Beverly Hills City Council Liaison / Sunshine Task Force Committee will conduct a Regular Meeting, at the following time and place, and will address the agenda listed below:

City Hall
455 North Rexford Drive
Conference Room 4A
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

October 28, 2019
5:00 p.m.

AGENDA

1) **Public Comment**
   Members of the public will be given an opportunity to directly address the Committee on items not listed on the agenda.

2) **Legislative Advocates**
   - Follow up items:
     - Changes to the legislative advocate form
     - Clarification of revisions to the ordinance
   - Accessibility of the legislative advocate registrations (Mark Elliot)
   - Violation hearings, penalty process & FAQ (Debbie Weiss)

3) **Notification/Outreach**
   - Follow up items:
     - Wording and appearance of notices
     - Certified mailings to neighbors near projects
     - Public noticing regarding Airbnb
   - Notifications regarding current discretionary/pipeline projects
   - Report on water quality (Thomas White)

4) **Development Process/Projects**
   - Follow up items:
     - Meeting applicants, residents and staff when a project comes forward
   - Loma Vista Inspection (Debbie Weiss)
   - Construction in residential areas during Yom Kippur holiday (Steve Mayer)
   - Resident participation in stop work order meetings (Steve Mayer)

5) **Transparency**
   - Follow up items:
     - Staff meetings with applicants regarding projects
     - Closed captioning and transcripts of public meetings
   - Email retention schedule (Debbie Weiss)
   - Tracking system for STF initiatives (Steve Mayer)
   - Comments on 9/12/19 highlights (Thomas White)
   - Updates to City Council Policy Manual and Commissioner Handbook (Thomas White)

6) **New Items**

7) **Next meeting: November 25, 2019**
Recommended agenda items due to City Clerk's Office by November 20, 2019

8) **Adjournment**

for

Huma Ahmed, City Clerk

Posted: October 25, 2019

A DETAILED LIAISON AGENDA PACKET IS AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW IN THE LIBRARY AND CITY CLERK'S OFFICE.

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Beverly Hills will make reasonable efforts to accommodate persons with disabilities. If you require special assistance, please call the City Manager's Office at (310) 285-1014 (voice) or (310) 285-6881 (TTY). Providing at least forty-eight (48) hours advance notice will help to ensure availability of services. City Hall, including Conference Room 4A, is wheelchair accessible.

ITEM #2

To: Sunshine task force
Re: Advocate registration information access improvements

Advocate Registration Accessibility Improvements

Over the past calendar year I have received an e-notice for nearly 300 advocate registrations. That includes 17 registrations in October alone. Given the level of activity I'm glad we're seeing it documented. However I think the public may be better able to conveniently access the registration information with some tweaks.

The problem

Reviewing the advocate registrations is cumbersome: the e-notices include only the advocate's name but not the client or project name (let alone the description and desired outcome). Providing only the advocate's name limits the descriptive value of the e-notice. More to my point it makes downloading the registration PDF unavoidable. Those PDFs quickly clutter the downloads folder!

Second, the advocate registration search results screen is not as informative as it could be. The information provided with a search result is too limited to be of much discovery value and that too begs a PDF download.

Third, the advocate registration PDF document spreads over at least two pages and it can stretch to twenty or more pages if past projects are numerous. This PDF document can be improved in two ways: tighten-up formatting to put the key information on one page; and make the advocate registration information viewable in the web browser. Even better to display it as HTML in the browser rather than format it as a PDF.

Finally, it is not clear (to me at least) if the PDF document that I download is supposed to be the document-of-record for an advocate registration. Should it be? Should the PDF be a static record of the registration or should it show the latest amendments or updates at the time of download? That question arises because the form that is attached to the e-notice seems to differ from the form that is downloaded from the database. (The latter bears a current timestamp and may also contain updated information.)[1]

Recommendations

- <u>The e-notice should present the most important information from the form in the body of the email</u>. That would include the advocate, his/her client, the description, and the desired outcome. Today viewing the important information requires extra steps: downloading the PDF registration document and then hunting for it in the downloads folder.
- <u>The e-notice link to the advocate registration should load the registration in the web browser</u>. Today we click on the 'click to view' link in the e-notice and it takes us to the database record (good) but the limited information available on that screen means we must download the PDF (not so good). Best and most efficient is to display the content of the registration on the screen in HTML with a download option.

- Put essential information at the top of the registration screen or registration PDF document. That should include the advocate's name, client's name, project name, description and desired outcome in addition to engagement and filing date. Secondary fields like 'sanctions' and 'expenditure lobbyist' could be displayed farther down near the attestation. If the header (BH logo) is reduced and empty fields and their labels (e.g., Address Line 2) are hidden then the screen or PDF could economize on space.
- Display past clients online but not in the PDF document. The past clients information is important but not directly relevant to the current filing. It should be available but arguably not necessarily on the same registration document.
- The PDF registration document as linked from the e-notice or online portal should open in the web browser. It's not clear to me why the advocacy registration PDF documents always force a download. More convenient would be to view the PDF in the web browser (if that is supported locally) as most PDFs are handled today.
- Rename the PDF document using the advocate's name and the filing date. The advocate-date format is more useful than the cryptic names used today. Since there is no practical limit on the number of characters in a filename why not be more descriptive? For example: *Smith-2019-10-14.pdf* or *Smith-[Client]-2019-10-14* instead of *DOC_2019101191202.pdf*. Finding the form in a cluttered downloads folder would be more convenient.

Additional observations

The online search and filing functions appear to work well. I have a few observations from my use of these tools.

Search tool (https://www.beverlyhills.org/application/lobbyist/search.jsp)

- Search results should show the project name (which is often a project address). The advanced search window can limit a keyword search only to the project field but the search results don't show the contents of that field. The user must download the PDF documents returned with the results in order to find the relevant filing.
- Search results should include the *filing* date in addition to the date of *engagement*. Routinely the elapsed time between engagement and filing is much longer than the 10 days allowed by the code; it can even be a year or more. Let's see the discrepancies at a glance in the search returns screen.
- Search results when manually sorted by engagement date should be appear as expected. Today a search will return results in the proper reverse chronological order from newest to oldest. But when re-ordered using the top-of-the-column toggle, the order appears randomized and clicking on the toggle a second time does not reestablish the original reverse chronological order. Once manually sorted the search must be re-run for the proper date order.

Advanced search

- Date-limiting the search using the 'from' date field should behave as expected. We expect to see registrations with dates of engagement dated after a specified 'from' date, but instead that search will return no result at all. (Sometimes it will show too few results depending on the date chosen.) Limiting search returns using the 'to' date does not behave as expected.
- Date-limiting fields should not enter a date unless manually entered or the date is chosen with the date-picker. Today these fields exhibit unexpected behavior: when inadvertently moused-over in combination with a scrolling action on the mouse, it is possible a random date will be entered into the date field. That occurs without clicking inside the field. Once populated with an arbitrary date, the date field *cannot be cleared* without a page refresh. Moreover a date cannot be directly entered with the keyboard (e.g. '01/01/19').

Online form filing

- The engagement date field on the filing form should validate for the current date (or earlier). Unless there's a need to disclose an engagement that hasn't happened yet, the date of engagement should validate in order to avoid problems like registrations that include an engagement date far into the future. Related: the date-picker need not show future dates if there is no reason to record a future engagement date.
- The disclosure filing form should ask for the location of the project separately if the advocacy is related to a specific parcel. Today the label on the online form reads, "Please indicate the specific name of the project you are lobbying for and/or location of the project." That subordinates the address to the name as chosen arbitrarily by the advocate. Better to require a parcel street address or APN #. That information is specific. Moreover, storing the street address or APN # separately has other benefits: parcel-related activity could be identified separately and even mapped; and both the e-notice and the PDF form could include the address as a separate line-item. That is not the case today because a street address (if given) is included in the project name field. *At the very least the label should emphasize that the priority is on an accurate street address for parcel-related advocacy.*

---

[1] Should the PDF document be the canonical record of the filing? If so then I note that the advocate form as attached to the e-notice has a different filename (DOC_2019092695047.pdf) than the PDF of that filing as downloaded from the online database (LegislativeAdvocateForm_1091.pdf). The latter is generated on-the-fly and has a different timestamp. That suggests different versions of the same disclosure. Which if either is the document-of-record?

ITEM #2

City of Beverly Hills
Legislative Lobbyist Administrative Hearing FAQ's

1. **Generally, what is the location of a Legislative Lobbyist Violation Administrative hearing?**
   a. Beverly Hills City Hall (Location: TBD)

2. **Can members of the public attend?**
   a. Yes, members of the public can attend as observers.
   b. Please, note, the hearing officer has the right to remove anyone who disrupts the meeting.

3. **Why can't members of the public speak?**
   a. The administrative hearing is similar to a court proceeding. Members of the public can submit their comments prior to the hearing directly to the City Prosecutor.
   b. Documents should be forwarded ten (10) days prior to a hearing.
   c. Contact Information:

Mr. William Litvak
Dapeer Rosenblit Litvak, LLP
11500 W. Olympic Blvd. Suite 550
Los Angeles, California 90064
Tel (310) 477-5575
Fax (310) 477-7090
Email: *wlitvak@drllaw.com*

4. **Will a transcript of the hearing be available after the hearing?**
   a. An independent court reporter will be retained to create a transcript of the hearing. The transcript will be posted as it becomes available.

City of Beverly Hills
Legislative Lobbyist Administrative Hearing FAQ's

5. **Will this hearing be broadcast on local Beverly Hills Television or Live Streamed on the City's website?**
    a. No. Legislative Lobbyist Administrative hearings will not be broadcast or live streamed.

6. **Who administers the hearing?**
    a. An independent hearing officer will be retained by the City.

7. **Can members of the public review notes that have been submitted to the City Prosecutor in advance of the hearing?**
    a. Documents that the City Prosecutor submits to the hearing officer for the hearing will be posted on the City's website as they become available.