Report to the Los Angeles City Attorney on an apparent violation of LAMC 48.04 by Tara Devine

February 21, 2017

Contents[1]

[1]Note that blue text indicates clickable links internal to this document whereas magenta text indicates clickable links to resources on the Internet.

1 Synopsis

1. Tara Devine is a consultant who worked in 2016 to establish a business improvement district in Venice. She qualified to register with the City of Los Angeles as a lobbyist during this time, although she did not do so. While she was qualified to register she knowingly violated LAMC §48.04(B) by fraudulently deceiving a number of City officials with respect to material facts related to the BID establishment legislation. The Los Angeles Municipal Code gives the City Attorney enforcement authority over knowing violations of this section. However, a pending suit against the City hinges on the same issues alleged herein, creating a conflict of interests for the City Attorney. Thus I ask that the City Attorney appoint an independent investigator to evaluate this report and to take action if necessary.

2 Jurisdiction

2. This report alleges that Tara Devine knowingly violated LAMC §48.04(B). Also, LAMC §48.09(C)(1) gives the City Attorney mandatory enforcement authority over such matters:

> Any person who knowingly violates any provision of Section 48.04 shall be liable in a civil action brought by the City Attorney.

Thus it is proper to submit this report to the City Attorney.

3 Background

3. Business improvement districts ("BIDs") are a form of assessment district authorized by the Property and Business Improvement District Law of 1994.[2] In the City of Los Angeles these are established by ordinance in collaboration with the City Clerk's office. The formation of a BID requires the City Council to pass two distinct ordinances: The Ordinance of Intention and the Ordinance of Formation.

4. BID formation requires the formation of a property owners' association, which is a private non-profit corporation with which the City contracts to administer the assessments collected from a BID.

5. Tara Devine is a consultant who, among other things, assists inchoate business improvement districts in getting established. She collects data required by state law and packages it in accordance with law and policy for presentation to the City Council in order that the necessary ordinances may be properly proposed and voted on. She also works closely with Clerk and Council staff members to guide the process to a successful conclusion.

[2] California Streets and Highways Code §36600 et seq.

6. Tara Devine recently worked on establishing a BID in Venice, which is located in Council District 11 ("CD11"). This BID is known as the Venice Beach BID ("VB-BID"). Mike Bonin is the representative for CD11. Debbie Dyner Harris is the CD11 staff member who worked most closely with Devine and the BID proponents during the multi-year establishment process. David Graham-Caso is Mike Bonin's director of communications. The various ordinances establishing the VBBID may be found in Council File 16-0749. In this matter, Tara Devine's clients are the Venice Beach Property Owners' Association ("VBPOA").

7. BID formation in some cases, including the case of the VBBID, requires a report from a licensed engineer. Among other things, this report must justify the decisions to include specific properties in the BID.

4 Tara Devine's apparent knowing violation of LAMC 48.04

4.1 Tara Devine is subject to LAMC 48.04(B)

8. Los Angeles Municipal Code §48.04(B) applies to "lobbyists." A lobbyist is defined in LAMC §48.02 to be an:

> individual who is compensated to spend 30 or more hours in any consecutive three-month period engaged in lobbying activities which include at least one direct communication with a City official or employee, conducted either personally or through agents, for the purpose of attempting to influence municipal legislation on behalf of any person.

9. That Tara Devine satisfies this definition with respect to her work on the VBBID is the subject of a separate complaint filed with the City Ethics Commission alleging violations of LAMC §48.07(A).[3] This report is quite lengthy and has been submitted along with this one as an appendix.

10. Since Tara Devine is a lobbyist under the meaning of LAMC §48.02, she is subject to the prohibitions in LAMC §48.04. In particular, §48.04(B) forbids a lobbyist to:

> Fraudulently deceive or attempt to deceive any City official with regard to any material fact pertinent to any pending or proposed municipal legislation.

[3]The definition of "lobbyist" is the same for both that report and this one, but the material facts supporting the allegations are different. There's no overlap between that report and this one except in the common definition of terms.

4.2 Tara Devine deceived City Officials with respect to a material fact

4.2.1 Tara Devine made statements to City officials with regard to a material fact

11. On August 9, 2016 Tara Devine emailed Venice property owner William Kuel, CC-ing City Clerk staff members Rita Moreno, Shannon Hoppes, and Miranda Paster, City Clerk Holly Wolcott, and CD11 staff member Debbie Dyner Harris. Kuel had been trying to get either the City or Devine to remove his property from the BID. In this email Devine stated:

> Please keep in mind, as we discussed during the petition stage, it is zoning and not use that guides assessment district formation. In many communities across California, zoning and use are not consistent. Conditional uses, legal nonconforming uses, variances, etc. are also all part of the landscape that causes differences between zoning and use. ... No, neither the Engineer nor I can remove your parcel from the proposed BID.

See Exhibit 1 (page 12).

12. On August 17, 2016, Yo! Venice[4] reporter Melanie Camp emailed David Graham-Caso with a list of questions about the Venice Beach BID. One of these questions was:

> Why are the boundaries of the BID so specific?

Subsequently, Graham-Caso forwarded Camp's email to Debbie Dyner Harris, asking her to arrange for Tara Devine to answer the questions. The next day Devine sent her answers to Graham-Case and Dyner Harris. In particular, in response to the above-quoted question, Devine stated:[5]

> State law clearly specifies that zoning, not use, is the appropriate criteria. Per state and local law, the residentially-**zoned** properties in Venice are not eligible for BID assessment. ... The "sawtooth" boundary lines are entirely due to a requirement that the proposed BID exclude residentially-**zoned properties** (which are not eligible for assessment.) If you look at a map of the zoning in the area, you can see that the boundary lines include the commercially-zoned, industrially-zoned and government/public facilities-zoned parcels, and exclude the residentially-zoned. This is consistent with state and local law.

See Exhibit 2 (page 14).

13. The relevant statements made by Tara Devine are:

[4] A local news website.
[5] Emphasis in original.

(a) That a property's zoning rather than its use is the appropriate criterion for including it in or excluding it from a BID.

(b) That neither she nor the licensed engineer had the power to remove a property from the BID.

(c) That state law requires that BIDs exclude residentially-zoned properties.

(d) That the inclusion of commercially-zoned properties is consistent with state law.

14. The material fact that these statements were in regard to is the fact of the matter with respect to which properties must be included in a BID, which may be included in a BID, and which shall not be included in a BID. First, according to the Property and Business Improvement District Law at §36632(c),

> Properties zoned solely for residential use, or that are zoned for agricultural use, are conclusively presumed not to benefit from the improvements and service funded through these assessments, and shall not be subject to any assessment pursuant to this part.

Thus the law requires residentially-zoned property to be excluded from a BID and that there are no types of property which the law requires to be included in a BID.

15. A "City official" is defined in LAMC §48.02 to be:

> any elective or appointed City officer, member, employee or consultant (who qualifies as a public official within the meaning of the Political Reform Act) of any agency, who, as part of his or her official duties, participates in the consideration of any municipal legislation other than in a purely clerical, secretarial or ministerial capacity.

16. The City officials to whom Tara made statements with regard to the material fact include Mike Bonin's staff members Debbie Dyner Harris and David Graham-Caso, as well as Holly Wolcott and a number of her staff members.

4.2.2 Tara Devine's statements created an impression for City officials

17. Through her careful and consistent statements with respect to which properties must be included, which may be included, and which must not be included Tara Devine created the impression among Mike Bonin and his staff that commercial properties were required to be included in the Venice Beach BID and that no one had the power to remove commercially zoned properties without rezoning them.

18. Through her explicit statement that "zoning, not use, is the appropriate criteria"[6] for inclusion of properties in the BID, Devine created the impression among Mike Bonin and his staff that zoning is the appropriate criterion for inclusion of properties.

[6] See paragraph 12 above.

19. That Dyner Harris, Graham-Caso, and Mike Bonin understood from Tara Devine that commercially-zoned properties were required by law to be included in the BID and that zoning was the dispositive criterion can be inferred from the fact that at a City Council hearing on the ordinance of formation on November 8, 2016, Mike Bonin made a statement which assumes that rezoning is the only way for a parcel to be excluded:

> I would just say one final thing to those who talked about the fact that properties that are zoned commercial but are used as residential. As I said when I met with you folks recently, I am happy to help those folks get their properties rezoned as residential properties. And I'm happy to meet with those folks and would even be willing to initiate a zone change from my end to make it a little less expensive and more helpful.

See Mike Bonin's remarks on YouTube.[7] Clearly Mike Bonin believed at the time he was speaking that there was no way other than through rezoning to remove a commercially-zoned property from the BID. He had already agreed to help his constituents remove their properties through rezoning. If he knew of an easier way to accomplish this goal he would almost certainly have used it. If Dyner Harris or Graham-Caso knew of an easier way, surely they would have told Bonin during or prior to the meeting that Bonin mentions in his remarks. Surely they would not have knowingly let their boss make false statements on the floor of the Council Chamber had they understood the truth.

4.2.3 The impression created by Tara Devine's statements was false

20. The Property and Business Improvement District Law gives the City Council the sole authority to determine which parcels benefit without reference to their zoning. According to §36632(a),

> The assessments levied on real property pursuant to this part shall be levied on the basis of the estimated benefit to the real property within the property and business improvement district. The city council may classify properties for purposes of determining the benefit to property of the improvements and activities provided pursuant to this part.

21. The Property and Business Improvement District Law states clearly and explicitly at §36624 that any property can be removed from the BID by the City Council at the hearing for the Ordinance of Formation if the Council determines that it will not benefit:

> At the conclusion of the public hearing to establish the district, the city council may adopt, revise, change, reduce, or modify the proposed assessment or the type or types of improvements, maintenance, and activities to be funded with the revenues from the assessments. Proposed assessments may only be revised by reducing any or all of them. At the public hearing,

[7] The URL is https://youtu.be/-YreZaI-VLQ?t=3304.

> the city council may only make changes in, to, or from the boundaries of the proposed property and business improvement district that will exclude territory that will not benefit from the proposed improvements, maintenance, and activities.

22. Thus all that is necessary to remove a property from a BID is for the City Council to determine during or before the hearing that that property will not benefit from being in the BID. The zoning of the property is irrelevant for its exclusion. Thus the belief that everyone exposed to Tara Devine's "zoning not use" theory had about the necessity of including commercial properties was inconsistent with the governing statute.

23. Furthermore, Devine's explicit statement that "zoning, not use, is the appropriate criteria" for inclusion of properties is false. As shown in paragraph 21, neither zoning nor use are dispositive criteria for inclusion. In fact, the only criterion is that a given parcel will benefit from the BID's activities.

4.2.4 Tara Devine knew that the impression she created was false

24. On June 30, 2015, while the list of properties to be included in the incipient BID was still being finalized, Tara Devine emailed a number of staff members in the City Clerk's office announcing that she was removing the Venice Post Office from the BID:

> I will also re-send the database as we made one tiny change. After a discussion with Ed, we removed the federal USPS parcel (Venice post office.) It was on the edge of the BID and was not required for a contiguous boundary, so we just removed it from dbase and other docs.

See Exhibit 3 (page 18).

25. In this same email she gives a detailed explanation of how the removal of the Post Office doesn't affect various parameters of the BID, but it's clear that none of this is meant to explain why it was allowable to remove the Post Office. Rather, all the explanation is directed at showing that the removal of the parcel does not require any of the other BID formation material to be revised.

26. The only justification that Devine gives for the removal is that she and Ed[8] discussed it and then "just removed it." Furthermore, the Post Office is zoned C2-1-0, which is commercial zoning. See Exhibit 4 (page 20).[9]

27. This episode shows that Devine knew that commercially-zoned properties could be removed from the BID for no reason at all. However, she continued for over a year to make statements that misled everyone into thinking that this wasn't possible. In one instance she explicitly and falsely stated directly to David Graham-Caso and Debbie

[8] The consulting engineer for the BID.

[9] I don't know how to link directly to a ZIMAS search, but this information can be verified by searching for 1601 Main Street on ZIMAS.

Dyner Harris that "zoning, not use, is the appropriate criteria" for inclusion of properties in the BID.[10] In another instance she explicitly and falsely stated, in an email copied to City officials, that she did not have the power to remove a commercially-zoned property.[11] Thus when everyone around her somehow developed and proceeded to act on the assumption that commercially-zoned properties could not be removed from the BID, she was aware that in fact they could be removed.

4.2.5 Quod erat demonstrandum

28. I have shown that Tara Devine knowingly[12] created[13] a false[14] impression in City Officials, which amounts to deception.

4.3 The material fact was pertinent to pending or proposed legislation

29. According to the Property and BID Law at §36625(a)(1), the ordinance of formation that the Council may pass to establish the BID must include, inter alia:

> the amount of the proposed assessment, a statement as to whether the assessment will be levied on property, businesses, or both within the district, a statement on whether bonds will be issued, and a description of the exterior boundaries of the proposed district

If the Council were to exercise the right granted to it by §36624 to alter the assessments or the boundaries of the district, this would necessarily change the content of the ordinance of formation. Thus the material fact at issue (paragraph 14 above) was pertinent to the pending ordinance of formation.

4.4 Tara Devine's deception was fraudulent

30. Tara Devine's clients in this matter were the VBPOA, which will administer the assessments collected from the BID. The more properties that are included, the more money the VBPOA will administer. Thus Devine's deception with respect to the City Council's ability to remove properties from the BID served to increase the money that her clients will control. Deception for the purpose of gaining a financial advantage is fraudulent deception.

31. Also, the proposition that Tara Devine considered potential assessments in deciding which properties to include is supported by the case of the Venice Post Office, discussed above in Section 4.2.4 (page 8). When she informed the Clerk's office that she was excluding it from the BID she mentioned that since it was owned by the Federal

[10] Paragraph 12.
[11] Paragraph 11.
[12] Section 4.2.4.
[13] Section 4.2.2.
[14] Section 4.2.3.

Government the assessment would be $0 anyway (see Exhibit 3, page 18). At this time she was evidently not aware that the property had been sold to a private party in 2012. At some point she discovered this fact and replaced the property in the BID, where it is assessed at $21,584.96, which is more than 1.1% of the entire assessed value of the BID.[15]

4.5 Tara Devine's fraudulent deception was knowing

32. I can't determine whether the requirement in LAMC §48.09(C)(1) that violations of LAMC §48.04(B) be "knowing" before the City Attorney must intervene refers to knowingly committing acts which violate the law or to knowing that one's acts violate the law. The first is an element of fraudulent deception and is argued for above in Section 4.2.4 (page 8). The second is harder to prove with documentation, but it is highly plausible that Tara Devine was aware of the law that her actions violated. She was formerly employed by the City and held positions under Richard Riordan, James Hahn, and José Huizar, and therefore was responsible for understanding the City's ethics laws and probably underwent mandatory ethics training.

4.6 Conclusion

33. It is highly plausible that Tara Devine knowingly violated LAMC §48.04(B) and that therefore ought to be investigated to determine whether she ought to be liable in a civil action brought by the City Attorney.

5 The City Attorney has a conflict of interest in this matter

34. On December 8, 2016 a number of property owners in Venice filed a writ petition against the City of Los Angeles and the Venice Beach Property Owners Association.[16] The petition argues in part that properties which are zoned commercially but used for residential purposes will not benefit from the activities of the BID. A finding that Tara Devine did in fact deceive City officials with respect to the appropriate criteria for inclusion in the BID would imply a finding that residential properties which are zoned commercially may actually not benefit from inclusion, and so will potentially weaken the defense in Okulick v. City. Thus the City Attorney's office has conflicting interests in the outcome of an investigation into these allegations.

[15] I haven't been able to collect documentary evidence relating to the process of replacing the Post Office in the BID. That it is presently included can be seen from the final Engineer's report (the URL is http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2016/16-0749_misc_1_06-24-2016.pdf). I'm not including that report as an Exhibit because of its length.

[16] Okulick et al. v. City of Los Angeles et al., Los Angeles County Superior Court case number BS166558. Henceforth "Okulick v. City."

6 Requested action

35. I request that Tara Devine's actions as described here be investigated and, if it's found to be appropriate, that a civil action against her be commenced so that she may be held responsible for her actions.

36. Because the City Attorney has a conflict of interest in this matter, as shown in Section 5, I request that the City Attorney arrange for an independent investigation of these allegations and, if they're found to have merit, for an independent party to bring a civil action against Tara Devine.

7 Exhibits

7.1 Exhibit 1 – August 9, 2016 email from Tara Devine to William Kuel et alia

Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>

Fwd: Proposed Venice BID & Residential Properties Zoned Commercial

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> Tue, Aug 9, 2016 at 4:12 PM
To: William Kuel <[redacted]>
Cc: Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>, Shannon Hoppes <shannon.hoppes@lacity.org>, Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Holly Wolcott <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>

Dear Bill:

It has been some time since we last spoke, but I wanted to respond to your most recent questions. Please keep in mind, as we discussed during the petition stage, it is zoning and not use that guides assessment district formation. In many communities across California, zoning and use are not consistent. Conditional uses, legal non-conforming uses, variances, etc. are also all part of the landscape that causes differences between zoning and use.

1) No, neither the Engineer nor I can remove your parcel from the proposed BID.

2) Here are some excerpts from the Engineer's Report that address the special benefits conferred on your multi-tenant residential use property (zoned commercial):

- "Special benefit" as defined by the California State Constitution means a distinct benefit over and above general benefits conferred on real property located in the District or to the public at large.

- The property uses within the boundaries of the BID that will receive special benefits from BID funded programs and services are currently a mix of commercial, industrial, government and residential. No parcels within the District are zoned solely residential. Services, programs and improvements provided and funded by the BID are primarily designed to provide special benefits as described below to identified assessed parcels and the array of land uses within the boundaries of the District.

- For residential parcels and residential portions of mixed use parcels within the BID (all located on commercial or industrial zoned parcels), it is the opinion of this Assessment Engineer that each of these parcels and uses specially benefit similarly to commercial/industrial parcels, from the clean and safe and district identity and special project programs designed to improve the cleanliness, security, marketability and livability of these parcels and residential units on them. Since the majority of residential units within the Venice Beach BID are used as business enterprises, live/work units, rental units, or vacation rental units whether single family units, apartments or residential condominiums, it is the opinion of this Assessment Engineer that each residential unit shall be treated as an existing or potential for-profit business enterprise, live/work unit, rental unit, or vacation rental unit. As such, the proportionate special benefits conferred on all residential parcels and units shall be considered similar to those conferred on commercial/industrial parcels within the Venice Beach BID. For these parcels, BID programs, services and improvements are designed to increase residential rental occupancies, rental income and return on investments. These programs, services and improvements are designed to improve commerce, security and aesthetic appeal for tenants, visitors and landlords of these parcels within the Venice Beach BID by reducing crime, litter and debris and increasing the safety and attractiveness of residential rental units within the BID and the nearby array of tourist related goods, services and activities, all considered necessary in a competitive properly managed tourist-based business district.

Please let me know if you'd like to discuss this further.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

7.2 Exhibit 2 – August 17-18, 2016 emails between Melanie Camp, Tara Devine, Debbie Dyner Harris, and David Graham-Caso

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>

Fwd: Venice BID Questions

1 message

Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org> Mon, Aug 22, 2016 at 11:53 AM
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Cc: david grahamcaso <david.grahamcaso@lacity.org>

Hi Miranda, I am sorry to bother you with one more thing, but we are trying to answer some questions for this Venice publication. Would you be able to check this over and see if there is anything missing/wrong/or something else?

Thank you so much!
Debbie

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Tara Devine** <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Date: Thu, Aug 18, 2016 at 11:49 AM
Subject: Re: Venice BID Questions
To: david grahamcaso <david.grahamcaso@lacity.org>
Cc: Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

Here are my answers to her questions. As mentioned, I think the Clerk should review these questions. I've highlighted in red those that they either should or may wish to respond to. Should my answers in any way conflict with theirs, I welcome you to use theirs. I do not expect that they will comment on boundary questions, as they are determined by property owner discussion (as well as the restrictions of state and local law.)

Is the voting structure fair? On the surface it seems that the owners who make up the majority of the total value of property are in support of the BID. How can a person who owns a small studio off the Boardwalk have their vote count against an entity as large as, say for example, Venice Breeze Suites?
The voting process is consistent with state law, and with other special assessment districts. Voting is weighted by the weight of the assessment. A voter paying more does have a greater vote than a voter paying less. There are 42 BIDs in Los Angeles, and hundreds across the state of California, formed in the same way.

A lot of the land is owned by the city. Does the city get a vote?
Yes, the City gets a vote. State law says that public/government parcels are not exempt from assessments. Anyone assessed gets a vote, proportional to the size of the assessment. The public property within the proposed Venice BID has a clear and direct relationship to the overall BID area. The proposed BID area is equally defined by its public and commercial spaces - it makes no sense to include private parcels and exclude the public parcels.

I've come across one lady, an 88 year old artist, who says she won't be able to afford the assessment on her live/work studio. What happens in cases like this?
I have not talked to this person (to my knowledge - at least no one has identified herself to me in this way.) I did talk to a male property owner of a similar age who lives on a very limited/fixed income, but he has elected to support the BID despite the financial obligation. I believe that if the assessment is not paid and is delinquent for a substantial period of time, at some point, the County Assessor can elect to place a lien on the property. The Clerk may be able to provide more information. I do not believe that there is any "hardship exemption" for property taxes or BID assessments. But again, Clerk or Assessor should answer this question.

Why are the boundaries of the BID so specific?
The boundaries of the proposed Venice BID are specific (but they are not gerrymandered.) State law clearly specifies that zoning, not use, is the appropriate criteria.
Per state and local law, the residentally-**zoned** properties in Venice are not eligible for BID assessment. The proposed BID includes all of the property eligible for assessment west of Abbott Kinney. Abbott Kinney has its own Merchants Association which already performs some functions similar to a BID. The "sawtooth" boundary lines are entirely due to a requirement that the proposed BID exclude residentally-**zoned properties** (which are not eligible for assessment.) If you look at a map of the zoning in the area, you can see that the boundary lines include the commercially-zoned, industrially-zoned and government/public facilities-zoned parcels, and exclude the residentially-zoned. This is consistent with state and local law.

Why not just form an Ocean Front Walk BID?
See above.

Why not blanket the entire area of Venice?
See response to "Why are the boundaries of the BID so specific?"

Is there a risk that crime and grime will migrate off the Boardwalk and out of areas within the boundaries of the BID to other parts of Venice?
Crime and grime does not conform to any particular boundaries. That is a possibility with or without the proposed BID. The proposed BID arguably includes the area of Venice that is most attractive to criminal activity and blight. If a safer, cleaner environment within the proposed BID is created over time, it is likely that there will be a substantial reduction in overall criminal and blight activity within Venice.

Is the public hearing being held on the last day of voting? If so, why was the decision made to schedule it this way?
State law requires that the proposed BID ballots be out for 45 days. Clerk can tell you when they were mailed, and when that 45-day window expires (my best guess is a day or two before it's been scheduled for council.)

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

On Wed, Aug 17, 2016 at 2:11 PM, david grahamcaso <david.grahamcaso@lacity.org> wrote:

> Yes, tomorrow is fine. Thank you!
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Aug 17, 2016, at 2:11 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
>
> > Hi David -
> >
> > I am out of the office today but back tomorrow. Can I respond to you on these question tomorrow? (No deadline mentioned in her email.)
> >
> > Also, on her very last question, I would have the Clerk (Miranda, Rita or their designee) answer that. They are responsible for tracking that timetable and the council scheduling.
> >
> > State law requires that the ballots be out for 45 days. Clerk can tell you when they were mailed, and when that 45-day window expires (my best guess is a day or two before it's been scheduled for council.)
> >
> > Clerk may or may not wish to answer a couple of her other questions (I can provide an answer to questions #1 and #2, but if the Clerk wishes to take those, I would defer to them.)
> >
> > The rest are really questions for me.
> >
> > On Aug 17, 2016 1:59 PM, "Debbie DynerHarris" <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org> wrote:
> >
> > > Hi Tara. Can you please respond to her? Thanks
> > >
> > > Sent from my samsung cell phone. please excuse any tpyos.
> > >
> > > --------- Forwarded message ---------
> > > From: "david grahamcaso" <david.grahamcaso@lacity.org>
> > > Date: Aug 17, 2016 1:46 PM
> > > Subject: Fwd: Venice BID Questions

To: "Debbie Dyner Harris" <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>
Cc:

Can you please send this to the BID consultant to get her help with the answers? Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Melanie Camp <mel@yovenice.com>
Date: August 17, 2016 at 1:09:20 PM PDT
To: david grahamcaso <david.grahamcaso@lacity.org>
Subject: Venice BID Questions

Hi David,

I have several questions regarding the BID. The information you provided, coupled with the information/misinformation flying around raises a couple of issues that need clearing up.

I'm interested in Mike's opinion, as well as your own, on any or all of these.

If I use these they will be part of a larger, more balanced piece that includes everything good about a BID so feel free to add anything that hasn't already been said in the information you sent through before....

Is the voting structure fair? On the surface it seems that the owners who make up the majority of the total value of property are in support of the BID. How can a person who owns a small studio off the Boardwalk have their vote count against an entity as large as, say for example, Venice Breeze Suites?

A lot of the land is owned by the city. Does the city get a vote?

I've come across one lady, an 88 year old artist, who says she won't be able to afford the assessment on her live/work studio. What happens in cases like this?

Why are the boundaries of the BID so specific?

Why not just form an Ocean Front Walk BID?

Why not blanket the entire area of Venice?

Is there a risk that crime and grime will migrate off the Boardwalk and out of areas within the boundaries of the BID to other parts of Venice?

Is the public hearing being held on the last day of voting? If so, why was the decision made to schedule it this way?

Thank you so much.

Mel

--
Melanie Camp
Yo! Venice
Managing Editor/Staff Writer
685 Venice Blvd, Venice CA 90291
Cell: +1.702.334.2921

7.3 Exhibit 3 – June 30, 2015 email between Tara Devine and Clerk staff about Venice Post Office

Re: Venice Beach BID

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> Tue, Jun 30, 2015 at 11:13 AM
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>

Ed got me the final ER last night at 10 PM - I am now working to finalize my MDP today and ship everything off to you.

I will also re-send the database as we made one tiny change. After a discussion with Ed, we removed the federal USPS parcel (Venice post office.) It was on the edge of the BID and was not required for a contiguous boundary, so we just removed it from dbase and other docs. It was assessed at zero from the beginning, so it has no effect on other assessments or budget (all dbase numbers remain the same.) Some tables in the extra tabs have also been updated as necessary due to Ed's general benefit calculation (total budget figures.) Otherwise, database is the same as the last submission on April 10.

We have also revised the map for clarity, to delete the USPS parcel, and to reflect all the APNs used in the legal boundary description.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

On Thu, Jun 25, 2015 at 12:49 PM, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org> wrote:
> Thank you Tara. Happy Birthday. I have a VC day tomorrow, I will look for it on Tuesday.
>
> On Thu, Jun 25, 2015 at 12:38 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
> > FYI -
> >
> > Ed said he will have the draft ER done tomorrow. Tomorrow is my birthday (not working!) but I should have the ER and MDP in to you on Monday or Tuesday, before I leave for vacation.
> >
> > Tara
>
> --
> Counting my blessings - Sing and be Happy Today!
>
> http://clerk.lacity.org/stellent/groups/departments/@clerk_master_contributor/documents/contributor_web_content/lacityp_026712.png

7.4 Exhibit 4 – ZIMAS entry for 1601 Main Street, Venice 90291

ZIMAS

Search | Reports | Resources

1601 S MAIN ST

Font: A A A +/-

Address/Legal

Site Address	1601 S MAIN ST
ZIP Code	90291
PIN Number	106-5A145 3
Lot/Parcel Area (Calculated)	31,383.0 (sq ft)
Thomas Brothers Grid	PAGE 671 - GRID H6
Assessor Parcel No. (APN)	4238014017
Tract	TR 10201
Map Reference	M B 145-89/90
Block	None
Lot	PT LT A
Arb (Lot Cut Reference)	2
Map Sheet	106-5A145
Map Sheet	108B145

Jurisdictional

Planning and Zoning

Special Notes	None
Zoning	C2-1-O
Zoning Information (ZI)	ZI-2452 Transit Priority Area in the City of Los Angeles
Zoning Information (ZI)	ZI-2406 Director's Interpretation of the Venice SP for Small Lot Subdivisio
General Plan Land Use	Community Commercial
General Plan Footnote(s)	Yes
Hillside Area (Zoning Code)	No
Baseline Hillside Ordinance	No
Baseline Mansionization Ordinance	No
Specific Plan Area	Los Angeles Coastal Transportation Corridor
Specific Plan Area	Venice Coastal Zone
Historic Preservation Review	No
HistoricPlacesLA	View