

From: **Margaret Molloy** <mmmolloy@earthlink.net>
Date: Thu, May 7, 2026 at 3:51 PM
Subject: Re: "PROTEST re VBBID & Traci Park Agenda Item 38 & Amending Motion 38(a) (CF 26-0170) at City Council on 2/17/2026" email on 2/23/2026
To: Patrice Lattimore <patrice.lattimore@lacity.org>
Cc: Christopher Garcia <christopher.garcia@lacity.org>, Ruben Viramontes <ruben.viramontes@lacity.org>, Donelle Nubia <donelle.nubia@lacity.org>, Izabella Hovhanisian <izabella.hovhanisian@lacity.org>, Eleni Polakoff <eleni@venicebeachbid.com>, Councilwoman Traci Park <councilmember.park@lacity.org>, Hydee Feldstein Soto <hydee.feldsteinsoto@lacity.org>, <Mitch.Kamin@lacity.org>, Ethics Commission <nancy.jackson@lacity.org>

*Apologies for the unfinished email that "escaped" earlier.

Hello Ms. Lattimore,

Please repost the "Communication(s) from the Public 02/17/2026" with the correct submission date and with the recipient emails viewable.

On 2/23/2024 I emailed you and other recipients a public comment titled "PROTEST re VBBID & Traci Park Agenda Item 38 & Amending Motion 38(a) (CF 26-0170) at City Council on 2/17/2026." On 3/04/2026 I emailed you to request that my 2/23/2026 public comment to you and other recipients titled "PROTEST re VBBID & Traci Park Agenda Item 38 & Amending Motion 38(a) (CF 26-0170) at City Council on 2/17/2026" be posted to the CF 26-0170 file. On 3/04/2026 you confirmed that you would post the email.

But that email appears in the CF 26-0170 file as a "Communication(s) from the Public 02/17/2026." **This is misleading.** My protest email specifically challenged the lack of public notice provided by Ms. Park and her staff and by the Venice Beach Property Owners Association/ Venice Beach BID of Ms. Park's 2/10/2026 motion for CF 26-0170, or mailing of petitions supporting renewal, or the 2/17 hearing for CF 26-0170. Additionally, it does not show the recipients.

it is essential to show the correct 2/23/2026 date of the email with all recipients, and the date the actual date the email was posted as "Communication(s) from the Public." on 3/04/2026. That complaint and any future legal consequences of the deficiencies it cites, is about the lack of public notice for the 2/17/2026 City Council hearing for CF 26-0170. **It was not sent on 2/17/2026 for these reasons:**

a. Ms. Park did not include any mention of her 2/10/2026 motion for CF 26-0170, mailing of petitions, or the 2/17 hearing in any of her communications to her constituents.

b. The Venice Beach Property Owners Association/ Venice Beach BID did not mention Ms. Park's 2/10/2026 motion for CF 26-0170, mailing of petitions supporting renewal, or the 2/17 hearing in any of their email communications. It was not listed on the 11/06/2025 VBPOA/ VBBID meeting agenda; or in "Venice Beach BID Bulletin" that were emailed by the VBPOA/ VBBID on 12/23/2025; 2/04/2026; or 2/12/2026; or in the Venice Beach BID Board of Directors Annual Meeting Agenda on 2/09/2026.

c. On 2/12/2026 the Venice Beach Property Owners Association held the "VENICE BEACH BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS ANNUAL MEETING." The VBBID Annual Agenda did not mention Ms. Park's 2/10/2026 motion for CF 26-0170, mailing of petitions supporting renewal, or the 2/17 hearing for CF 26-0170.

d. Agenda Item 4(c) was "Directors Report." Executive Director Eleni Polakoff did not mention Ms. Park's 2/10/2026 motion for CF 26-0170, mailing of petitions supporting renewal, or the 2/17 hearing in her report.

e. On 2/12/2026, a "Special Program: Special Guest Speakers" followed immediately after the VBPOA/ VBBID annual meeting. Ms. Park was a special guest. Ms. Park did not mention her 2/10/2026 motion for CF 26-0170, mailing of petitions, or the 2/17 hearing in her comments to attendees.

f. Ms. Park is a lawyer by profession though not acting in that capacity as the City Council representative for District 11. Nevertheless, constituents expect a level of professionalism and transparency based on her professional experience. On 2/10/ 2026 Ms. Park created a motion in CF 26-0170: "Venice Beach 2027-2035 Business Improvement District (BID) / Renewal" without citing any laws that authorize that action. It includes:

To renew the BID, **proponents must follow the procedures** for establishment as provided by State law and requires the approval of a Management Plan and Engineer's Report.

I THEREFORE MOVE that the City Council instruct the City Clerk to provide the necessary assistance for the renewal of the Venice Beach Business Improvement District.

I FURTHER MOVE that the City Clerk be authorized to make any changes or adjustments to the above instruction in order to effectuate the intent of this Motion.

(emphasis added)

Nothing in Ms. Park's motion suggested instructing the City Clerk to submit petitions as a **proponent** of a **private property owners BID** for 30.83% of all property. The City of Los Angeles cannot be a **proponent** of a **private property owners BID** that imposes significant additional property fees on all individual private property owners within the BID area, many of whom do not support the BID and mandatory Prop 218 assessments on their properties.

g. Ms. Park is a lawyer by profession though not acting in that capacity as the City Council representative for District 11. Nevertheless, constituents expect a level of professionalism and transparency based on her professional experience. On 2/17/2026 Ms. Park scheduled a vote on CF 26-0170 as Agenda Item 38 on the City Council agenda. But Ms. Park introduced a **material** amendment to her motion as Item 38(A) **during** the hearing without the required 72 hrs. public notice.

I MOVE that the matter relative to assistance for the renewal of the Venice Beach Business Improvement District (BID), **item 38 on today's Council agenda (C.F. 26-0170), BE AMENDED** to include the following additional recommendation:

- INSTRUCT the City Clerk, or their designee, to sign the petition for the City-owned parcels included in the Venice Beach Business Improvement District (BID).

Ms. Park cited no law that authorizes a (a) material amendment during a hearing without the 72hr public notice required by the Brown Act and Government Code § 53753; and (b) Ms. park cited no

law that entitled her and her City Council colleagues to "INSTRUCT the City Clerk, or their designee, to sign the petition for the City-owned parcels included in the Venice Beach Business Improvement District (BID)."

h. On 4/01/2026 Ms. Lattimore submitted a "Report from the City Clerk" titled "THE VENICE BEACH BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (PROPERTY BASED) RENEWAL." Under "PRELIMINARY PETITIONS" Ms. Lattimore states,

The petitions received indicate affirmative financial support of the project in an amount equivalent to \$1,236,826.86. This represents 50.51% of the proposed District's projected first year assessment revenue of \$2,450,835.93. Because the more than 50% threshold of preliminary support has been achieved, the formal business improvement district establishment process, including a public hearing before the City Council, may be initiated.

(emphasis added)

Public records show "LA City Petitions_Verified" signed by Ms. Lattimore on 3/19/2026.

For these reasons and more, it is essential to show the correct 2/23/2026 date of the email with all recipients, and the date the actual date the email was posted as "Communication(s) from the Public." on 3/04/2026.

Please all recipients confirm receipt of this email.

Appreciatively,

Margaret Molloy

VENICE BEACH BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS ANNUAL MEETING:
VENICE BEACH BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS ANNUAL MEETING AGENDA_February 12, 2026.jpg

On Mar 4, 2026, at 12:45 PM, Margaret Molloy <mmmolloy@earthlink.net> wrote:

Hello Ms. Lattimore,

On February 23, I requested that my public comment, "PROTEST re VBBID & Traci Park Agenda Item 38 & Amending Motion 38(a) (CF 26-0170) at City Council on 2/17/2026," be posted to CF 26-0170. This request means that the attached Public Record Act documents submitted in pdf format should be fully readable. It is not a discretionary request and with respect, you are the responsible party as City Clerk, not Mr. Garcia.

Every person has a legal right to protest an ordinance. Every person has a legal right to have their timely comments published for the public record (California Streets and Highways Code Section 36623, California Government Code Section 53753, Government Code § 54950 et seq, and Article XIID, Section 4 of the California Constitution).

From: Margaret Molloy <mmmolloy@earthlink.net>
Subject: PROTEST re VBBID & Traci Park Agenda Item 38 & Amending Motion 38(a) (CF 26-0170) at City Council on 2/17/2026
Date: February 23, 2026 at 2:58:46 AM PST
To: patrice.lattimore@lacity.org
Cc: Councilwoman Traci Park <councilmember.park@lacity.org>, Eleni Polakoff <eleni@venicebeachbid.com>, "Huckelbridge, Kate@Coastal" <Kate.Huckelbridge@coastal.ca.gov>, "Warren, Louise@Coastal" <Louise.Warren@coastal.ca.gov>

PLEASE POST THESE COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS TO CF 26-0170

Please confirm receipt of this email. I would appreciate confirmation of the posting of my 2/23 public comments including the attached pdf as readable in full to CF 26-0170 at your earliest convenience.

Appreciatively,

Margaret Molloy

(emphasis added in red)

On Mar 4, 2026, at 12:52 PM, Patrice Lattimore <patrice.lattimore@lacity.org> wrote:

Good afternoon, Ms. Molloy:

Your comments have been received and will be posted to CF 26-0170 today. Apologies for the oversight.

Thanks

Patrice

(emphasis added in red)