

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

PRESIDENT  
Michael Greenwald

VICE PRESIDENT  
Ray Pollok

**MEMBERS**

Brian Allen	Oscar Jimenez
Alfredo Castillo	Rahim Kazi
Chris Coyle	Ralph Kroy
Berj Demirjian	Dave Parikh
Kyle Ellis	Skylar Rose
Sid Gold	Andres Topete
Bill Hopkins	Joe Vitti
Wayde Hunter	Keren Waters

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES,  
CALIFORNIA**



**GRANADA HILLS NORTH  
NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL**

**BOARD MEETING  
AGENDA WITH MINUTES**

**GHNNC Contact Information**

**Address:** 11139 Woodley Avenue  
Granada Hills, CA  
**Telephone:** (818) 923-5592  
**Website:** www.GHNNC.org

**GHNNC BOARD MEETING  
Location**

Saint Euphrasia School Auditorium,  
11766 Shoshone Ave.  
Granada Hills, CA 91344  
**Tuesday, November 06, 2018 at 6:30 PM**

**A. Call to Order, Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance, Welcome/Introductions/Calendar.**

**Roll Call [Quorum (16 present/ 11 required)]**

- (1) Present: Brian Allen, Alfredo Castillo, Chris Coyle, Berj Demirjian, Kyle Ellis, Sid Gold, Michael Greenwald, Bill Hopkins, Wayde Hunter, Oscar Jimenez, Rahim Kazi, Ralph Kroy, Dave Parikh,<sup>1</sup> Ray Pollok, Skylar Rose, Keren Waters
- (2) Absent: Andres Topete, Joe Vitti

**B. Comments from CD 12, LAPD Senior Lead Officers, Elected Official Reps, Government Agencies.**

*DONE Comments (Jose Galdamez)*

- (1) There will be a ‘purposeful aging’ town hall meeting on November 29<sup>th</sup> at 6:30pm across from City Hall.
- (2) For the Neighborhood Council funding program, the San Fernando Valley funding representative was recently promoted. The new San Fernando Valley funding representative is Paola Posada (paola.posada@lacity.org).
- (3) Regarding Neighborhood Council elections, last month there were two regional workshops in the South Valley and North Valley. These workshops included outreach suggestions and a roundtable. DONE resources regarding the election timeline, neighborhood demographic data, and graphic design layouts are available upon request.
- (4) DONE representatives were out at polling locations informing the voting public about the existence of Los Angeles Neighborhood Councils.
- (5) Brian Allen asks when information will be available for participants in the IgniteLA program in our area. Jose Galdamez responds, stating that last night the women in the program were recognized, and information about the next IgniteLA will be forthcoming.
- (6) Glenn Bailey asks regarding the funding roundtable, and whether there will be such roundtables in the San Fernando Valley. No information available right now.

*CD12 Comments (Jesse Strobel)*

- (1) Councilmember Englander is resigning as of December 31, 2018, for an opportunity in the private sector. Kyle Ellis asks about whether the vacancy is on the 31<sup>st</sup> or the 1<sup>st</sup> as there is an impact on whether a special election will take place. Later clarification is that the effective date is on the 1<sup>st</sup> of 2019, meaning that the City Council will have the option of appointment or holding a special election.
- (2) The Councilmember submitted a motion to evaluate the ‘get help’ application, which would assist with finding homeless resources on demand. There will be a 6-month pilot period. Shepherd of the Hills wants to incorporate available faith-based services into the application.

<sup>1</sup> Dave Parikh’s ethics certificate expired on June 7, 2018, and he is ineligible to vote.

- (3) The City Council recently received a report back on mitigation of pooling water on streets in order to prevent mosquito breeding. Bill Hopkins asks whether this includes mid-street pooling, Jesse Strobel says that it only affects the sides of the street – in the gutters and storm drains.
- (4) The City Council is considering a draft ordinance to allow a 6:1 match in City elections. While a signature gathering provision has been removed, the basic requirement to receive matching funds is \$25,000 in contributions consisting of \$100 or less.
- (5) A member of the public asks about the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Amenities Fund. Jesse Strobel states that she will ask Councilmember Englander before the end of the week. The member of the public asks about the amount of money in the fund and what is happening regarding the \$1 million pledged to the pool. Jesse Strobel states that the \$1 million to the pool went to the design of the pool, and the plan is to begin construction during 2019, and open by summer 2020 for a total of \$10 million. Michael Greenwald states that \$1 million is ludicrous and wants information about who the contractor was; Brian Allen states that he will check with the Board of Design(Engineering); Bill Cotter states that he has been asking this question for three years, and there is no reason for the delay. Another member of the public agrees with Bill Cotter, and suggests that an audit may be needed.
- (6) Bill Cadravi asks about the details of Councilmember Englander’s replacement, and whether there is any direct involvement by Councilmember Englander in the process. Jesse Strobel responds that once City Council resumes in January 2019, Council President Herb Wesson will appoint a caretaker. Councilmember Englander has no authority to decide, but has informed the City Council that he wants Nicole Bernstein, his Chief of Staff, to fill the caretaker role. States that the rumor is that there will be a special election, but it is at the option of the City Council.

*AD39 Comments (Jude Hernandez)*

- (1) State Assemblywoman Luz Rivas was at the unveiling for CalTrans fallen workers memorial.
- (2) San Fernando Valley Veteran’s Day parade will be on Sunday, November 11<sup>th</sup>.

C. Public Comment on non-agenda items (limited to two minutes).

*Public Comments*

- (1) Glenn Bailey comments that he submitted a request regarding the VANC mixer in March, asking for money. Additionally comments that the next budget day date is June 29. Finally states that Saturday, September 28, 2019, will be the next NC Congress.
- (2) Bill Cotter comments regarding the neighborhood watch.
- (3) Donna Zero comments that there was a traffic study done in Granada Hills, and asks about the up-speeding of several streets in the neighborhood. Bill Hopkins comments that the state must do it every seven years and that the police cannot issue speeding tickets absent this traffic study and the State imposing new speed limits consistent with the study.
- (4) Sergio presents the Granada Hills youth project from Frost Middle School.
- (5) Bill Hopkins comments that the Southern California Preparedness Foundation received an Award of Excellence from the Business & Industry Council for Emergency Planning & Preparedness.

D. Emergency Preparedness Item of the Month.

*EP Chair Comments (Bill Hopkins)*

- (1) Emergency preparedness starter kit.

E. **[PASSED]** Motion to approve the October 02, 2018, Board meeting minutes.

**Motion:** Bill Hopkins

**Second:** Oscar Jimenez

**Vote:** [Yes – 15; No – 0; Abstain – 0; Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

F. Executive Committee

1. Call for volunteers for an office search committee.

The following Board Members volunteered: (1) Dave Parikh, (2) Alfredo Castillo, (3) Berj Demirjian, and (4) Wayde Hunter.

G. Treasurer Report.

1. **[PASSED]** Motion to approve the September 2018 MER.

*Board Comment*

- (1) Brian Allen comments that the only payments reflected are outstanding rent and refreshments.

**Vote:** [Yes – 15; No – 0; Abstain – 0; Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

2. Budget Advocates Report.

*Board Comment*

- (1) Brian Allen comments that the Budget Advocates have been working with various City departments, and are already working on reports. The City departments have been more responsive, and the conversations are more candid and open. Possible movement on getting a Budget Advocate imbedded in the Mayor's budget team, and additional meetings with the Mayor this year.
- (2) Budget Day is on June 29, and wants people to get interested and to participate.
- (3) Oscar Jimenez asks whether there is review of locations to eliminate expenses in the Budget Advocates analysis of the City's budget. Brian Allen comments that cuts, and increases are within the ambit of the Budget Advocates – and that they will be heavily involved in Proposition B if it passes tonight.
- (4) Glenn Bailey comments that there will be a survey issued by the Budget Advocates in the near future asking the public and NCs to participate in commenting regarding budget issues.
- (5) Skylar Rose asks Brian Allen whether this surveys will be effective. Brian Allen comments that this survey will be valuable if people participate.
- (6) Bill Hopkins wants Budget Advocates to more carefully craft the questions and give people options for narrative input. Brian Allen cannot speak specifically as to what will be on the survey, but the main issue is to get the survey into the hands of the public for comments.
- (7) Sid Gold comments regarding the contracts given to outside vendors, and wonders if these expenditures are in the details given to Budget Advocates by City departments. Brian Allen says that all departments have outside services, and that Budget Advocates see some of the details, not all of them.

H. Planning and Land Use. Report.

*PLUM Chair Comment (Kyle Ellis)*

- (1) Kyle Ellis reports that the October Planning and Land Use Meeting was a fairly lengthy one due to the substantial amount of land-use related items proposed and updated by the City in September-October.
- (2) Jose Galdamez of DONE requests that the items be tabled, as there was not a summary in the agenda for each item. Michael Greenwald comments that the entirety of the motions were publically posed and sent to DONE for further public dissemination, DONE apparently chose to not publish the attachments, and did not inform us of their intent to not send out those attachments upon submission. Brian Allen states that he talked to Semee and Grayce and they said that NC support is not required to put attachments on agendas, and they never informed us whether we are required to do something different.
- (3) Kyle Ellis comments that since everyone is in agreement that GHNNC has, at a minimum, technically complied with the Brown Act, we should move forward with the motions as posted.
- (4) Maria Fisk asks about whether the Board all had the motions, the Board Members note that they did.

1. **[PASSED]** [*Council File No. 12-0460-S4*] Motion to oppose the Department of City Planning's October 11, 2018, proposed process overhaul unless amended to include all of the following changes:

The Department of City Planning's complete dismissal of the concerns raised by community members about the notification process to Neighborhood Councils demonstrates a fundamental disregard the Department of City Planning has for Neighborhood Councils as advisory bodies. This aloofness is further demonstrated by the complete absence of Neighborhood Councils in the proposed regulations, even when the use of Neighborhood Councils in their advisory capacity would be both appropriate and beneficial to the planning process.

Specifically, GHNNC disagrees with the Department of City Planning's analysis on page 26 of their report and their determination that the early notification system and the mailed notice is sufficient to notify Neighborhood Councils of all relevant projects within their areas of responsibility. Mailed notifications almost always arrive too late for a Neighborhood Council to take action due to the fact that committee meetings and board meetings are usually held on a monthly basis, making the turn-around typically take two full months. Together with the arbitrary release schedule for early notification updates, the early notification system often hides projects relevant to communities by improperly designating the relevant neighborhood where the project is located, and by requiring Board members to read through every single project in the City in order to try to find projects that are relevant to their particular Neighborhood Council. Neighborhood Councils require substantially different notification in order to effectively communicate with their communities and seek stakeholder feedback on proposed projects. GHNNC suggests that the Department of City Planning change their notification system to Neighborhood Councils and provide additional and different notification to Neighborhood Councils than is currently provided. One suggestion would be to implement direct communications by City project managers to Planning and Land Use Committee chairs and vice chairs via phone or email, when a new project is received by the project manager as part of the ordinary bureaucratic process.

As to the other matter, GHNNC refers the City Council to pages 28-29 (Section 56), 36-37 (Section 74), 49 (Section 91), 50 (Section 93), 68 (Section 95, X., 14, b), 73 (Section 95, X., 19, b, 2), 75 (Section 95, X., 22), 109-10 (Section 154, G., 2), and 123 (Section 176, E.) as a non-exhaustive list of examples where the Department of City Planning could have incorporated the Neighborhood Council advisory function into the proposed code amendments in an appropriate and beneficial manner, but failed to do so. As the City Council is aware, the purpose of Neighborhood Councils is to "have an advisory role on issues of concern to the neighborhood" (City Charter, Art. IX, Sec. 900). The sections of the proposed amendments referred to in this paragraph all relate to considerations that the Department of City Planning has to make about the compatibility of proposed projects with the scale and character of the surrounding community. Unelected employees of the Department of City Planning have no legitimate basis for making determinations about the character of a community absent significant input from members of the community or their elected representatives, i.e. without the advice of the relevant Neighborhood Council.

Accordingly, the Department of City Planning should be required to seek the advice of the Neighborhood Council when they are obligated to consider character of the community. Specifically, they should be required to request feedback from the Neighborhood Council on the following considerations: (1) whether a project is in the substantial interest to the community; (2) whether a project is designed to match or contribute to the aesthetics of the community; (3) whether a project alters or changes the existing uses of the development site in a manner that conflicts with or divides the community; (4) whether a project is designed to meet the needs of the communities existing and future residents; (5) whether a project would accommodate a broad range of uses that serve the needs of adjacent residents and promote neighborhood activity; and (6) whether a project is adequately served by City services, including access to parks, recreation, public transportation, police, and fire services. These are all considerations that a Neighborhood Council is well placed to offer substantial and constructive advice, and which an employee of the Department of City Planning is unable to consider in any meaningful manner absent such advice. To the extent that the straw-man argument is raised regarding how such a requirement would delay projects if the Neighborhood Council fails to respond or grant Neighborhood Councils a veto power over projects, the City Council should note that the simple solution to such a trivial problems is to give Neighborhood Councils a timeline for completing such comments – say three (3) months from when the Department solicits the Neighborhood Council’s advice – and keep the ultimate decision-making authority vested with the Department of City Planning.

In conclusion, Neighborhood Councils should play an active advisory role in the land use and development of their communities, and the proposed changes to the code do not provide Neighborhood Councils with the opportunity to exercise their obligation under the City Charter to have an advisory role in these project. Therefore, GHNNC opposes the changes to the City’s Zoning laws unless they are amended to ameliorate the concerns raised herein.

*Board Comment*

- (1) Sid Gold ask what the stance of the motion is. Kyle Ellis says that it is a position of ‘oppose unless amended.’

**Vote:** [Yes – 14; No – 0; Abstain – 0; Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

2. **[PASSED]** [*Council File No. 13-1493-S5*] Motion to re-submit GHNNC’s street vending proposal, dated September 27, 2017, together with the further amendments related to opt-in/opt-out dated December 05, 2017, and May 01, 2018. Specifically, GHNNC re-submits the following recommendations:
  - 1) Street vending should be prohibited on all purely residential streets absent the residents of the street ‘opting-in’ to allow street vending to occur on their street;
  - 2) Prior to the City issuing a permit, any applicant seeking a permit should be required to submit to a review and obtain an opinion from the Neighborhood Council(s) from the neighborhood(s) where they seek to engage in vending activities;
  - 3) There should be a process for the local Neighborhood Council(s) to be able to recommend to the permitting agency: (a) conditions on the hours of operation, (b) conditions on the location(s) in which the applicant may conduct

- business within the neighborhood, and (c) conditions on the types of products they may vend;
- 4) Prior to a permit-holder being issued a renewal for an existing permit, the permit-holder should be required to return to the local Neighborhood Council(s) and obtain another opinion under the same conditions as for new applications;
  - 5) There should be different lengths of time that a permit can be valid prior to requiring a renewal depending on whether food is being sold at the location: (a) permits for the sale of non-food (products-only) should be able to be approved for a period of either one-year, two-years, or three-years; and (b) permits for the sale of food and non-food products, or only food, should be renewed every year;
  - 6) There should be different categories of permit for street vendors that will primarily sell their food and/or products: (a) at a stationary location, or (b) in a manner that is non-stationary (*i.e.* using handcarts, at multiple temporary locations, using trucks, *et cetera*);
  - 7) An applicant seeking a permit for a stationary location should be required to submit a plan that describes: (a) the proposed location of their merchandise, (b) their plan for any deliveries or drop-offs, (c) the proposed locations of any signs, and (d) how their proposed location will permit the free flow of (i) foot traffic, and (ii) automobile traffic;
  - 8) Any permits issued for a non-stationary street vendor should specifically delineate the boundaries within which they are permitted to vend;
  - 9) No permit for a stationary street vending location should be issued within 100 feet of a single-family residence or a school;
  - 10) Non-stationary street vendors should be barred from selling anything (food or products) within 100 feet of a school;
  - 11) After obtaining an opinion by the local Neighborhood Council(s), and prior to the issuance of any permit, the agency in charge of the permitting process should review the application for compliance with all relevant laws and deny the applicant if the applicant is not in full compliance;
  - 12) The agency in charge of the permitting process should take the opinion of the local Neighborhood Council(s) into consideration when determining whether to grant or deny a permit;
  - 13) The City should not set minimums on the number of permits the agency in charge of the permitting process should be required to approve;
  - 14) If an applicant seeks a permit with a component that includes the on-site preparation of food, the Department of Health & Safety and the agency in charge of the permitting process should review the application for compliance with all relevant food-handling laws and deny the applicant if the applicant is not in full compliance;
  - 15) Depending on the types of food or products that an applicant seeks to vend, the applicant should be required to demonstrate compliance with any of the following on an as-needed basis: a Food Handling Certificate, FTB Resale License, Los Angeles County Health permit, and compliance with relevant federal, state, or local statutes, ordinances, or regulations;
  - 16) Upon receipt of a permit, the permitted street vendor should be required to openly and visibly post their permit during all hours they are engaged in vending, including setting up and tearing down a stationary location;

- 17) The permit should clearly and visibly list: (a) hours of operation, (b) the location(s) in which they may engage in business, and (c) the types of products they may vend;
- 18) Failure to adhere to the permitting, display, or operational limitations and requirements should lead to incrementally more severe punishments, including but not limited to: (a) impounding of any products on offer by a non-compliant vendor, (b) a fine that can incrementally increase, and (c) up to 6 months in jail for egregious violations or repeated violations by the same person(s).

*Board Comment*

- (1) Oscar Jimenez asks about food trucks and what the controls are in place for them as compared to street vending.
- (2) Bill Hopkins asks whether the motions can be consolidated into a consent calendar.

**Vote:** [Yes – 13; No – ; Abstain – 1 (Oscar Jimenez); Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

*Board Comment*

- (1) Wayde Hunter comments that we should place all remaining items on consent calendar.
- (2) Berj Demirjian asks whether we should be commenting on a Citywide issues. Kyle Ellis and Michael Greenwald comment that we should be commenting on them, on behalf of our stakeholders.
- (3) The President places the remaining motions in Planning and Land Use on consent, and the vote is recorded as to each and every separate motion pursuant to the consent calendar vote.

3. **[PASSED]** [*Council File No. 18-0911*] Motion to support the development and publication of a directory of affordable housing units made publically available to the public. Additionally recommend that the City authorize renters of units to have a right to file a claim in court to enforce affordable rental units in the building where they reside. Further, GHNNC recommends that the City incorporate any such database in a mapping directory such a Zimas.

**Vote:** [Yes – 13; No – 0; Abstain – 1 (Alfredo Castillo); Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

4. **[PASSED]** [*Council File No. 18-0002-S124*] Motion to support the City’s resolution that encourages the State Legislature to mandate that the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration develop a universal standard for the integration of an address-specific formula into all online retail tax software, and that the state enact legislation that expands the current registration requirement that all online retailers use certified tax software that meets this standard.

**Vote:** [Yes – 13; No – 0; Abstain – 1 (Alfredo Castillo); Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

5. **[PASSED]** [*Council File No. 18-0932*] Motion to support if amended to modify Article 4 of the “responsibilities and tasks to be performed” in order to include a requirement that Consultants should demonstrate substantive attempts to solicit feedback from Neighborhood Councils within whose boundaries the task is performed & surrounding Neighborhood Councils, and incorporate any feedback from Neighborhood Councils into their environmental analyses. Specifically, to the extent the consultant’s tasks requires evaluation of whether any proposals require evaluation of the character of the community, contractors should solicit feedback from Neighborhood Councils on: (1) whether a project is in the substantial interest to the community; (2) whether a project is designed to match or contribute to the aesthetics of the community; (3) whether a project alters or changes the existing uses of the development site in a manner that conflicts with or divides the community; (4) whether a project is designed to meet

the needs of the communities existing and future residents; (5) whether a project would accommodate a broad range of uses that serve the needs of adjacent residents and promote neighborhood activity; and (6) whether a project is adequately served by City services, including access to parks, recreation, public transportation, police, and fire services.

**Vote:** [Yes – 13; No – 0; Abstain – 1 (Alfredo Castillo); Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

6. **[PASSED]** [*Council File No. 18-0002-S125*] Motion to support City’s position of ‘opposed unless amended’ regarding the High Speed Rail Authority’s preferred S-14 route, where the City opposes the current plan and requests the authority move the Sun Valley portion of the route underground.

**Vote:** [Yes – 13; No – 0; Abstain – 1 (Alfredo Castillo); Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

7. **[PASSED]** [*Council File No. 14-1635-S2*] Motion to support if amended to clarify that the home sharing ordinance expressly does not include rental property that is rented out on a month-to-month basis, as there is concern that the language of ‘30 days’ may inadvertently be interpreted to include month-to-month rental arrangements.

**Vote:** [Yes – 13; No – 0; Abstain – 1 (Alfredo Castillo); Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

I. Citywide Committee Report. Sid Gold.

*Citywide Chair Comment (Sid Gold and Brian Allen)*

- (1) The LADWP had a presentation on Measure W and their plan on spending \$150 million to catch rainwater.
- (2) There was a presentation about fossil fuel free California – Sid Gold comments that solar does not work at night, and so planners want to build storage facilities with large batteries.
- (3) There was a discussion at LANCC about NCs having more of a say in city decisions, possibly in conjunction with the NC Congress by setting up a legislative body with all NCs to deal with citywide issues. Kyle Ellis comments that GHNNC has already approved the idea in principle.
- (4) Office of Public Accountability, a commission set up by Mayor, voted on the independent ratepayer advocate Dr. Fred Pickle; LANCC wants more transparency.

J. Outreach and Publicity Committee Report.

*Outreach Chair Comment (Keren Waters and Brian Allen)*

- (1) Thanks Board members who attended the Street Faire.
  1. **[PASSED]** Motion to approve up to \$750 for the Document Shredding Event, Saturday, December 08, 2018.

*Board Comment*

- (1) Bill Hopkins asks whether it will be 2 trucks – there will be two trucks.

**Vote:** [Yes – 14; No – 0; Abstain – 0; Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

2. **[PASSED AS AMENDED]** Motion to approve up to \$250 for refreshment for NC Election Preparation Town Hall Meeting. The town-hall will be hosted by GHNNC Outreach with NC Election Board.

*Board Comment*

- (1) Kyle Ellis asks when the town will be – it will be before the end of the year.
- (2) Bill Hopkins suggest to modify the motion to specify that the funds must be spent before the end of the year.

**Motion to Amend** – Motion to approve up to \$250 for refreshment for NC Election Preparation Town Hall Meeting to be spent before the end of 2018-19 fiscal year. The town-hall will be hosted by GHNNC Outreach with NC Election Board.

Motion: Bill Hopkins

Second: Brian Allen

**Vote:** [Yes – 14; No – 0; Abstain – 0; Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

**Motion as Amended**

**Vote:** [Yes – 14; No – 0; Abstain – 0; Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

3. **[PASSED AS AMENDED]** Motion to approve up to \$250 for refreshments for a Town Hall Meeting for community feedback of traffic concerns in and around Granada Hills.

*Board Comment*

- (1) Keren Waters comments that although we moved on an item this meeting, we should do more outreach.
- (2) Kyle Ellis suggests modifying the motion per the prior motion.

**Motion to Amend** – Motion to approve up to \$250 for refreshments for a Town Hall Meeting for community feedback of traffic concerns in and around Granada Hills to be spent before the end of 2018-19 fiscal year.

Motion: Kyle Ellis

Second: Michael Greenwald

**Vote:** [Yes – 14; No – 0; Abstain – 0; Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

**Motion as Amended**

**Vote:** [Yes – 14; No – 0; Abstain – 0; Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

4. **[PASSED AS AMENDED]** Motion to approve NPG from Granada Hills Foundation for up to \$2,500 for Granada Hills Holiday Parade.

*Board Comment*

- (1) Bill Hopkins states that we need to set a specific number for the NPG.
- (2) Michael Greenwald comments that he does not see the same outreach opportunity at the parade absent our participation in the parade itself.

**Motion to Amend** – Motion to approve NPG from Granada Hills Foundation for \$1,000 for Granada Hills Holiday Parade.

Motion: Bill Hopkins

Second: Michael Greenwald

*Board Comment*

- (1) Alfredo asks what we're getting out of providing funds to the Holiday Parade.
- (2) Keren Waters states that GHNNC will be in the parade.
- (3) Bill Hopkins comments that the NPG specifies the details.
- (4) Wayde Hunter supports the \$2,500 as Granada Hills has a small downtown, and that this is pretty much the last small town parade in the region.
- (5) Brian Allen understands that this is in support of Granada Hills, and this parade does not market who we are, but does not believe we are getting \$2,500 of advertising, but \$1,000 is sufficient.

**Vote:** [Yes – 8; No – 6 (Oscer Jimenez, Ray Pollok, Rahim Kazi, Wayde Hunter, Ralph Kroy, Berj Demirjian); Abstain – 0; Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

### **Motion as Amended**

#### *Board Comment*

- (1) Bill Hopkins comments that we need to consider our geographic area and our broader community interests, and that we are still Granada Hills even if we are split North and South. You can get the neighborhood to see our entry in the parade procession, and do other outreach.
- (2) Keren Waters says that it is good to be in front of the community.
- (3) Berj Demirjian comments that our objective should be to support the community, and that not everything needs to be about outreach.
- (4) Brian Allen comments that the Holiday Parade flyer does not include GHNNC, but does include GHSNC and other ‘southern’ organizations.
- (5) Wayde Hunter comments that the parade is what we make of it, and we can make a lot of it if we choose to fully participate.
- (6) Dave Parikh calls for the question.
- (7) Ralph Kroy says that he has been in the parade for 25 years, and asks why we don’t get out there.
- (8) Alfredo Castillo loves the parade, and that we may be losing focus on what we are doing for the parade. We need to do more to do outreach for the community.

#### *Public Comment*

- (1) A Member of the public mentions that there isn’t anything in GHNNC, but there is an excitement from the community about the parade, so there is a value to be part of the parade.

**Vote:** [Yes – 14; No – 0; Abstain – 0; Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

### K. Public Safety, Report. Ray Pollok.

#### *Public Safety Chair Comment (Ray Pollok)*

1. **[PASSED]** Motion to the LADOT and CD12 that signs reading “No Left Turn 4-7 PM except Saturday and Sunday” be placed on the following feeder streets where they intersect the west side of Balboa Blvd.: Westbury Dr., Lisette St., Tennyson Pl., Orozco St., Sesnon Blvd., and Timber Ridge Dr. Also on sign reading “No Right Turns 4-7 PM except Saturday and Sunday” be placed on Woodley Ave. where it intersects the east side of Balboa Blvd. Mapping attached.

#### *Board Comment*

- (1) Kyle Ellis asks about whether there was consideration about how this might impact traffic further back to go through more neighborhoods to avoid lights. Commented that this is unlikely, as the current traffic does not have such a large impact.
- (2) Dave Parikh asks about how this will help; mapping apps generally follow the law once updated about the traffic laws; would be easy for officers on bicycles to catch lawbreakers.
- (3) Michael Greenwald comments that this will inconvenience him, but it is worth it. We can adjust it as the situation develops.
- (4) Brian Allen comments that Woodley Ave. is a major thoroughfare, and this will take all the traffic out on Knollwood.
- (5) Wayde Hunter comments that this proposal makes sense, since this is about making it so that Waze will not route people through the neighborhoods.
- (6) Ray Pollok has been looking into the issue for a couple of years now, and this issue is widespread, and this is the only proposal that we’ve been able to come up with.
- (7) Ralph Kroy comments that the people were blowing through the stops signs on his way here.

*Public Comment*

- (1) Bill Cotter comments that Balboa is impacted to Knollwood, so mapping applications route people into local streets, blocking people in their own driveways. Intended to prevent commuter traffic trying to circumvent a light or two. The signs will be publicized.
- (2) Donna Zero asks about the no right turn on Woodley – east side of Balboa to prevent the same issue developing on Woodley. Agrees with the problem, but comments that this would impact going north during rush hour – there is no real answer, but the goal is to stop the speeders in the neighborhood at the moment and go from there.
- (3) A member of the public asks whether the signs will be on Balboa. Answer is that it is up to the City, but generally will be at the ‘T’ intersections on Balboa, so on the side and across the street.
- (4) A member of the public asks whether modification of signals was considered. It was somewhat considered, but it seems to be a cost issue, and would take time and money, whereas this is cheap and quick.
- (5) A member of the public asks about Foothill choke point, and Bill Cotter comments that the Public Safety committee should look at it in the future.

**Vote:** [Yes – 13; No – 1 (Brian Allen); Abstain – 1 (Skylar Rose); Ineligible – 1 (Dave Parikh)]

L. Emergency Preparedness Report. Bill Hopkins.

*EP Chair Comments (Bill Hopkins)*

- (1) Last Emergency Preparedness Committee meeting included a refresher course on fire extinguisher use.

M. Board Member Comment on Non-Agenda Items

*Board Comment*

- (1) Wayde Hunter states that the next SCLCAC meeting will be on November 8<sup>th</sup>.
- (2) Kyle Ellis hopes that everyone voted. Asks for the next board meeting to include an item regarding Councilmember Englander’s resigning
- (3) Brian Allen comments that we should consider a retreat, and do more research into the Brown Act.
- (4) Alfredo Castillo comments that other NCs take a break in the middle of the meeting and allow showcase talents from the community.
- (5) Sid Gold comments that the Department of Planning is trying to streamline alcohol licenses for certain restaurants.
- (6) Bill Hopkins comments that there is additional material on Emergency Preparedness available to the public.
- (7) Michael Greenwald is working on CalTrans yard, there is new fencing, but still ugly yard; suggests fencing with GHNNC and GHSNC advertising. Berj Demirjian agrees, but worries about vagrants. Ralph Kroy had a conversation with Hertzberg’s representative who helped.
- (8) Michael Greenwald also states that when an email comes in from the community – requests all comments should be responded to by officers – Michael Greenwald, Ray Pollock, Brian Allen, Kyle Ellis – and for the Board to refrain from separately replying as individuals.

N. Adjournment

**Adjourned** [8:53 P.M.]

Abbreviation Guide			
BA	Budget Advocates	BONC	Board of Neighborhood Commissioners
CD	Los Angeles City Council District	CERT	Community Emergency Response Team
CIS	Community Impact Statement	CM	Los Angeles City Council Member
DONE	Department of Neighborhood Empowerment	EVOC	Emergency Vehicle Operations Center
GHNNC	Granada Hills North Neighborhood Council	HOPE	Homeless Outreach Partnership Endeavour
LADOT	Los Angeles Department of Transportation	LADWP	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
LANCC	Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Coalition	LAPD	Los Angeles Police Department
NC	Neighborhood Council	NPG	Neighborhood Purposes Grant
PLUM	Planning and Land Use Management Committee	SCL	Sunshine Canyon Landfill
SCLAF	Sunshine Canyon Landfill Amenities Fund	SCLCAC	Sunshine Canyon Landfill Community Advisory Committee
SFM	San Fernando Mission Boulevard		