This document was generated by AI and is not an official meeting record. It may contain errors. **Transcript**

April 2, 2025, 9:02PM



Vega, Michelle 0:08

We can go ahead and begin with introductions from the board offices. Can we have introductions from SD1 please? Please.



Omoto-Frias, Tamela 0:17

Hi, this is Tammy Mulgeefreeze and I'm joined here with my colleague Kim and Diana.



Vega, Michelle 0:23 Wonderful.

Introductions from SDE 2.



GM Giza, Maeve 0:28 Hello mate. Do you have in the second district here?

Vega, Michelle 0:33 SD3.



cc Cabello, Cecilia 0:35 Cecilia Cabello with St. Three and joined by my colleague Mike Aguilar Cadet.

Vega, Michelle 0:42 Wonderful. Great.

Fox, Rachel 0:44 Hi and Rachel Fox from SD3. Cabello, Cecilia 0:47 Sorry, Rachel.

Vega, Michelle 0:50 SD4.



sg Schauerman, Grant 0:52 The grant showman SD4.



Vega, Michelle 0:54

Wonderful. And I am here. Michelle Vega from SD5. I'm gonna be joined by my colleague Gina Ender, but she's running a few minutes late. OK, with that? Do we have any general public comment today?



Dardy Chen 1:09

Any general public comment please speak up or raise your hand on teams please. Hey, I don't see any. So back to you chair.



Vega, Michelle 1:20

OK. We will move on with our board motion items.

We'll begin with the first one. That is from ST5 and SD1, which is the Armenian

Genocide Remembrance Day in Los Angeles County.

I think this I will go ahead and lead the discussion on this.

I think it's pretty self-explanatory.

This is a motion that the 5th district has been doing for quite some time, and we're doing it in partnership with Supervisor Solis's office to recognize Armenian Genocide Day, and then also because there's an action asking.

CEO to work with county departments to promote events and educational materials regarding the genocide.

That's why we've got it here for cluster review.

Is there anything that the 1st district would like to say on it?

Omoto-Frias, Tamela 2:03

I have no comments, but I'll open it to my colleagues.



Vargas, Diana 2:10

Hi everyone.

I just wanted to just say that for once again asking us to co-author this mission as we have done historically in the past.



Vega, Michelle 2:21

Wonderful. OK. Are there any questions from any of the deputies regarding this motion?

No.

OK.

Well, feel free to reach out to me if anybody has questions that arise after. Otherwise the proposed agenda date for this is April 15th.

Next, we can move on to our second board motion, which is by SD5 as well, which is celebrating 20 years of civic art and investing in its future.

We have Gina Ender, our arts deputy.

On to provide a brief overview of the motion.

EG Ender, Gina 3:01

Sure. Thank you.

So the motion serves 2 purposes.

One is to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the Department of Arts and Cultural Civic Art Division and also spotlight some great civic arts programs, including one that's happening at the library during April.

And then the second is very 5th district specific, ensuring that arts and culture are a part of the rebuilding process. And Altadena Post Eden fire because.

The arts are such part of the character of that community and so it's providing services.

Including different activities to support the Community fire preservation kits to help residents who might have had art or personal belongings that were destroyed and to help them kind of recover those, and then just in general during rebuilding to make

sure arts are focus of that. So that's the. Motion feel free to ask any questions. Thanks.

VM Vega, Michelle 3:55

Does anybody have any questions? OK.

I don't see any hands up.

All right.

So then we will move on to the next item, which is motion by SD3, which is support for Assembly Bill 1430. Bennett on county reporters fees.



cc Cabello, Cecilia 4:15

Thank you, AB 1430, which was introduced by assembly Member Steve Bennett of Ventura County. Increases document recording fees at the level necessary to adequately fund recording service. Current state law mandates that recording fees are at \$10.00 for the first page, \$3 for each additional page.

And requires that \$1.00 of each \$3 fee for each additional page must be deposited into the county's general fund.

The bill is sponsored by the County Recorders Association of California to address the structural shortfall in current state established base document recording fees that have not been adjusted in more than 10 years. As a result, and in combination with the lagging real estate market, the LA recorder, the.

La County recorder function, despite the state legislative intent to be self funded, is being augmented by NCC funding, which then pulls other funding from necessary resources.

Central public services.

Currently, AB 1430 is sitting in the Assembly local government committee awaiting a hearing date.

Supervisor Horvath introduced the motion at the request of our registrar, Recorder county clerk, who is here to answer any questions.



Vega, Michelle 5:31

I just have a actually.

Sorry, I take it that was on me. Dean, did you have anything you wanted to add or you're just here to answer questions?

Dean Logan 5:40

No, just thanks, Cece, for your overview this.

This is something that we referenced in our budget hearing during the the department budget hearings process and and again the emphasis is to just to get some numbers to it. We have been averaging about a \$13 million augmentation to cover what hasn't been collected in the rece.

From the recording fee.

This this provision would would shrink that gap.

By 9 million. So we still have 4 million augmentation to go, but I think there's still time to negotiate in the if the bill moves forward, there may be some negotiation on a CPI index or something of that in in the in the future. So we're continuing to look at that.

Vega, Michelle 6:25 Right. OK.

Omoto-Frias, Tamela 6:25 Yes, question. Oh, sorry, Michelle.

Vega, Michelle 6:27 Yes, no, no.

Omoto-Frias, Tamela 6:27 Are you done?

Vega, Michelle 6:27 Go ahead, Tamika. I'll ask.

Omoto-Frias, Tamela 6:28

Yep, I just wanted to ask I I thought that a few years ago we did a \$75 recording fee for property. Is this different?

Dean Logan 6:36

It is Tammy.

Thank you for that question.

So this is the base recording fee which is the amount of money that that.

Was intended and legislative intent was intended to cover the cost of administration of the recording function. In addition to this fee, there are a number of other fees attached to document recordings.

So there's the affordable housing fee.

There's a fraud notification fee.

There is a domestic violence fee so so our recorder function is used to bring in revenue for a number of of other services.

The base recording fee was originally intended to cover the cost of the actual recording process, but it hasn't been adjusted since 2010.



Omoto-Frias, Tamela 7:16

Bass plus the real real estate documentation. It's an addition to right.



Dean Logan 7:21

lt's a. It's a in addition to the base speed, correct?



Omoto-Frias, Tamela 7:24

OK. And then this bill applies to all counties, not just LA County, right? OK, good. Thank you.



Vega, Michelle 7:32

Great. Do any of my colleagues have any other questions?



GM Giza, Maeve 7:36

Quick question, do we have a target date for this going to the board?



Dean Logan 7:42

I believe this is scheduled to be on the agenda on the 15th.



Giza, Maeve 7:46 Thank you.

Vega, Michelle 7:48

I was actually just gonna ask does lair have a fact sheet on this Cece? Oh, cool.



Dean Logan 7:52 They are. They're putting one together right now, so we yeah.

Vega, Michelle 7:54

Oh, great. OK. Great. OK, perfect. Thanks. All right. Any other questions on this? No. All right, we will move on to the next item, which is also by the 3rd District Supervisor Horvath, which is support for Senate Bill 456. By Senator Ashby on Community beautification act. Cece, take it away.

Fox, Rachel 8:19 FR I'm going to steal this from Cece.

Vega, Michelle 8:21 Oh great.

Fox, Rachel 8:22

Thanks everyone.

This is.

This would create a licensing exemption for muralists that allows them to continue to engage in Commission work for civic art programs or projects.

Current law right now creates some confusion around licensing requirements for

muralists.

There are some public notices that one started going around back in 2023 to municipalities that indicated that muralists fall under the definition.

Of a contractor under the business and Professions Code section.

So some of the public agencies and cities that commissioned muralists if they wanted to ensure they were compliant, the muralist would have to carry a contractor license. If they were doing work that exceeded more than \$500.

So this requirement of of contractor's license for mirrorless is an enormous burden on artists.

To qualify for commercial licensees.

Muralists must accumulate 4 years of specialized experience under licensed contractor Pass a law in business exemption and pay annual licensing fee. So this is really prohibited muralist and I will say for municipalities from proceeding with working with artists and have put a lot of projects on pause throughout the state.

So this bill would clarify the standard practice and add muralist narrowly defined to a list of activities in the business and profess.

That are not subject to licensure. This is something also that our arts advocates have been asking for.

So I will allow if the Department of Arts and Culture has any additional comments, feel free to chime in.



Heather Rigby 10:05

Thank you, Rick, excuse me.

Hi everyone.

Thank you, Rachel.

I'm Heather Rigby, the chief deputy for Department of Arts and Culture. I think you covered it, I think essentially.

The existing code requires muralists to be licensed contractors.

If they don't have a license, they would be required to hire a licensed contractor to essentially do a paint by numbers of an artist design.

And that's just not how muralists work.

We mural is the hand of the artist or the hand of artist and community members that have participated in its creation, and it would also create a financial burden that would reduce.

The fee that the artist takes home at the end of the day.

So this is just a a clarification to allow muralists to be exempt from the licensing requirement.

And here for any any questions you might have.



Vega, Michelle 10:59

Similarly, I was just going to ask is layer putting the other fact sheet on this as well?



Heather Rigby 11:04

I am hearing that they're working on a fact sheet for the bill be provided on Friday.



Vega, Michelle 11:09

Great.

Any other questions from any board offices?



Omoto-Frias, Tamela 11:15

I know that the fact sheet usually goes like to the ledge deputies, but can we make sure that our arts and the operations deputy gets it too? Thank you.



Heather Rigby 11:22 HR Yes, thank you.

Vega, Michelle 11:28

Any other questions from board offices? No. OK with that, we will move past this item. Dardi do we have any public comment or on the on the section of the agenda on the board motions?



Dardy Chen 11:45 No, we do not.

Vega, Michelle 11:46

OK, wonderful. We do not have any discussion items, nor do we have any presentation items. So with that, at 2:13 on April 2nd, we will go ahead and adjourn. Thank you.



Omoto-Frias, Tamela 11:58 Thanks Michelle.



Dardy Chen 11:58 Have a good one. Bye.

- Omoto-Frias, Tamela 11:59 ОТ Thanks all. Thank you.
- GM Giza, Maeve 11:59 Thank you.

Kouassi, Koffi 12:01 KK Thank you.

Dardy Chen stopped transcription