will favor them. Importantly, the College should be building housing to support students, reduce traffic, and relieve our housing crisis.

k) **Ted Winterer** – SMC states that 38% of Samohi students take classes for free while in high school, earning college credit. 45% of Samohi students matriculate to SMC directly from high school. SMC's Promise Program is free to full time SM students and offers up to \$1200/year in textbooks. Would I support another bond measure? That would depend on the projects covered. We've all benefited from the Broad Theater, the Swim Center, the track, the planetarium and other College facilities. Housing for students to reduce commuter traffic would help. And we're helped by the contribution to Memorial Park from the last bond, so perhaps a future bond might assist with converting SMO to a park.

4) What steps would you support to require SMC to mitigate and reduce the negative impacts of student/staff commuter traffic on the neighborhoods surrounding its numerous campuses?

a) **Phil Brock** -- Our traffic management department must work closely with all relevant transportation services to devise new ways to move students between campuses without harming our community.

b) **Tom Cizek** -- My employer is a global micromobility operator. Fewer cars, dedicated multi-modal corridors, safe pedestrian infrastructure and new mobility pilots (including safe infrastructure that crosses I-10) and open streets are our SMC neighborhood campuses of the future.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- The Big Blue Bus “anytime, any ride” program in which SMC subsidizes free transit passes for SMC students and faculty has been successful in getting teachers and students out of their cars and onto transit. I certainly would encourage SMC to look for similar innovations to reduce the burden on the nearby neighborhoods.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- I support Brian O’Neal’s proposal to create a “good neighbor” program between SMC and the impacted neighborhood to determine mitigations to reduce the negative impacts of commuter traffic.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- The City has encouraged and I support multi-modal transportation methods for SMC’s campuses. Santa Monica College students also receive free bus passes to encourage them to use public transportation. SMC built its parking structure on the Boulevard to mitigate traffic in the residential areas. Covid-19 has forced a new remote way of learning. Therefore, I expect that there will be less traffic after recovery.

g) **Jon Mann** -- Free BBB service and jitneys to residents, students and workers in the area. Free parking at the airport!

h) **Tod Mentch** -- Can we incentivize public transportation? Force SMC to do so? What about closing off traffic to key streets during high volume times? These seem like good ideas to me.

i) **Christine Parra** -- The recent construction to the main SMC campus allows an opportunity to re-orient visitors to the campus by making Pico Blvd. the main entrance. This would in turn drive visitors to use the Pico parking structures. Additionally, I would work to require staff to park offsite and bus in and incentivize students to do the same by providing access to reduced parking passes. I would also incentivize using public transportation/bikes by giving credit or reduced registration fees if students can prove they are only using public transportation or bikes.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- Importantly, the College should be building housing to support students, reduce traffic, and relieve our housing crisis.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- Traffic mitigation? Continue the free rides on the BBB paid for by SMC. More convenient shuttle from the Expo Line.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Mid-City Neighbors (MCN):**

1) **Mental health beds** -- Currently, local police have to transport people placed on 5150 holds (a forced 72-hour detention for mental evaluation of those deemed to be a threat to themselves or others) to either UCLA Medical Center in Westwood (which is usually at capacity and therefore unable to take new admissions) or Harbor-UCLA Medical Center. **Would you require Providence St. John's Health Center, which has two development agreements with the city and is therefore obligated to provide community benefits, to provide mental health beds? If not, why not?**

a) **Phil Brock** -- Providence St John's always wants to expand its campus footprint. Within our town, mental health facilities will allow our police and fire units to respond faster where needed and provide a direct community benefit. I am in favor of this proposal.

b) **Tom Ciszek** -- Yes, we must make changes at the state level to change the statutory definition of "grave danger", and increase the number of beds for mental health at St. John's will contribute to the health and wellbeing of all of us in Santa Monica. Ignoring the problem of homeless mentally ill will not make it go away.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- I support having Providence Saint John's Health Center provide in-patient mental health beds as well as other mental health services as part of its community benefit obligation.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- Addressing mental health is a major issue for Santa Monica's public safety plan, especially as it relates to the homelessness population. Many people experiencing homelessness suffer from mental health issues and available beds are very limited which increases the risk for residents and homeless alike. Once elected, I will insist that mental health beds be included as community benefits for Providence St. Johns Healthcare Center.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- St John and UCLA need to step up for our homeless residents many of whom have mental health issues. I would be willing to advocate for such in the DA requirements. There may be some limitations as to what I can do because my office is within 1 block of St Johns so I may have to recuse myself because of the proximity issues (will be determined by City Attorney).

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- We need to make use of all of our resources and maximize the community benefits out of any development. That being said, we need to consider the type and the need. Covid-19 has exposed serious racial, ethnic, gender and age inequities. As a member of the Social Service Commission in reviewing community benefits, mental health was in the discussion and that was precisely one of the asks of us from Providence St. Johns.

g) **Jon Mann** -- Yes. This is a regional problem and our city bears the brunt of the problem. County and state must provide funding for compassionate care instead of abusive so called "non profits"! Too many of my fellow veterans are falling through the cracks and could be housed at the Westwood VA facility if funding was provided for more housing.

h) **Todd Mentch** -- Absolutely!

i) **Christine Parra** -- I would require that Providence St. John's Health Center provide mental health beds in their development agreement as an obligation to the city. This is a critical need for our community. When first responders have to transport a patient to a hospital or facility outside of the city, it removes a needed resource from the city. Compounding the problem is "wall times" (the amount of time first responders wait before the hospital triages and receives the patient). If we had these services in Santa Monica, our Paramedics would not have to leave the city.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- I have supported adding mental health treatment capacity to our community by leveraging resources like our hospitals and nonprofit providers. It is a key part of the comprehensive health treatment of our residents.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- Absolutely, yes. We have a mental health crisis in this country with one in five citizens experiencing some sort of mental health issue and so many living with severe mental illness.

2) **Preferential parking** – Would you support a return of preferential street parking for neighborhoods close to businesses, with hourly enforcement? If not, why not?

a) **Phil Brock** -- Yes, we must mitigate the negative impact of businesses that have no employee parking on our neighborhoods. By the way, I feel that companies without adequate employee parking must contribute to the neighbor's cost of preferential parking. I need to add a point. Let's get the auto trailers off our residential streets, once and for all!

b) **Tom Cizek** -- Yes, but this necessitates having adequate parking in the city. We will use data to drive decision-making and ideally reduce the number of cars in Santa Monica over time. I also propose that metered parking along Ocean Ave. (south of Pico) adjacent to Barnard Way Linear Park be made 24 hours.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- I think that almost all of the streets in the Mid-City neighborhood currently have preferential parking. Until we have a more comprehensive approach to parking throughout the City, I would not change that. I honestly do not think that the City will ever have the resources to enforce preferential parking in any neighborhood on an hourly basis.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- As businesses open up, I would support a return to preferential street parking for neighborhoods close to businesses with time allotments designated to support both businesses during the day and residents after 5pm. Time specific preferential parking will ensure that businesses have parking for their customers and some of their employees during the day while allowing residents parking spaces when they get home from work. We need to always protect residential neighborhoods from commercial encroachment.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- Preferential parking is a continuous war in Santa Monica. The enforcement must be credible enough to discourage scofflaws. Is that every hour, every two hours, etc? I don't know what the level of enforcement is actually the most cost effective? But certainly there must be a credible enforcement which may vary block to block and may change over time.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- As a resident who lives on a high volume traffic street, I understand the necessity for residents to look into preferential parking. As a councilmember, I have reviewed and supported the request of amending and/or changing preferential parking zones with modified enforcement.

g) **Jon Mann** -- We need more parking, but not at the expense of residents who are being crowded out! SMC students and others take up street parking for long periods of time and dump their trash on the street!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- Yes! I have asked for this repeatedly in my Ocean Park neighborhood

i) **Christine Parra** -- I support preferential street parking for neighborhoods close to businesses and I would waive the annual preferential street parking charge. Additionally, I would ensure that enforcement is placed on the police department's daily schedule.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- No. I think preferential parking is a privatization of public space. When parking is priced, it is best managed. The preferential parking districts spread from one block to another like cancer, pushing their problems off to their neighbors. They exclude the majority minority service workers in our city in favor of our majority white residents.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- Yes, and as we've started to see increased employee parking in residential streets near businesses that are reopening a restoration of preferential parking is being considered

3) **Street cleaning** – The Mid-City area needs street cleaning more than once a month due to heavy traffic use, homeless trash, and business trash in our gutters.

Would you support more frequent street cleaning in our neighborhood? If not, why not?

a) **Phil Brock** -- Yes, I support weekly street cleaning. With twenty-eight assistant city attorneys, I sure we can clean up that department enough to pay for the citywide street cleaning we expect.

b) **Tom Cizek** -- More frequent street cleaning would be a luxury at this point given the onset of the COVID crisis, while we should consider adjusting cleaning to be more effective, increasing frequency in a single neighborhood should be weighed against all priorities; however, if possible should be pursued.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- The City reduced street cleaning during the pandemic because residents, who are now working from home, did not want the burden of moving their vehicles on street cleaning days. I understand that monthly cleaning does not meet the high standards of cleanliness to which Santa Monican are accustomed but I think that we



will have to restore weekly street cleaning on a City-wide basis. If all the neighborhood groups represent to the City that residents now are willing to move their vehicles every week, the City would be willing to revert to the weekly cleaning schedule.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- If elected to the City Council, I will prioritize City services that have a direct impact on residents. Once revenue is re-established, city services must be reinstated on an equitable basis, meaning that resources and services are provided where the need is the greatest. Street cleaning will be one of the city services that is prioritized that directly benefits residents.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- While street cleaning once a month is probably too low. Lets try twice a month as soon as the City budget stabilizes (still too many uncertainties now). This is an area where we must be doing more with less: what are the real savings and benefits for different levels of sweeping? I would like to hear the public discussion about this. Certainly residents and parkers need certainty as to when sweeping is happening.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- Unfortunately, this is one of the services that was cut and we hope to restore after recovery. We will look at which neighborhoods may need more frequent street cleaning.

g) **Jon Mann** -- Yes, and more sidewalk cleaning, more trash receptacles and trash pickups; the smell of urine pervades...

h) **Todd Mentch** -- Yes. Can we work with businesses to get extra revenue?

i) **Christine Parra** -- I fully support the restoration of weekly street cleaning in our neighborhoods and am very concerned about the pile-up of dry leaves and debris that accumulates in our gutters. This can create a fire hazard and it threatens our beaches. The City's own website tell us that "Urban runoff, the surface water from our yards, driveways and streets, that flows through storm drains is the greatest single source of pollution to the beaches and water of Santa Monica Bay... urban runoff cannot always be adequately treated before it reaches our bay and beaches." The current once-a-month street sweeping is shameful.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- Yes. It is time to restore street sweeping.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- Yes, as recovering revenues allow.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Northeast Neighbors (NEN):**

1) **Unbundled parking** -- Residents have asked the City to close a loophole that has yet to be addressed in the regulations: New apartment buildings are allowed to “unbundle parking” – i.e., to charge separately for rent and parking. Residents in the neighborhoods want to be assured that tenants who choose to pay for rent but not for parking are not later allowed to purchase the much cheaper preferential parking passes and park on the neighborhood streets.

**Would you agree to close this loophole if elected to City Council?**

a) **Phil Brock** -- Close the loophole and force those businesses without parking to contribute to the neighbor's permit fees.

b) **Tom Ciszek** -- I live in a single apartment with parking bundled and can also purchase residential and visitor preferential permits in 3R (as well as at the beach lot). I agree this is not fair and we must address this loophole and consider a bigger discussion - potentially redesigning the entire preferential parking system (and parking zones) in a more fair manner.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- I support prohibiting residents of buildings with unbundled parking from purchasing preferential parking passes.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- I have an issue with unbundled parking because it creates more pressure for residents when it comes to street parking. Once elected I would support a study to look into closing the unbundle parking loophole.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- Close the unbundled parking loophole.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- I would definitely look to Rent Control to see how prevalent this loop hole is being used. The neighborhood streets should not be impacted by this loop hole.

g) **Jon Mann** -- Yes, absolutely, and thanks for bringing this to my attention!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- Yes! This is absurd. It's obvious what tenants would do in this case to save money. I get that, but not at such a high cost to the community. If you cannot afford the parking spot, you cannot afford the car.

i) **Christine Parra** -- I agree to close the loophole if elected. The goal of encouraging residents to use transit is a good one, but unbundling does not provide a real incentive if the new residents can park on the neighborhood streets.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- Yes.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- Yes, and I'm disappointed we haven't done it sooner. My bad for not following up on it.

2) **How should the City address the unhoused mentally ill and drug addicted people who are overwhelming our parks and public spaces?**

a) **Phil Brock** -- I have provided a twelve-point plan to lessen homelessness in Santa Monica. The one thing that must be obvious to all is that we continue to fail and have become a magnet for homelessness. We must reverse that. My full plan is at -- <https://votebrock.org/issues/homelessness> -- Among my plan's points: arrest and prosecute felony drug dealers and users. Restore park rangers as a permanent force in parks that are in trouble. Close Samoshell, prevent community feedings in our parks, make West Coast Care and our police HLP team operate twenty-four hours a day, add more SMPD units on our streets, emulate Bobby Shriver and get the VA to take responsibility for their homeless vets, and shut down problem, single carry convenience stores.

b) **Tom Ciszek** -- The city must work with the state, VA and the county to make more mental health beds available, which would need supplemental support for social workers and mental health experts in the health department. The homeless situation is separate but related to low income housing and safety. We must also change definitions in our law (e.g. encampment, grave danger) such that we can address this chronic, heartbreaking issue in our city. This comes back to the homeless budget and the resources we set aside for this. The answer is there is no definite number. Right now there is no budget set aside for this, so we must shift resources directly into mental health treatment and outcomes. It is a systemic problem.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- The City needs to work with the County (which is the primary provider of mental health services) to bring more mental health services to Santa Monica. I support creation of a community mental health center which I think would be a game changer in addressing the mental health needs of our community, including those people experiencing homelessness

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- We need a "compassionate accountability" approach to addressing the mentally ill and drug addicted in our City. We need to enforce our laws and work to provide support for those in need. It is immoral to allow people to suffer from mental illness on our streets and parks without our intervention. We need temporary

shelters to provide short term care and support and we also must collaborate with our regional partners to provide a long term solution to this crisis.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- Our homeless problem is way beyond our local ability to solve. A regional solution is needed. So we need a County wide solution. For example many homeless are vets often with mental issues (PTSD etc). They should be housed at the VA which is the only nearby institution with enough land to actually deal with the scale of the problem. Remember the VA was once called the “Old Soldier’s Home” and could return to that mission. This is not Nimbyism but a practical approach to maximize our limited resources and trying not to become a homeless magnet.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- I support all of our outreach teams and social service providers who do the best they can to get people housed and mentally ill people into shelters. At our last Council meeting as part of Safety Reform, we voted to increase Neighborhood Resource Officers, make changes to Emergency Calls and Dispatch. I believe that is a step in the right direction. We have increased the number of Ambassadors at different locations to work with local neighborhoods and help keep park and open spaces available for recreational use and activities for residents. We need the support of the Federal Government to help house people suffering from mentally illness.

g) **John Mann** -- Our parks have been taken over by criminals. Open drug dealing and use, unsanitary and dangerous practices, defecating and urinating in public, etc. Unacceptable, our City Council is responsible! Our parks are for families and must be monitored by Police 24/7. Repeat offenders banned from Santa Monica! We must not blame disenfranchised homeless; these are street thugs invading our city and parks!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- I am going to work with Rep Liu and get the Fed Gov to create a VA focused (also serving general homeless population) Health Facility on the fastly underutilized land just east of the city border. It's ambitious, but I will do it!

i) **Christine Parra** -- The city needs to have a compassionate and collaborative plan to address the unhoused mentally ill and drug addicted in our parks and public spaces. A review of other city homelessness and support plans show a multi-pronged approach. It begins with understanding the needs of our homeless residents, identifying and forming partnerships, expanding community education, engaging the community in roundtable discussions and studying and incorporating best practices. We can accomplish this by having an expert in the city to work with a resident-based committee.

j) **Terry O’Day** -- We must provide aggressive, consistent outreach to get people the services and housing they need.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- Our two street outreach teams, C3 and HMST, helped to reduce our homeless population by 8% in our last count, even as the County population increased 13%. While that work continues, we just authorized adding more DMH staff to SMPD operations. And I regularly speak with Dr. Jon Sherin, a Santa Monica resident who runs DMH, about what he can do to decentralize County mental health services and bring them into the field – I’ve been working on a privately-funded mobile psychiatric services van (stalled due to the recession) for his staff to service our city and I’m in discussions with SMFD about connecting them with DMH resources.

3) **Will you accept developer funding of your campaign for City Council?**

b) **Tom Ciszek** -- The answer to this question is a firm no.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- No campaign contribution from any source ever will influence my vote. In the past, I have accepted contributions from housing developers. I may do so again. I will not accept any campaign contributions from any applicant that has a project pending before the City. In addition, I comply with the Oaks Initiative that prevents candidates from accepting contributions from persons that have benefitted from recent City contracts.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** – No.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** – No.

g) **Jon Mann** -- It has always been my position to never accept, or solicit developer or any special interest contributions or endorsements! I will represent the residents and only the residents if elected! I’ve said that before and I’ll say it again!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- No. I am not accepting any funding. Self funded and entirely online is how I will always campaign. At this point, I would say a good rule of thumb is that if you see a professionally printed street sign for a candidate, you might want to take a serious look at why that is. I encourage my supporters to make signs by hand.

i) **Christine Parra** -- No, I will not accept developer funding for my campaign for City Council.

j) **Terry O’Day** -- It is expensive to run for office in Santa Monica, and the most cost-effective tactic - canvassing - has been taken away by Covid. The campaign needs funding to send mail and communicate with voters. The city has a strict limit on contributions in dollar value and due to Oaks Initiative, no one who benefits from a council vote may donate to candidates. Therefore I have no trouble taking funding from a source without feeling

beholden to them in any way. What's more, I prefer to take funds from people in Santa Monica, rather than raise from friends and family who are needier.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- No.

\*\*\*\*\*

**North of Montana Association (NOMA):**

1) There is only one small park (Goose Egg Park) in NOMA. How will you work to expand park and recreation space in or around our neighborhood?

a) **Phil Brock** -- Absolutely! Pocket Parks are needed, and I have never given up my fight for a children's playground and a dog park in NOMA, for example.

b) **Tom Ciszek** -- While there is only one formal park, Palisades Park and formalizing the San Vicente greenway could provide more space; ensuring Reed Park is safe is important too. There are also many square feet of street which could be made to create public parklet or gree-space on some of the wider streets (e.g. Marguerita, Georgina) as well as along 4th street (I used to live on San Vicente and 3rd)

c) **Gleam Davis** -- The Council preserved the Playground Partnership program which gives the community access to fields at Roosevelt and Franklin Schools. I also support upgrading bike lanes along San Vicente and Ocean Avenues. With the change in retail and commercial land usage, it is possible that a property along Montana Avenue might become available for purchase. If that property were in an appropriate place for open space, I would support having the City consider purchasing it for use as a park.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- Pocket parks provide open space for residents to enjoy the outdoors. If elected to the City Council, I will work with the Parks and Recreation Commission to identify areas for pocket parks.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- Yes we need many more parks, particularly in the post covid world where pandemics may occur regularly. I would want a public discussion of the optimum place for a new park (pocket or otherwise) in NOMA.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- Palisades Park, one of our most beautiful parks, runs through NOMA Neighborhood. So many are lucky to have beautiful yards in the NOMA neighborhood as well. In addition, as we re-structure downtown it is my hope that public open space is a part of the Development Agreements.

h) **Todd Mentch** -- Not sure what can be done here.

i) **Christine Parra** -- I will fight to create open space on any city owned lands and this includes the property at 4<sup>th</sup> and Arizona. I will also fight to make certain that the limited open space is clean and safe for residents.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- I believe open space and parks must reach every neighborhood. We have to invest to create these options.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- While technically not within NOMA's borders, we recently added a universally accessible playground on the beach north of the Pier that until the COVID shutdown was always at capacity with happy kids and their parents on the weekends. There is talk about making San Vicente more hospitable to walkers, runners and cyclists to expand recreational opportunities. And of course Palisades Park is a wonder. Beyond that, with R-1 tear downs selling for millions of dollars it's hard to imagine the City could assemble enough parcels for a large park – perhaps a pocket park or two..

2) While NOMA is primarily a single family (R-1) area, there are multiple family residences on Montana, on some streets north of Montana, and along San Vicente. **How will you preserve the R-1 sense of this area and others throughout the City that may be subject to state or city ordinances to allow multiple units (beyond ADUs) in these areas?**

a) **Phil Brock** -- First, I fought to preserve the historic garden and courtyard apartments as the Historic San Vicente Coalition co-chair. Second, as I have stated elsewhere in this questionnaire, I will fight the state's proposed housing requirements, which will decimate NOMA's character and nature. By joining other like-minded cities, we can defeat the housing requirement legislation when it next rears its ugly head. Our city must stand up and be counted, not lay down and roll-over, as they have done in the past.

b) **Tom Ciszek** -- Meeting the State obligations and providing affordable housing in Santa Monica is a challenge. The weather is great, and we love living here - who wouldn't?! - and the willingness to pay follows that demand. As part of planning for the RHNA obligations, the city should design a mathematically fair division practice across census tracts based on data. Without legal intervention, the state mandates for housing growth will require the city to explore innovative and new solutions throughout Santa Monica. Housing density is another problem in and of itself. I want to work with the city planning commission to evaluate a long-term comprehensive General Plan for the city that addresses this need of affordable housing in a smart, data-driven and sustainable way without displacing residents or businesses that may be occupying surrounding space already.



c) **Gleam Davis** -- I do not support placing large apartment buildings in R-1 zones. But it is likely that the state will continue to encourage the creation of additional housing opportunities in R-1 zones. It also is important to remember that R-1 zoning in Santa Monica is the legacy of exclusionary covenants that discriminated against Blacks and other people of color. This intentional past discrimination requires that we take intentional remedial action in our present. For that reason, I am open to looking for ways to make housing in our R-1 neighborhoods more affordable and more diverse.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- As a Council member, I would maintain the zoning rules that protect the character of R-1 neighborhoods. I would also work to bring together our Council, County Representative and State Legislators to hear from residents and discuss the housing affordability crisis and identify real solutions and not worsen the crisis by incentivizing the construction of more market rate housing.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- Sacramento is the major threat to our R-1 neighborhoods. See items 1 & 2 of Citywide issues above. I will fight to preserve the character of all R-1 neighborhoods against all threats.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- I support ADU's and believe they are one answer to affordable housing and the housing crisis. I will always look to protect that which makes every neighborhood unique in Santa Monica.

h) **Todd Mentch** -- I think we can selectively re-zone areas of certain R-1 communities. VERY selectively.

i) **Christine Parra** -- I oppose and will fight state legislation mandating denser housing in R-1 neighborhoods. The infrastructure cannot support the added density and zoning should be controlled by the local elected government. Sadly, our current City Council members did nothing to object the Nine Bad Bills advanced by the state legislature. As a member of the Santa Monica City Council I would and will stand up for local control and join with other cities that protect their residents and the quality of their neighborhoods. The most affordable housing is existing housing.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- ADUs should fit into the design of the neighborhood in a way that creates improvements in our quality of life and put 'eyes' on our alleys to improve safety.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- It makes no sense to me to increase density in R-1 neighborhoods which don't have access to transit, as one of the key components of addressing climate change is housing people so they don't have to rely on a car every day. I have shared my opposition to bills such as SB 1120 with our legislators.

3) What ideas do you have to balance the Santa Monica budget without further cutting resident-oriented services such as trash removal, street sweeping, library access, and reduction in police and emergency services?

a) **Phil Brock** -- As I have answered elsewhere in this questionnaire, we are not broke, nor are we in dire straits. We have merely reduced our budgetary outlay to 2013 levels. By managing our income versus expenses as a regular business would, Santa Monica will see rebirth as a leaner, more durable city. We can restore services throughout 2020-2021 and begin to reorient our economy in a more diversified manner. Eliminate the talk of gloom and doom. Our city will be fine under new leadership that uses common sense as a guide.

b) **Tom Cizek** -- Cut unnecessary spending by implementing and working within the new-COVID budget-levels as the new normal city operating budget. The city should and can increase revenue generating code-enforcement activities (littering, electric vehicles on the bike path) while simultaneously looking at the challenging, but largest portion of the budget - the Big Blue Bus - and how to continue to optimize and operate - using operations research and cost-benefit analysis of the wellness and economic spillover benefits associated with new types of transportation and mobility for all.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- Because of the economic downturn caused by the pandemic, the City has modified its organizational structure to reduce the number of high-paying positions while still providing a high level of service to residents. The other way to restore services while maintaining a balanced budget is to promote Santa Monica's economic recovery. If we can revitalize the economy, by encouraging residents to Buy Local (rather than online) and bringing visitors back to our hotels and other attractions, we can begin to restore some of the cuts that we all regretted having to make.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- These essential services would be prioritized and no further cuts would be acceptable. I would cut more at the top of the organization to protect essential services. I will prioritize making cuts as far away from essential resident needs and services.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- The City needs to do more with less starting with staff reductions and pay reductions but also ending its capital improvements projects. The best way to do this is a long discussion but certainly the City has made progress in this directions. The question is how can we still do more with less while simultaneously making the cuts fair: those with more will be reduced the most while those with less will get reduced the least. Eventually we will reach a stable basic level of service from which

we can start our recovery. The first replaced services should be those that touch residents directly (crime prevention, libraries, street sweeping etc ).

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- The City will need to think past today to our future in 10 and 20 years and look at projects and restoring our businesses that can bring real revenue to our city. I do not want to cut further any essential services we rely on. These are tough choices but I will fight to protect basic services, as I did during our brutal budget process. I voted no to the cuts, because I knew this would impact services to residents.

h) **Todd Mentch** -- Cash management. We appear to have a tremendous amount of cash on hand. I would work with city manager to ensure we maximize this resource. We could potentially make a few million a year relatively risk free. Revenue increases: Higher permit fees. Higher fees for ride sharing (why did the SMCC recently DECREASE these taxes?!?!?). The decades of getting more services with less revenue are over.

i) **Christine Parra** -- Services to residents should be a top priority for the City. I think we need to look at the City budget to determine which projects are essential. We also need to begin to require that developers deliver Community Benefits that actually benefit the community when projects are approved. The city has clearly overextended itself.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- We must prioritize public safety first and then services. The only way to restore our services to pre-Covid levels is to restore our economy. We are working to do this with permit streamlining, Covid-safe certifications, opening streets, and more.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- Voter approval of Measure SM will yield roughly \$3M in the first year and \$5M thereafter to restore services. Passage of State measure Prop 15 will yield a sustainable and predictable revenue stream not subject to the vicissitudes of economic cycles – a recent NY times article observed that New Orleans had to cut 25% of its budget because, like Santa Monica, it depends a lot on revenues impacted by a recession such as sales tax and tourism spending. On the other hand, Boston cut services by only 10% because they are able to rely much more on property taxes. Finally, we need more Federal support – cities with populations under 500K got no direct funding from the CARES Act and our cut of the CARES \$ allocated to CA was \$1.1M compared to the \$28.6M allocated to Santa Ana, a city roughly three times our size.

4) There was a great deal of anger at the way the police handled the May 31st vandalism. There has been no transparency about these actions since then.

Do you have a plan to create more transparency in the oversight of such actions? If yes, could you share it with the neighborhood organizations?

a) **Phil Brock** -- We continue to await reports when we all saw the day's events with our own eyes. We should all be angry! It was the single worst day in our city's 145-year history. I have written about May 31st four times in my op-eds for the Santa Monica Mirror. Reading any of those will provide you with my detailed feelings. The City Council has consciously hidden from responsibility as has the Chief of Police (why does she still have a job). Even the embarrassment of ads in the Los Angeles Times has not awakened a sense of responsibility for the looting or the tear-gassed protestors. What's worse, no city council member has gone to any looted businesses to talk with the store owners that lost so much that day. Opaqueness will not be a part of my time as your elected representative. Honesty and transparency will be the hallmark of my time on the dais.

b) **Tom Cizek** -- Yes my plan includes a Chief's Commission for Community Wellbeing to drive the investigation into May 31st and the following policies:

1. Assign a Deputy Chief for Community Wellbeing
2. Implement training and simulations that train officers on de-escalation techniques
3. Immediately implement ordinances protecting police officers who interrupt or report abuse by a fellow officer or supervisor,
4. Seek authorization from the CA Legislature to issue citations for municipal code violations and minor misdemeanor offenses
5. Seek a CA legislature support to allow the appropriation of funds to fund a mental health units and investments into early intervention programs
6. Seek transparency in dispatch calls and police scanner information; measure and report to outcomes of incident calls

c) **Gleam Davis** -- It broke my heart to see tear gas and rubber bullets used in Santa Monica. The Police Department undertook to do a thorough After-Action Report regarding the events of May 31 and the City Council required an independent review of the facts contained therein. However, it has become apparent that the Police Department does not have the resources to complete the quality report that the community deserves. The Council, therefore, has authorized hiring a qualified consultant to assist with the report. Once that report is completed, it will be shared with the community.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** – Peaceful protesters were tear gassed while looters were ignored! We need more civilian oversight of law enforcement. We need data on arrests and citations to be shared and disaggregated by race and ethnicity to protect our police department from allegations of harassment and bias. Body cameras can also assist in strengthening transparency. Ultimately, we need to create a culture of respect and fairness in our police department. I would like to create a Public Safety Task Force to develop solutions and a standing Resident Oversight Committee to provide consistent feedback and oversight.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- We need a full report of what happened on May 31st. The report must be public and discussed publicly. The important thing is to understand not only what happened and why but understand the lessons of what happened. It will happen again (see Sept 1 tactical alert) unless those lessons are taken to heart.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- The City has hired a firm to investigate and report back to the City Council about the hard realities of May 31; the choices that were made and why. We need to have all the facts prior to bringing them to all of our residents. As we know this process takes time and we should not rush into bringing an incomplete report. In addition, the City created a Safety Task Force which has made recommendations that the city will be implementing.

h) **Todd Mentch** -- I spoke with the Police Association about this during my interview on 9.3.20. First, I think the SMPD has been too maligned for this incident. I think they did well to limit what could have been a much more serious and tragic event. That being said, it's obvious any real analysis/discussion has been tabled by all involved parties until after the election. And let's be honest, that makes sense. When I am elected, I will make certain a proper analysis by authoritative third parties is completed and we take action to learn and implement lessons.

i) **Christine Parra** -- Since the City Council appears to be delaying the production of an After-Action Report until after the election, we may not understand why the police acted as they did on May 31<sup>st</sup>. We need to remember that police officers do not go into service seeking fame or fortune. They do it to protect and serve. I know that our officers were just as heart-broken about what happened in our City on that day and they want an opportunity to win back our trust. We need more police visibility; rangers in parks, decoy police cars, and community policing.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- With colleagues, I led the council to require independent fact-gathering, oversight and assessment of the May 31 actions of our PD. We are pressing everyday to have comprehensive facts presented as soon as possible.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- Council authorized outside assistance to accelerate the SMPD after action review, which thus far has been frustratingly slow. That report when completed will be then independently assessed. In the interim, I have advocated to Chief Renaud to reach out to the community more, which she is doing belatedly, as I believe our residents deserve to hear for her sooner rather than later.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Pico Neighborhood Association (PNA):**

1) There is a lot of resident anger toward the current City Council and City Hall regarding irresponsible development that prioritizes developer versus resident needs, deteriorating public safety, with higher crime rates and enabled looting, the PAL child abuse scandal, the CVRA lawsuit, and institutional racism at City Hall.

Why should residents re-elect incumbent City Council members who are partly to blame for the problems we currently face in Santa Monica? What will you do to ensure that our City government practices transparency and accountability and prioritizes the residents' quality of life?

a) **Phil Brock** -- Residents should not re-elect any incumbents to our city council. I've had enough, and I hope you have too. It's time for a change. With my partners, Oscar de la Torre, Christine Parra, and Mario Fonda-Bonardi, we will stand up for this city's residents. All of us are committed to transparency, honesty, and responsiveness to the residents' needs, all of the residents of our city.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- I supported important projects such as Pico Branch Library and program improvements at Virginia Avenue Park. The City has improved transparency through communication efforts and website enhancements. As councilmembers are elected by the community at-large, they are accountable to every resident in the City. Although Santa Monica certainly is not perfect, few cities match Santa Monica in its efforts to provide a broad and equitable range of services to residents. Of course, as we examine the issues raised by the Black Agenda and the Public Safety Reform Advisory Committee, I hope our community will come together to do even better.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** – Incumbents have shown that they care more about getting re-elected and helping their allies profit than representing resident tax payers. I will work with the City Manager to ensure that city programs have safety measures and protocols in place that will safeguard our residents including our most vulnerable our children and elderly of our City. I will establish district elections to ensure that every neighborhood has it's own representative that will be accountable to the residents in their district. I will work to elevate the voice of our residents and decrease the influence of big money and special interests.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- City transparency is a continuous problem. The Pico neighborhood has been historically the victim of much abuse/neglect which won't end until we have two of our slate sitting on the dias.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- As a resident in the Pico Neighborhood, I know firsthand the issues that we face. Even before being appointed to council, I have been actively improving the

quality of life of residents and neighbors. Since appointed I have been speaking, directing staff, and acting on the best policies to better our communities wellbeing. I have engaged residents from the Pico Neighborhood that had never been engaged in Civic Participation or in decision making.

g) **Jon Mann** -- Residents are furious! I am furious! The city spent millions to defeat district elections so incumbents wouldn't have to run against each other! Blatantly undemocratic interference preventing me from running in my Pico neighborhood against two incumbents, both appointees, and a coalition builder! I have long been advocating the City Council be recalled and set up a Facebook page for that purpose. I would implement a virtual Town Hall on the city website to empower residents, for transparency and to hold all city officials accountable. This has been my mission since before I ran for City Council the first time in 1992 and has been integral to my platform. If elected it will be my legacy!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- I am not going to disparage any candidate or sitting member. Your question answers itself. Regarding the second question, my solution to help going forward: all official government proceedings should be recorded and posted online. Why do civil servants need to have private meetings? I am not going to lie, or promise what I cannot try to deliver, or make a deal that goes against these promises for the support of ANY organization.

i) **Christine Parra** -- Residents should not re-elect the incumbent City Council members. They are the reason why we have seen irresponsible development throughout the city. They should be serving the residents not special interests. It's time for change! I believe in complete and total transparency and accountability to our constituents. The needs and wants of residents will be top of mind in every and all developments. The failure of the City Council to heed reports of child molestation at PAL is a dark mark on their record and more reason why we need to support four new City Council members on Nov. 3.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- I will work to ensure the community trust in our actions by communicating openly and factually.

k) **Ted Winterer** – The crime rate in Santa Monica decreased by 16% in 2019. The revelations about abuse at PAL two decades ago are horrifying, and the current Council provided financial payments to those who claimed abuse. Those who support district elections could have put an initiative on the ballot. Instead, plaintiffs' attorneys have run up a \$22M bill. Council approved an Equity and Inclusion initiative for City staff. Measure AB will allow HR to consider more than the top three test takers for hiring and promotion. All Council decisions are made in public and our meetings are available via streaming and CityTV; the Open Data portal, e-newsletters, and SM Alerts share



information; and various laws ensure transparency about lobbyists, campaign funding and the personal finances of elected officials and commissioners.

2) The City of Santa Monica provides millions of dollars of public funds to OPCC/The People Concern annually. Residents and OPCC clients have raised issues with the administration of the programs and the lack of attention being provided by the agency's employees.

What is the City of Santa Monica doing to ensure that OPCC/The People Concern is providing adequate and safe care for its clients? What accountability measures are in place to guarantee that the majority of the City's funds are spent on direct client services and not on salaries for high level administrators?

a) **Phil Brock** -- Your question raises the appropriate question. I have heard of repeated detailed problems at their facilities and ongoing issues with administering the numerous grants The People Concern receives each year from the City of Santa Monica. I want a complete audit of their programs, use of funds, and I want to see the inherent value of the results of their efforts with our resident's funds. We do not have adequate safeguards in place. They need to be put in place accordingly.

b) **Gleam Davis** -- All City grantees are accountable to the City. It is my understanding that the complaints of various residents and clients of OPCC were investigated and, to the extent necessary, changes in OPCC operations were required.

c) **Oscar de la Torre** – As a Councilmember, I would advocate for a funding condition tied to the public funds we give OPCC/The People Concern that would ensure that a majority of the funds go to provide direct services rather than to salaries. In terms of the safety of the program, I would require an annual audit on services that will also include interviews and review of case files for clients. As a founder of a City funded program I understand how the City can leverage grant funds and the RFP process to ensure we hold these grantees accountable to prove their worth.

d) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- The high salary problem inevitably collides with the ability to actually deliver services to the user of that particular service. I do not know at this time what the financial structure of OPCC/ People of Concern is, but I'm willing to be educated and look into it if it is under City control. I do not know how it fits into the City budget. Has there been accusations of misuse of funds? Please let me know as I have not heard of any.

e) **Ana Maria Jara** -- The City has received a report from OSHA where it implicitly looked at all resident's complaints and issues and addressed the complaints. Like all non-

profits funded by the city, they have oversight, must turn in reports and be held accountable on their use of funds.

f) **Jon Mann** -- Residents must have oversight of so called “non profits”! Salaries are excessive for administrative staff and services are curtailed. Abusive staff and overpaid administrators must be terminated without compensation. Violent clients must be removed for the safety of disenfranchised homeless! Mentally ill clients, women and children must be provided separate facilities!

g) **Todd Mentch** -- I will work to end the city funding. Why are we subsidizing the Annenberg Foundation? I want those funds directed to my federal land health facility project. Catchy name/achronym TBD.

h) **Christine Parra** -- There should be monthly reporting/auditing and direct accountability. If OPCC/The People Concern is not meeting pre-determined metrics, funding should be reallocated.

i) **Terry O’Day** -- The City requires its grantees to meet strict requirements for audit, comply with financial reporting requirements, and respond to city inquiries. Organizations whose leadership do not demonstrate transparency and misuse public funds, like Pico Youth and Family Center, are not recommended for further funding.

j) **Ted Winterer** -- Like all grantees, The People Concern must submit financial reports which are reviewed to assure City funds are spent appropriately. Human Services has investigated allegations about TPC and found no issues.

3) **Gandara Park** (formerly Stewart Park) was constructed in 1971 on top of a commercial landfill. According to the City’s landfill gas well reports, there have been continual gas leaks into the atmosphere, including but not limited to methane and benzene. But to date, there hasn’t been any public hearing to determine if daily use of Gandara Park is safe for families and children.

Would you be in favor of scheduling a Public Hearing to determine whether the landfill gas wells are working properly and whether using Gandara Park is safe? Would you also be in favor of posting a notice to residents that Gandara Park lies atop a former landfill?

a) **Phil Brock** -- Let's clean up the Toxic Triangle of Santa Monica. Gandara Park is the public epicenter of the issues in that neighborhood. It needs to be thoroughly cleansed and then restored. As the Chair of the Recreation and Parks Commission, I brought the issues surrounding that park's use and danger to the city administration's attention without success. As a city council member and with my colleagues' help, I will spearhead the cleanup and restoration of the park and the surrounding area. This MUST be a priority.

b) **Tom Ciszek** -- Yes, we could schedule a Public Hearing, this is common sense. I would be in favor of a notice to residents and park visitors; however, why wasn't this done previously as part of the formerly named Stewart Street Park adjacent to Mountain View Trailer Park and the I-10 freeway speaks to the economic discrimination we see even today in our city.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- The methane levels in Gandara Park are regularly monitored and reported to relevant regulatory agencies. To my knowledge, this monitoring has confirmed that Gandara Park is safe and that there is no dangerous methane leakage there. If there is some confusion around this, the City certainly could put out an information item describing the results of the monitoring and the reporting. Given that monitoring has demonstrated that the Gandara Park is safe, I am not sure what the purpose of a notice regarding the landfill would be.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** – The gas wells at Gandara Park have been ignored for too long from our “environmentalists” on the Council. If elected, I will call for a public hearing to determine if Gandara Park is safe for families. I will also support posting a notice for residents that Gandara Park was a former landfill. The current “environmentalists” on the City Council avoid discussing environmental justice issues. I live next to the freeway, the City dump and the Expo maintenance yard. I understand fully the need to mitigate environmental hazards emanating from our infrastructure and transportation.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- Gandara Park needs continuous monitoring given its previous landfill status to make sure the levels of pollution, if any, are WELL below safety standards. The standards may change over time and the outgassing, if any, may also change over time.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- I would be open to working with environmental organizations on this issue.

g) **Jon Mann** -- Yes, here again I reiterate, residents must have oversight!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- YES! This is our duty as public servants.

i) **Christine Parra** -- I am absolutely in favor of a Public Hearing and will commit to calling for one if elected. If the park is unsafe, residents should not be using it until it is made safe.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- I am in favor of continued scientific assessment of the Park and its air quality. If notifications are required, I will support those. If a community hearing will be helpful, I will support that as well

k) **Ted Winterer** -- At the very least I would support testing by Public Works and if issues are found a hearing would be in order. Posting a notice makes a great deal of sense.

4) The Santa Monica Community Development Department engaged in an effort to up-zone Pico Blvd., providing for more bars, larger restaurants, and more density in store front buildings. The Pico Neighborhood Association opposed these proposed changes because they would exacerbate gentrification, putting small businesses and renters at risk of displacement.

What would be your policy priorities to slow down gentrification that threatens small businesses and long term renters?

a) **Phil Brock** -- Stop the gentrification of the Pico Neighborhood. Stop displacement and add enterprise zones for neighborhood-serving, diverse ownership, retail businesses. Stop SMC from using the neighborhood as their dorms. Add more incubator grants and protect the zoning. Pico Blvd should not be upzoned.

b) **Tom Cizek** -- Given there are many types of zoning: industrial conservation, institutional, cemetery/SMC border, Parks and Mixed Use Blvd) among R2/R1 zoning, we could seek to work with our planning and the Santa Monica conservancy to establish preservation efforts in the Pico neighborhoods given there are none north of Pico and south of I-10. Improving transportation corridors to cross I-10 safely if you're not in a car will help small businesses thrive and establishing cultural events in our parks can help preserve the Pico neighborhood. Gentrification is always bad, but all development that is smart and does not displace residents and businesses can be good.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- The best way to keep current residents in their homes is to discourage new development in existing residential neighborhoods and encourage the building of new housing on commercial boulevards and in formerly industrial areas in the east side of Santa Monica. Small businesses can be protected by zoning for a range of commercial footprints that includes small floor plates that are relatively inexpensive and by using flexible zoning laws that permit a wide variety of businesses in commercial areas.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- The City planners ignored Pico Neighborhood residents when they tried to protect the character and scale of their neighborhood and in fact attempted to "up-zone" Pico Blvd. to give developers an incentive to build. Now more than ever, Santa Monica is losing small businesses. We need to protect them from displacement. Once elected, I will work to provide displacement protections for local and small businesses by providing them with incentives to stay and thrive.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- Gentrification effects all neighborhoods but those with cheap land costs e.g. Pico neighborhood are the first to be affected and suffer the largest impact. Encouraging landlords to keep rents low, or even reduce them is the best way to preserve existing business tenants. Currently market forces are pushing in this direction but that is a short term solution as the recovery will eventually bring in the same gentrification forces back in force. The City had started some modest incubator grants and this project needs to be expanded so businesses can survive while we come up with more permanent solutions to gentrification. Residents are best protected by my continuous support for rent control.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- I have already been working on that. I have requested that city look into developing along the Santa Monica and Wilshire Blvd. corridors and stay away from Pico Blvd. I along with Mayor McKeown put forth on an item 13 the Right to Return for former residents displaced by the freeway. I led on the efforts for Community Corporation to purchase a large property in the Pico Neighborhood that allowed over 40 low income families to remain in their homes. This amounted to over 200 people of color to remain in the Pico Neighborhood. I will continue these efforts to prevent further gentrification.

g) **Jon Mann** -- The court order for district elections must be reinstated so I can empower my fellow residents to take back our diverse Pico neighborhood. No more gentrification! Maintain diversity and lower density. If elected I will make a special effort to replace lost low income housing for seniors and living wage workers who have been Ellised out.

h) **Todd Mentch** -- Limited areas, not a blanket up-zone. Higher permit fees and ongoing usage tax. I want to work to expand out rent control in smart ways. Limiting annual increases, but means testing rents (in both directions, we are embarking upon an era of potential rental rates decreasing).

i) **Christine Parra** -- I am not in favor of up-zoning Pico Blvd. If anything, we should be working with our existing small businesses to determine what we can do to help bolster their business and drive patrons to them. The position of PNA should be taken seriously by the City Council, which seems to be too influenced by developer interests.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- Supporting local businesses and residents to improve their neighborhoods and quality of life has always been my priority.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- Recently approved SB 330 requires housing developers who demolish existing housing to replace any deed-restricted and/or rent-controlled housing. Since the Pico Neighborhood was downzoned from R3 to R2 most existing housing torn

down could only be replaced with a smaller building. Given the rent-controlled units would have to be replaced in a smaller building, long term renters are highly unlikely to be displaced due to this new law.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Wilshire-Montana Neighborhood Coalition(Wilmont):**

1) **Miramar** -- What is your assessment of the Miramar redevelopment project, and how would you work to lessen its impact on the Wilmont neighborhood?

a) **Phil Brock** -- Moving the entrance to 2nd Street as planned is untenable. Having a concrete wall of buildings without any undulation or break in the architecture is ridiculous. The size of the building at 2nd and Wilshire needs to be lowered and set back. Return the entrance to Wilshire Blvd, reduce the number of condos allowed, vary the height and density on California are among the steps I would seek.

b) **Tod Ciszek** -- The Miramar will have a significant impact on the neighborhood and all of Santa Monica. The top focus should be on pedestrian safety and transportation for our neighborhood residents. Ensuring that expedited access is provided in spite of the potential increased congestion not just for the Miramar project but also Gehry - Santa Monica and Ocean and 4th/5th and Arizona which will increase traffic, create more competition for existing hotels and increased costs for the City with their commercial space and housing. Open streets and residential only streets must be considered.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- I believe that the Miramar project offers an important opportunity to revamp an obsolete hotel and provide important community benefits such as affordable housing. In terms of neighborhood community benefits, one of the most important components of the project is the addition of sufficient parking to allow employees who must drive to work to park in a lot at the site rather than on nearby streets.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** – The Miramar project has the votes to move forward as is with the current City Council. The Miramar project can be a better project by mitigating the traffic concerns on 2<sup>nd</sup> street. Most of the traffic should be focused on Wilshire and Ocean Avenue. Public access to the roof top views should also be a part of the plan. I would rather have hotel rooms versus condos and the project should provide the maximum amount of affordable housing units and community benefits. Community benefits should be felt most by the community most impacted.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- The Miramar project is very controversial. Unfortunately I cannot, at this time, speak to it because sitting on the Planning Commission I will be

hearing it on 9/9 and thus I cannot take an priori position without the benefit of the full discussion and hearing from all the other Commissioners. At that hearing or afterwards on its tape on City TV you can see my position which I will gladly explain.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- The Miramar is before the Council soon and I will weigh in all arguments as I review the proposals and plans. I am open to hearing all of the Community's views on the project.

g) **Jon Mann** – Oppose!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- First, I would say it's 50/50 it happens at this point: The Economy. Restricting construction traffic and requiring developer work with subs to limit worker parking by requiring off site parking facilities and shuttles, or mandating that workers use top levels of nearby structures. Creative ways to limit neighborhood impact, again, IF it happens.

i) **Christine Parra** -- The proposed Miramar redevelopment project does not work. The traffic circulation needs to be re-worked so that the entrance and exit remains on Wilshire Blvd., the size needs to be reduced and the condos offering zero community benefit should not be approved.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- I am currently evaluating what has been presented to the Planning Commission. I expect that this design is substantially better than those past, and will seek to have a strong community benefits package and mitigations for traffic and impact on Wilmont.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- I haven't reviewed in any depth the current proposal as I've waited for the Planning Commission to hold its hearings. I was unable to watch the second hearing last night due to the Dem Club endorsement meeting, but it's clear from the first hearing that there are significant concerns with circulation and the entrance/exits to parking which should be addressed.

2) **Dog park** -- Wilmont estimates that 5,000 dogs live in our neighborhood. **How would you help us establish and maintain an off leash dog park in the densest neighborhood in the City?**

a) **Phil Brock** -- We can't establish large parks in Wilmont, but we can fund small parks similar to Euclid Park (double lot sizes) by obtaining neighborhood parcels. It is too bad that property directly adjacent to Wilmont could not have received for public use. That parcel is at the northeast corner of Montana and 4th Street. It would have made a great park. At the risk of risking the wrath of tennis players (sorry in advance), we could also



establish a small dog park on a portion of Reed Park if we are creative. I will fight for more dog parks in addition to the other park space needed in Wilmont.

b) **Tod Ciszek** -- I love dogs and would be happy to help with any city project that helps them. Santa Monica dogs enjoy 4 different off leash dog parks today (That's a lot of poop!) If we need a dog park in this area, one consideration would be adding a dog park within Reed Park. This would require support from advocates within the Wilshire-Montana Neighborhood, and the allocation of funds in the City's annual budget. I would create a committee to research the best location for the park and to design or outsource its design, help steer the park through data and a public process for decision making regarding siting a new dog park - potentially at Reed Park!

c) **Gleam Davis** -- At my request, the proposed Plaza project in downtown, will include a dog park. While it is not actually in Wilmont, its proximity to Wilmont should make it a useful amenity for Wilmont residents. Creation of a dog park within the bounds of Wilmont may be more difficult because it will require finding a parcel that currently is not used for housing. It is possible that changes in commercial land use patterns may cause a parcel on Montana to become available and that might create an opportunity for a park that could include an area for off leash dogs.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** -- I would support a study and public discussion of an off leash dog park at an appropriate location north of the Santa Monica Beach Pier. Pocket parks can also provide open space for residents and their dogs to enjoy the outdoors. Once elected to the City Council, I will work with the Parks and Recreation Commission to identify areas for pocket parks.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- Dog parks are part of a larger issue of too few parks in Santa Monica which includes dog parks, active parks (playing fields) passive parks (for leisure strolling etc. ) and vegetable gardens for residents. The ability to create new parks is high on my priority particularly because of park's role in assisting dense neighborhoods to survive periodic lockdowns required by pandemics which will certainly reoccur. Until the budget allows it, we cannot really proceed to build new parks, but it might be valuable to have a public discussion on where the next WILLMONT park should go?

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- I know that dogs and pets are very important to families, and important for them to spend quality time together. Therefore, I am open to working with residents on finding viable spaces.

g) **Jon Mann** -- Yeah!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- I think we can do this at Douglas Park.

i) **Christine Parra** -- As a dog lover and parent to two fur babies, I would love to see an off-leash dog park in Wilmont and other areas of the city. I would like to see us use some of the space at Reed Park for a dog park for the surrounding neighborhood, which is the densest part of our city.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- I would love to get a dog park in Wilmont. Let's look for a place and seek state funding for parks.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- Clearly finding the real estate for a dog park is the big challenge. I asked Karen Ginsberg about putting in a dog run at Reed Park a while ago and she advised me one would be piloted briefly as part of efforts to activate the park. I should reach out to her successor Andy Agle to see what was learned from that pilot.

3) **Commercial incursion** -- Wilmont continues to be concerned about commercial incursion into a residential neighborhood that stretches from Ocean Avenue to 21st Street, and from Wilshire Blvd. to Montana Avenue. **How will you help us prevent further commercial intrusion in our residential neighborhood?**

a) **Phil Brock** -- Stop the elimination of parking for retail and mixed-use properties on Wilshire and Montana. Recognize that Wilshire is a neighborhood-serving street in Santa Monica. While it is a walkable street for residents, the employees of restaurants, print shops, etc., should not be permitted to scrounge for parking on residential streets. The bottom line, residents in Wilmont, deserve a seat at the table for all discussions about issues that border the places they live, work, and play in.

b) **Tom Cizek** -- At this time Santa Monica has no shortage of commercial space available for lease or purchase; and while more Santa Monicans are probably running their businesses from home than ever before, this doesn't mean that retail stores are popping up all over our residential neighborhoods. I would like to review the data on these commercial intrusions to ensure zoning ordinances clearly define and protect residential neighborhoods. As long as the significant commercial vacancies remain, I do not see this as a significant concern today.

c) **Gleam Davis** -- The zoning code controls the uses of land in the Wilmont area. As the majority of the area between Wilshire and Montana is zoned for residential, there is not much risk of additional commercial incursion into the neighborhood. I would not support changing the zoning code to allow additional commercial activities in Wilmont.

d) **Oscar de la Torre** – Commercial encroachment in residential neighborhoods is a major concern for me. The LUCE should provide us with a guide on how we grow. Yet, it is constantly ignored by the City Council and the Planning Department. If elected I will work to ensure that the intent and goals of the LUCE are put into action and practice and that includes protecting neighborhoods from commercial intrusion.

e) **Mario Fonda-Bonardi** -- I have always taken a strong position against over development. But the commercial incursion is always a hazard to neighborhoods adjacent to boulevards. I will advocate the code permitted conversion of vacant retail and office uses to residential uses. This reverses the usual incursion: let the residences encroach on the commercial uses for once, which also helps restore our housing/job in balance.

f) **Ana Maria Jara** -- I believe our zoning regulations will confine commercial development to the main streets and out of the neighborhoods. But even low scale business on Montana draws people who wish to patronize them and overflow into the neighborhood. We have used preferential parking to help protect residents. I am always willing to discuss other measures to ensure neighborhoods have safeguards.

g) **Jon Mann** – Moratorium on all development except low income housing!

h) **Todd Mentch** -- Where is this happening? On Lincoln? I generally have platform items that will work to limit this type of development.

i) **Christine Parra** -- As someone who has been personally affected by commercial incursion into my neighborhood, I would do everything in my power to stop that from happening throughout the city. A new City Council could revisit what has become of our general plan, the Land Use and Circulation Element. As a Council member I would advance a review of the current policies of densification. I will also listen to the residents and take their concerns seriously and act on them.

j) **Terry O'Day** -- This is a residential neighborhood and must be preserved for residents. Unapproved commercial intrusion should not be allowed.

k) **Ted Winterer** -- The LUCE and our zoning clearly define almost all of Wilmont as residential and these protections should remain in place. I was not on the Council when the decision to allow Pali House to operate as a hotel was made, but I certainly would not support any other commercial operations within Wilmont.