

# LANCC

**Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Coalition**

President: Bob Gelfand  
Vice President: Leonard Shaffer  
Secretary: Daniel Wiseman  
Treasurer: Glenn Bailey

**WEBSITE (Minutes, Documents, etc.): [www.lanccoalition.org](http://www.lanccoalition.org)**

**WEB-BLOG (Notices, etc.): [lanccreports.blogspot.com](http://lanccreports.blogspot.com)**

**Send emails (questions, comments, etc.): [Info@lanccoalition.org](mailto:Info@lanccoalition.org)**

## **DRAFT MINUTES of JUNE 2, 2012 MEETING**

Hollywood Constituent Center  
6501 Fountain Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90028

### **Preamble to the LANC COALITION BYLAWS (Revised February 8, 2008):**

The Neighborhood Councils of the City of Los Angeles do hereby create this Charter

- to provide a more effective voice for the residents of Los Angeles,
- to create a more effective system of Neighborhood Councils
- to communicate with each other, and
- to fulfill our responsibilities under the Los Angeles City Charter.

(work to improve the quality of life in our communities, advise City Government of our concerns)

1. The **MEETING was CALLED TO ORDER** at 10:18 am by LANCC President, Bob Gelfand  
INITIAL REREMARKS and **PRESIDENT's REPORT**.
  - a. There was a Preparatory Meeting of the LANCC and other interested persons – Saturday – May 26, 2012 – Bob Gelfand, Leonard Shaffer, Daniel Wiseman, Glenn Bailey, Cindy Cleghorn, Jack Humphreville, Ken Wyrick, Heinrich Keifer, Tony Wilkinson.

- b. They discussed LANCC-NC COMMUNICATIONS - NC MASTER LIST (clientserv) ... NCs, INTERNET CONNECTIONS and proposed development of lists of NC PRESIDENTS-VEEPS-SECRETARIES will be developed.
- c. LANCC WEBSITE ... current status and effectiveness of our Website [lanccoalition.org](http://lanccoalition.org)  
... expanding, revising and/or linking our Website  
.... Access to the Website by LANCC Officers to UPLOAD DOCUMENTS
- d. RE-IDENTIFYING, RE-QUALIFYING, RE-ESTABLISHING and RE-MOTIVATING LANCC **NC REPRESENTATIVES** - sending a request to all 95 NCs.
- e. The group discussed preparing LANCC Agendas  
– Regular Issues  
- Special Guests  
- Reports  
- Publication and Publicity  
  
- Two Motions were prepared (Gelfand/Wiseman) regarding the LANCC DECISION MAKING PROCESS:
- f. **MOTION #1: STATEMENT of LANCC POLICIES:**

Whereas: LANCC tries to gather and refer information necessary for NC Actions to the NCs but LANCC does not speak for specific NCs.

Therefore: LANCC wants to have representatives from all 95 NCs.

LANCC Representatives are responsible for communicating issues to their NCs.

It is not necessary for a NC Representative to be a NC Board Member.

Only one LANCC Representative from any single NC may vote on any single issue

LANCC assumes that these Representatives act in the best interest of their NC

(with or without specific approval of their NC)

**MOTION PASSED:** 19 Ayes, 1 Nay, 0 Abstentions

- g. **MOTION #2: RAPID RESPONSE:** LANCC wants to be able to respond quickly and decisively to issues that arise suddenly or which have short (less than 30-60 day) timetables. On receiving and approving documentation of an appropriate issue (from any NC Stakeholder or other sources), the LANCC officers will prepare a position paper and send it to all LANCC Representatives for their immediate responses. The LANCC Representatives are expected to “vote their conscience” and/or “vote in the best interest of their NCs” and give a response to the LANCC Officers as soon as possible. As always, if there is time and opportunity, the LANCC Representatives may submit the issue for deliberation and action by their NC.

**Len Shaffer** reminded us of the rapid response to the announcement, several years ago, of a (Greig Smith initiated) B&F Committee recommendation to decrease the NC annual allocation from \$ 50,000 to \$ 11,500. Within days over 40 NCs responded in opposition and

the City Council set the suggestions aside. Much of this activity was due to the efforts of Jim Alger.

OTHER RAPID RESPONSE METHODS (options) may include

- SURVEY MONKEY, etc.
- CONSTANT CONTACT, etc.
- BLOGS (e-democracy, Yahoo Group, NCASHs, Gmail Group, etc.)

**MOTION PASSED:** 19 Ayes, 1 Nay, 0 Abstentions

2. President Gelfand asked all **PARTICIPANTS and GUESTS to (voluntarily) IDENTIFY** themselves and to (voluntarily) sign-up on the sign-up sheets if they want to receive LANCC notices, agendas, minutes and other communications.
  - a. Secretary Daniel Wiseman passed out three “auxiliary sign-up sheets” and requested the Stakeholders to enter their names and the names of their NC’s President, Vice President and Secretary as a start to creating an accurate, up-to-date MASTER LIST. Other inputs are in process; including a letter to all known NC Presidents asking for their participation. He asked all present to be sure that their NCs “renewed” the assignment(s) of a LANC Representative(s) and send us a formal confirmation of this assignment.
  - b. There were 35 NC Stakeholders present (by nose count)  
These participants come from all SEVEN REGIONS of Los Angeles.
  - c. SPECIAL Guests:
    - Kathay Feng (Common Cause, [kfeng@commoncause.org](mailto:kfeng@commoncause.org))
    - Anjuli Kronheim (Common Cause, [akronheim@commoncause.org](mailto:akronheim@commoncause.org))
  
    - Maria Fisk (Granada Hills South NC)
  
    - Adam Murray (Inner City Law Ctr., [amurray@innercitylaw.org](mailto:amurray@innercitylaw.org))
    - Gigi Szabo (New Directions, Inc., [gszabo@ndvets.org](mailto:gszabo@ndvets.org))
    - Dave Sheridan (The Sober Living Network, [dmsheridan@verizon.net](mailto:dmsheridan@verizon.net))
    - Autumn M. Elliott (Disability Rights, [autumn.elliott@disabilityrightsca.org](mailto:autumn.elliott@disabilityrightsca.org))
    - Alisa Orduna (Housing Stability, United Way, [aorduna@unitedwayla.org](mailto:aorduna@unitedwayla.org))
  
    - Claire Bowin (LA Planning Dept, [claire.bowin@lacity.org](mailto:claire.bowin@lacity.org))
  
    - NOT PRESENT were:
      - Bong Hwan Kim (Candidate for City Council, District 13)
      - Graycie Liu and Bong Hwan Kim (DONE)
3. The **AGENDA was reviewed and passed** with the addition of time for the DISCUSSION OF REDISTRICTING by COMMON CAUSE.

4. The **MINUTES of the MEETING of May 5, 2012 were reviewed and approved.**

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT – LIGHTNING ROUND – COMMENTS & REPORTS**

- a. **Cindy Cleghorn** announced the NC Congress for Saturday, September 24, 2012
- b. **Glenn Bailey** reported that the FY2012-2013 would cause the Van Nuys & San Pedro auxiliary testimony sites to be closed down. The budget also modifies the Office of Public Security (MOU with LAPD) to provide security for public facilities.

He announced that **Dr. Frederick H. Pickel** (the Office of Fiscal Accountability/Ratepayer's Advocate) would speak at the next Valley Alliance of NCs (VANC) Meeting. **Kevin James**, candidate for Mayor, appeared at the last VANC meeting and the other Mayoral Candidates are invited for future meetings. VANC will hold a Forum of City Planning at CBS Studios on June 28<sup>th</sup>.

- c. **Greg Bartz** (DWP) – distributed copies of the **FIVE-YEAR EXTENTION (renewal) of the MOU**. He said that ratification of the renewal (and, presumably, reverification of the NC-DWP MOU Reps) is necessary from every NC. Mr. Bartz gave us a fact sheet which describing **“an unprecedented replacement of its Customer Information System (CIS).”** Essentially, it itemizes areas where customers have had difficulties in accessing or dealing with DWP. DWP's efforts will include hiring two new Assistant Managers and reassigning another Assistant Manager (from other duties) to address these problems.
- d. **Joanne Yvanek-Garb** told of the West Valley Playhouse production of “Squabbles” and encouraged the participants to support their local cultural activities.
- e. **Gary Feldman** (Palms SH) aired his views of the Palms NC to LANCC.
- b. **Ivan Speigel** is one of several IEAs for the upcoming elections. They are to contact councils in their area.
- c. **Ken Wyrick** told of the 10<sup>th</sup> year anniversary celebration of Boyle Heights NC. He said that all NCs need more systematic organizational planning (employing modern software methods). Boyle Heights is working with the Planning Dept (?Community Plan?)
- d. **Tony Wilkinson** announced the opening of a (DONE-based) NC elections office in the Van Nuys City Hall (Fourth Floor).
- e. **Steve Box** will hold a Leadership Conference, here, at 1:00 pm, today. Leadership Academies are being held all over the City dealing with a wide range of topics: elections,

outreach, social media, data bases, etc.

- f. **Robert Guevarra** announced Lummis Day – Sun, June 3, 2012, Highland Park. He recommends that we read **Steven Box’s City Watch (05/24/2012) article; “City Hall: Everybody’s Talking – Nobody is Listening.”**
- f. **Len Shaffer** pointed us to State Assembly Bill #2231 (Felipe Fuentes). It is opposed by the L.A. City Council. Mr. Fuentes, who is running for CD7 (when Mr. Alarcon’s term is over) is re-writing a ballot measure to impact the City of Los Angeles, specifically. Mr. Fuentes argues that the **4,600 miles of broken sidewalk (2005 statistics)** are broken by tree roots planted by the City.

6. **TOPIC: The L.A. City Council REDISTRICTING COMMISSION’s MAP** - presented by **Kathay Feng** (COMMON CAUSE)

- a. COMMON CAUSE ([www.commoncause.org](http://www.commoncause.org)) is aware of or considering the following:
  - Current or **PROPOSED LITIGATIONS** questioning the constitutionality of the Map by Councilmember Parks, Councilmember Perry, Koreatown Community and, possibly, others.
  - A **REFERENDUM to CANCEL/MODIFY/REVERSE** the recommended Maps. This would needs 40,000 signatures within 40 days of City Council Approval (June 4, 2012). There are City Ordinances which would have to be litigated, first.
  - A **BALLOT INITIATIVE** to change to a NON-POLITICAL, **“INDEPENDENT” Panel of Redistricting Commissioners for future redistricting** processes. This action would not take effect until 10 years from now.
- b. A sign-up sheet was passed out for those who might want more information or wish to participate in these activities. In answer to a question: Common Cause was part of the Zocalo Conference.

7. **TOPIC: Response to Mr. Park’s MOTION Re: NC OUTREACH**

BACKGROUND: Recently, Mr. Parks/Ms Perry drafted **CF #10-1797-S7**.

Its first sentence is pregnant with meaning: **“There are several major issues pending before the City Council and there is legitimate concern that our neighborhood councils are either not informed, or then have not discussed them and taken**

**positiona, or they do not realize the extent of impact to their communities these issues would have, or they have not communicated their views to the City Council.** For example, ...the waste-shed facilities proposal...” In response, a LANCC MOTION (see Appendix #1) was put before the LANCC.

- a. **Daniel Wiseman** noted that this could be taken to indicate that Mr. Parks and Ms. Perry want to be sure that the NCs fulfill their obligation to “...advise the City ...” That, however, will require that:
  - #1 – The “major issues” are defined and itemized by the Mayor and City Council
  - #2 – The background and importance of all “major issues” be systematically provided to the NCs with enough time allowed (minimum 90 days) for information gathering, processing, presentation, deliberation and decision-making by the NCs.
  - #3 – The NCs be given ample opportunity to present their views to the Mayor and City Council.
  - #4 - That a “feed-back loop” be established for each “major issue” that will be used to evaluate the decision-makers recommendations and that the NCs be afforded the opportunity to regularly report back to the Mayor and City Council on the status of the “major issue.”
- b. **Jay Handal** added that the Regional Alliances should be able to participate. The WRAC process takes 90 days. So far, NCs do not get the necessary information in time to react. They are expected to find, define and process the “major issues” without help from the Mayor, City Council or Departments. He and **Ivan Speigel** have drafted background material, see Appendix #1, and a proposal as a **RESPONSE MOTION to the Parks proposal (CF #10-1797-S7):**
- c. **Jeff Jacobberger** said that, at present, on most City Council Ordinance issues, all NCs can do is ask for more time.
- d. **Glenn Bailey** said that NC volunteers must arrange to be in the position to react, to send an email and to appear at City Council or Committee Meetings.
- e. **Ken Wyrick** wants to look at our own capabilities, our own resources, our future plans
- f. **Randy Waller** said we should concentrate on advocacy and advice and be less concerned with the level of our annual NC funding. We should find the people in our Councilmember’s offices with whom we can connect and work
- g. **Robert Guevarra** said that not all LANCC participants have the authority to speak for their NC. Appointment by the NC may help.
- h. Restatement of the **RESPONSE MOTION** (Handal/Seigel) to the Parks proposal **(CF #10-1797-S7):**
  - (1) All “important” issues should be sent to the NCs 60 days prior to their first hearing so that the NCs may have time to reach out to their stakeholders and take a position. A good

example of this is the weekly notice from the Planning Department which alerts NCs to the applications filed for their District.

**(Secretary's Note:** Other sources are to available at the Early Notification System – ENS – including regular emailing of the City Council “New Council Items,” Council and Committee agendas and their preparatory materials. You will need to copy this and paste it to your URL box: <http://lacity.org/SubMenu/ENSEarlyNotificationSystem/EarlyNotificationSystem/subscriptions/CityCouncilCouncilCommitteeandAdHocCommitteeAgendas/index.htm>)

Each City Department head should be responsible to work with the NC system as a partner, not an adversary.

- (2) DONE shall compile and regularly update a contact list of all NC Board members.
- (3) The City Council and all of its Committees shall allow a five minute public comment period to all speakers that are officially representing their NCs.
- (4) All Council District offices shall meet regularly with their NCs and work with them to develop plans allowing for greater NC input in the decision making process.
- (5) The E&N Committee shall look into the funding of DONE pertaining to the capacity to fulfill its mission. An additional staff position shall be funded with part of its job description being to track all impending legislation and department hearings and to notify the NC system in a timely manner.
- (6) NCs should be allowed to request a postponement of all upcoming legislation so that they may properly notify their stakeholders and have time to meet and take a position.

An amendment to remove item (5), above, failed.

This proposal in its six original parts was PASSED: 19 Ayes, 1 Nays, 1 Abstention.

Chairman promised to get this action out to everyone and said the Executive Committee will assign specific people to deliver our recommendations, formally, to the E&N, to BONC and elsewhere.

## 8. **TOPIC: LA CITY BUDGET, its impact on the NCs - Daniel Wiseman**

- a. Each NC will get **\$ 37,000 ANNUAL ALLOCATION.**  
There is NO “withhold” of money for NC’s Elections  
The impact of this decrease is a \$ 300,000 savings to the City but a significant impediment to the operations of NCs ... especially those NCs with “fixed obligations” for office space and support staff ( Executive Directors, Librarians, Secretaries, etc.)
- b. DONE (aka “EmpowermentLA”) is to retain the 2 position that were originally deleted (total 18 positions). This is expected to continue the current level of service to the NC’s Funds Control (requests for checks, etc.)

c. Over \$ 600,000 has been left in the City Budget to support DONE’s management of the NC Elections.

d. GLOBAL CONSIDERATIONS

- FY2012-2013 General Fund is expected to be \$ 4.538B – 3.5% more than FY12 (\$ 4.386B)  
 The Mayor continues to propose and the City Council continues to **expect increased G.F.**  
 income despite the fact that such increases are “pure speculation.” The Budget proposes  
**increased G.F. expenses in stead of “curing” this year’s Budget Deficits at the start.**

- The biggest **“OBLIGATORY INCREASED EXPENSES”** are our wholly contracted  
 (that is, previously agreed) **INCREASES IN EMPLOYEE SALARIES. \$135.53M.**

- = Paying off an UNPAID FY2011-12 Employee (COLA) Compensation Adjustment (\$ 2.56M)
- = CONTRACTED FY2012-13 Employee (COLA) Compensation Adjustment (\$ 44.09M)
- = Full Funding for (formerly) Partially Funded Positions (\$ 134.52M)
- = Labor Provisions (what is this?) (\$ 2.60M)
- = Employee-Labor MOU Negotiated Payouts (\$ 1.11M)

e. Mayor’s and City Council predict an initially \$ 238M, ?\$ 247M or more **BUDGET DEFICIT**  
 but have suggested the following:

<b><u>MITIGATIONS</u></b>	<b><u>“SAVINGS”</u></b>	<b><u>“REMAINDER”</u></b>
<b><u>TOTAL ESTIMATED DEFICIT (take your choice ...\$ 238M( \$ 247M( \$ 250M)</u></b>		<b><u>\$ 250.0M</u></b>
Suggested INCREASE in EXPECTED PROPERTY TAXES	\$ 5.6M	\$ 244.4M
Increased Incomes from...	\$ 87.5M	\$ 162.9M
- Fire EMS (Ambulance) Services (\$15M)		
- Fire EMS (one-time) Services (13.5M)		
- Public Works/Engineering Fees (\$ 0.40M)		
- Raising Parking Fines by \$ 5 per fine (\$ 10.0M)		
- Redirection of ex-CRA FUNDS (one-time) (\$ 48.6M)		
Special Fund Revenues to “offset” G.F. Expenses	\$ 44.4M	\$ 127.5M
Decreased Departmental Allocations (?increased efficiencies) \$ 69.7M		\$ 57.8M
<b><u>(THIS IS MANDATORY ...across the board... no Department will be spared)</u></b>		
“OTHER CHANGES & ADJUSTMENTS”	\$ 57.7M	\$ 00
<b><u>(These \$ 57.7M ACTIONS are TOO COMPLEX for “us” to understand)</u></b>		

**(If you follow and believe these figure are real ... you might be a politician.)**



- f. The “BALANCE” of the budget remains in question. The Mayor calls layoffs his last resort to save money (yet he continues to apply these measures before implementing efficiencies).
- “Managed Hiring” (tight hiring freeze) will continue.
  - City Attorneys will be (the only group) assured they will be cut. Some think that this is due to their opposition to the earlier employeesalary adjustments and other policies of the Mayor.
  - Originally, the Mayor proposed to cancel the funding for 438 Unfilled positions and layoff 231 actively employed people (mostly women) ... saving \$ 25 million. The City Council approved cancelling the unfilled positions but found money to decrease the layoffs to 209 ... saving \$ 19 million. They also softened the blow so that the layoffs would not occur until for six months (after December 31, 2012).

## 9. TOPIC: COMMUNITY CARE FACILITIES ORDINANCE debate

On Feb. 6, 2011, **Council Members Greig Smith & Ed Reyes** proposed **LOS ANGELES CITY ORDINANCE (CF #11-0262)** which asked the City Planning Commission to “...forward a proposed ordinance:

- defining

*Community Care Facility, Licensed;*  
*Residential Care Facility for the Elderly, Licensed;*  
*Alcoholism or Durg Abuse Recovery or Treatment Facility Licensed;*  
*Single Housekeeping Unit*

- amending the definitions for

*Boarding or Rooming House* and  
*Family* for the Council’s actions...”

- bringing the Municipal Code into conformity with State law; and

- regulating these facilities as public benefits;

The **STATE OF CALIFORNIA** licenses care facilities for persons who can not live alone but who do not need extensive medical services...typically help with medications and assistance with personal hygiene, dressing and grooming.”

**(Secretary’s Notes:** The Secretary created the outline format and blue coloration, above, (but not the italics) in order to focus on the nature and functions of these residences. The Secretary is surprised that the word, “*Family*,” requires a different definition for divorce proceedings, child-custody, residential considerations and other areas of law. We wonder about extended families, family groups, multiple families and domestic “help” (including “caregivers”) living in a Single Family Residence (SFR) for economic and personal reasons. Small & large residences? What about “Mother-in-law” extensions? What about “garage conversions?” When does a Single Family Residence become a Multiple Residence (or a “family” or “non-family” group)? How can this debate have any meaning and how can the LANCC audience understand the arguments without this basis?

The following groups living in these residences were suggested, with the assistance of the participants:

- Multiple (extended) Families living in a “SFR”
- Homeless
- Persons recently released from jail  
(including those who have served their terms and have no further “obligation”  
(including those released in association with the transfer of state jails to local jails)
- Parolees and probationers. (These people often SELF-PAY for their residence.)
- Veterans (including those recently returned from war fronts) (VA or HUD or SELF PAY),
- Recovering alcohol, drug or substance abusers seeking sober living facilities (Often they SELF PAY)
- Shelters for battered women and/or children
- Supervised Care Facilities for Cognitive, Mental and Functionally Challenged  
(persons with mild-to-moderate Mental and Neurological Disorders)
- Other (marginal and or episodic) disabling conditions
- Special care facilities useful at the time of recovery from an injury, procedure or illness  
(examples include stroke, hip replacement, meningitis...)
- Minimal assisted care for the aging.
- (possibly) Certain types of Social Security-type Disabilities  
(MOST OF THESE ARE LICENSED BY THE STATE and CONTROLLED BY STATE LAW)

a. The DEBATE (PRO):

**Maria Fisk** argued that these facilities are commercial profit-centers in non-commercial residential neighborhoods and are associated with significant nuisance (noise, unpleasing public acts, etc.) and criminal activities by the resident/clients.

b. The DEBATE (CON):

**Adam Murray** (Attorney, Exec. Dir., Inner City Law Center), [amurray@innercitylaw.org](mailto:amurray@innercitylaw.org) (CON) said there are 9,000 homeless veterans in this City. The Ordinance is opposed by many government and non-profit organizations (including United Way) which deal with homelessness. A legal opinion, requested by his group, said that the Ordinance was “unconstitutional” and that the ordinance violates fair housing laws.

c. **Gigi Szabo** (Dir. Of Housing, New Directions, Inc., [gszabo@ndvets.org](mailto:gszabo@ndvets.org)) is part of a company that operates 5 Community Care houses in West LA. Two of their facilities would be shut down by this ordinance. She claims that the Ordinance would shut down “good operators”... but that “bad operators” would continue, anyway.

d. **Jerry Askew** suggested the use of “Conditional Use” and/or “Zone Variance” decisions from the Area Planning Commission level to define these facilities. He said Granada Hills South NC

supports the Ordinance.

e. Also present were:

Dave Sheridan (Attorney, The Sober Living Network)  
[dmsheridan@verizon.net](mailto:dmsheridan@verizon.net),

Autumn M. Elliott (Attorney, Disability Rights California)  
[autumn.elliott@disabilityrightsca.org](mailto:autumn.elliott@disabilityrightsca.org)

Alisa Orduna (Housing Stability, United Way)  
[aorduna@unitedwayla.org](mailto:aorduna@unitedwayla.org)

NO MOTION was made. NO ACTION taken.

10. **TOPIC: L.A. CITY MOBILITY PLAN (DOT?) - Claire Bowin (Planning Dept [claire.bowin@lacity.org](mailto:claire.bowin@lacity.org))**

- a. **Clair Bowin** spoke from a HANDOUT (“GREAT STREETS – GREAT NEIGHBORHOODS”) which depicted the problems in L.A. Traffic (our “car-dependent culture, slowed freeways, smog, lack of bicycle lanes, lack of public transportation, etc.) and some of the recent improvements (increased MTA lines, Red-Gold-Blue-Green lines but emphasized that much more needed to be done. She introduced the “**LA2B Project**” which intends to involve the public (especially NCs) to provide input (problems & priorities) at **ThinkLab Community Workshops, Car-Free Days, CicLAvia** and other events.

Its website, [la2b.org](http://la2b.org), is an excellent resource. She would like all NC’s Planning, Land Use, Transportation and Streets (etc.) Committees to know about and use.

- b. The Activity Guide for NCs mentions challenges, new transportations (colored lines, MTA routes, etc.) ... She wants NC input. She didn’t mention how it could be received, processed and implemented.
- c. In answer to a question about a MTA BUSLINE #734: #734 now goes from Sylmar to Ventura Blvd (42 min) and turns around and goes back (along Sepulveda Blvd.) This “shortened” route is necessary to allow 20 min breaks for DRIVERS after 90 minutes of driving. BUT ... it could go on over the Sepulveda PASS (405 FWY) to Wadsworth VA, UCLA and end at CENTURY CITY ... taking 15,000 of the 400,000 Sepulveda Pass Cars off the road. This is possible right now. This idea was created and supported by the Sherman Oaks NC Planning Committee. ANS: This is a MTA decision. City Planning can recommend that MTA does this.

11. **ADJOURNMENT** at 1:15 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: July 7, 2012 @ 10:00 a.m.

LOCATION: Hollywood Constituent Center  
6501 Fountain Avenue  
(Fountain & Wilcox, West of Cahuenga Street)  
Hollywood, CA 90028

**APPENDIX #1** – The full text of background material and the response motion to **CF #10-1797-S7** (the Parks/Perry proposal for NCs to report on specific issues) is included on the following pages:

DRAFT

WHEREAS COUNCIL MEMBER PARKS HAS MADE A MOTION , SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER PERRY, REQUIRING NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCILS TO REPORT BACK TO E & N ON HOW NC'S PERFORM OUTREACH WITH REGARDS TO CITY ISSUES.

Be it resolved that LANCC, in its regular meeting dated 6/2/2012, moves to approve the following response to the motion:

Neighborhood Councils, by charter and ordinance, are mandated to be the link between the City government and the citizens of Los Angeles. Neighborhood councils recognize their responsibility in this matter. In an effort to do so, many NC's have created newsletters, blast e-mails, events, town halls and other forms of outreach.

BUT, the City of Los Angeles has not, for the most part, established any kind of procedures that would allow Neighborhood Councils to fulfill this duty. In fact, many of the current procedures are set up to work against any input from stakeholders and their elected Neighborhood Councils. What follows are only a few examples:

A- Neighborhood Councils are NOT advised in advance of issues. In many cases, Neighborhood Councils are never apprised of issues, thereby making it impossible for the NC's to get the word out, get feedback, and deliver said feedback to the elected officials. Many issues only come to the attention of the NC's within 72 hours of the issue being heard by the City Council. As the elected officials must realize, NC's are bound by the Brown Act and do not have the ability to respond officially within such a short period of time. There isn't even enough time to file a Community Impact Statement.

B- The current DONE contact list is several years out of date. It is virtually impossible to get any kind of timely notice to the entire Neighborhood Council system. The present policy only allows each individual board member to update their personal information. The Secretary of each NC should be given a password and allowed to provide this information for their entire Board. Failure to do so should result in DONE hiring temp staff to do it for them with the salaries being deducted from the NC's yearly funding assessment.

C- When Neighborhood Council members, many of whom have to take time from their work, appear before a Committee or the whole Council, they are routinely given two minutes to report or give public comment on an issue. It is extremely difficult to give any kind of reasoned response in this short time allotment. If the City Council really wanted input from official NC representatives they should allow a reasonable time period for official input. Only last year, a Committee Chair combined four agenda items into one public comment period. Speakers were given two minutes to speak on four very different items. Not only did this negate any kind of meaningful input, but it was disrespectful of the NC representatives who took the time to travel downtown with the hope of real participation.

P. H. W. 11

D- The relationship between Neighborhood Councils and their respective Council offices is a mixed bag. Some Council offices work closely with their NC's and actually request their input on certain issues. There are other Council offices that could care less about NC's and would actually like them to go away. Some don't even have the courtesy to return phone calls. If the goal of your motion is to explore ways for better citizen input - it has to start at the top.

E- There has been a systemic demolition of the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment caused by the City's inability to generate revenue and cut expenses in a more prudent way, but there has been no reduction in the amount of services that they are required to provide. There is no question that this lack of a proper staffing level has caused the Department and the NC system to falter in their ability to stay fully informed. The staff at DONE has been reduced from a 2008 level of 49 employees with 18 field reps, to the current level of 15 employees with 7 field reps. During the same time period, the number of Neighborhood Councils has risen from 89 to 95. DONE is the NC's direct conduit to the City government and is in the best position to notify the Neighborhood Councils about upcoming legislation. Someone should be assigned to keep track of upcoming hearings and meetings but each current staff person is already trying to handle the work load of three previous workers.

F- City Council members are busy people, but if they really wanted Neighborhood Council input they would show up at meetings to hear it. Public testimony at full Council meetings is a farce. The members are talking on cell phones, meeting with constituents, or leaving the chamber for large periods of time. How can Neighborhood Councils take their role seriously if the decision makers don't or if, as in some cases, they have already decided how to vote and could care less about what we have to say or the amount of time it took us to formulate our recommendations.

THEREFORE, we request that Council member Parks submit a motion to the full City Council mandating the following:

- ✓ 1- All "important" issues should be sent to the Neighborhood Councils 60 days prior to their first hearing so that they may have time to reach out to their stakeholders and take a position. A good example of this is the weekly notice from the Planning Department which alerts NC's to the permits pulled for their district. Each City Department head should be responsible to work with the NC system as a partner, not an adversary.   
→ applications filed
- 2- The Department Of Neighborhood Empowerment shall compile and regularly update a contact list of all Neighborhood Council Board members.
- 3- The City Council and all of its committees shall allow a five minute public comment period to all speakers that are officially representing their Neighborhood Councils.
- 4- All Council District offices shall meet regularly with their Neighborhood Councils and work with them to develop plans allowing for greater NC input in the decision making process.

5- The Education and Neighborhoods Committee shall look into the funding of the Department Of Neighborhood Empowerment pertaining to its capacity to fulfill its mission. An additional staff position shall be funded with part of the job description being to track all impending legislation and department hearings and to notify the Neighborhood Council system in a timely manner.

6- Neighborhood Councils should be allowed to request a postponement of all upcoming legislation so that they may properly notify their stakeholders and have time to meet and take a position.

This body asks the Chairman to consider the above information when reviewing how NC's interact with their stakeholders and the City government.

Submitted by:

Jay Handal, Chair, West LA Neighborhood Council

Ivan Spiegel, Parliamentarian, Venice Neighborhood Council

DR