



**GREATER
ECHO PARK ELYSIAN
NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL**



PRESIDENT
KWAZI NKRUMAH
VICE PRESIDENT
MANICITO "FENDER"
SANTOS
TREASURER
EVA MEJIA
**CHIEF INFORMATION
OFFICER**
PAUL BOWERS

BOARD OF GOVERNOR'S MEETING
Tuesday, September 23, 2014
7:00 P.M.

MEETING LOCATION
Cisneros Learning Academy
1018 Mohawk St.
L.A. 90026

**CERTIFIED
NEIGHBORHOOD
COUNCIL**
APRIL 16, 2002

TELEPHONE: (213)400
9155
WEBSITE:
ECHOPARKNC.ORG
EMAIL:
INFO@GEPENC.ORG

MAILING ADDRESS
P.O. BOX 261046, LA CA
90026

DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVES

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----|----------------------|----|-------------------|----|-------------------|----|
| Veronica Arellano | D1 | Richard Courtney | D2 | Santiago E. Perez | D3 | Mellie Bautista | D5 |
| Matt Sharp | D1 | Ann-Marie Holman | D2 | Paula Guadron | D4 | Carolina Jimenez | D5 |
| Katrina Bouza | D1 | Gordon H. Lake | D3 | Tad Yenawine | D4 | Vincent Rodriguez | D5 |
| Judith Garcia | D2 | "Rio" Jill Contreras | D3 | Jessica Cutler | D4 | Alma Baja | D5 |
| | | | | | | Avelyn J Tapia | D5 |

A G E N D A

1. Administrative items..... 8 minutes
 - a. Roll Call
 - b. Adoption of Minutes
 - c. Recognitions
 - d. Administrative Reminder: BOG Meetings will begin with DONE-required trainings.
2. Tuesday's Meeting will start with a 45 minute presentation. All GEPENC Board members are required to participate.....45 minutes

Discussion with the Office of the City Attorney which may include any of the following topics:

- a. Legal concerns arising from conduct between or among board members: Board communication skills (including electronic), representing the City with dignity, personal conflicts in City matters, disharmony versus disagreement, eliminating bullying and

harassment, and improving conduct at meetings, including a questions and answer session on these topics.

- b. Plan for a Citywide System of Neighborhood Councils
- c. The Administrative Code provisions applicable to Neighborhood Councils
- d. Ethics and conflict of interest laws applicable to Neighborhood Council board members
- e. The Brown Act
- f. The California Public Records Act
- g. The Americans with Disabilities Act
- h. The Board's bylaws.
- i. The City Charter

Speakers may include Deputy City Attorneys Vivienne Swanigan of the Labor Relations Division and Alois Phillips of the Neighborhood Council Advice Division. Please note that this discussion does not fulfill the requirement that board members also take the mandatory 2 hour ethics course.

3. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items 10 minutes
4. Announcements..... 4 minutes
5. Reports of State Electeds, Council Districts, and/or Various City Agencies 12 minutes
6. Community and Stakeholder Organizations..... 8 minutes
7. Motions and Resolutions 60 minutes
Discussion/possible action on the following agenda items for September 23, 2014 BOG Meeting:

A. PLUC (Planning and Land Use Committee) Recommendations:

1. GEPENC-PLUC recommendation to: Establish a Parking Solution to mitigate the flow of traffic into residential areas and maintain Public Safety; And to Mitigate the Overflow of Standing Patrons onto the Public Sidewalk to maintain order and respect local residents' pedestrian zones in regard to ZA-2014-2432-CUB-ZV/ENV-2014-2433: Lot 1 Café (1533 W Sunset Blvd 90026)

B. SLCO (Schools and Community Organizations) Recommendations:

1. GEPENC authorizes a letter of support for the Parking System Reform Plan, authorized/sponsored by LA Parking Freedom Initiative, that is designed to be: revenue neutral; sensitive to community need and economic abilities; and provide a rational framework for parking control that is in the public interest and does not focus on revenue generation. The Parking System Reform Plan includes but is not limited to the following:
 - “Caps fines for violations of regulations which have no public safety component ...at \$23.00” with possible exceptions for adjustable fines in high parking demand areas or times.
 - Establishes the LA Parking Services Administration

- Establishes traffic officers as “neighborhood-centric liaisons” to the community with a “clear public service mandate”
- Creates a neighborhood stakeholder based input and review process for the establishment and alteration of local parking regulations and fees
- Separates parking ticket revenue from the general fund by placing it in the Special Parking Revenue Fund (SPRF)

(See document, Attachment A, at the end of this agenda: “For Immediate Release” for a complete summary.)

The letters will be written and mailed no more than a week after the Board approves this motion. Co-chairs or person assigned by the co-chairs of SLCO will write the letters to the organizations designated recommending support of this plan.

2. GEPENC calls for an in depth investigation of the now cancelled contract with Apple and Pearson to provide I Pads for LAUSD students.
The public have been made aware of serious mishandling of the now cancelled LOS Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) one billion dollar contract with Apple computers and Pearson to provide I Pads for all LAUSD students.
The GEPENC requests the Los Angeles Board of Education. LAUSD Inspector General and the LA County District Attorney conduct an in depth investigation of Dr. Deasy and other employees, including former employees, involved in the now cancelled contract with Apple and Pearson to provide I Pads for LAUSD students.
The investigation should include recommendation for any disciplinary actions to be taken against any LAUSD staff found to have committed any wrongdoing.
The letters will be written and mailed no more than a week after the Board approves this motion. Co-chairs, or person assigned by the co-chairs will write the letters to the organization listed above requesting the investigation.

C. PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE Recommendations:

1. Motion for the GEPENC Board to write a letter that requests the City of Los Angeles and the City Attorney’s office to lift the Glendale Corridor gang injunction. (Please see supportive background information Attachment B to this agenda.)

D. BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE Recommendations:

Budget and Finance Motion Items for Executive Committee Agenda September 12, 2014

1. [BFC 4-0-0] Discussion and/or Possible Action on the recommendation from the Budget and Finance Committee to adopt the July 2014 Monthly Reconciliation Statement.
2. [BFC 4-0-0] Discussion and/or Possible Action on the recommendation from the Budget and Finance Committee to adopt the August 2014 Monthly Reconciliation Statement.
3. [BFC 4-0-0] Category 100 -- Operations Account --- website hosting
Discussion and/or Possible Action on the recommendation from the Budget and Finance Committee, to approve \$150.00 to Go Daddy, and \$200.00 to Zbra Studios for the Manual

Transfer/Migration of GEPENC’s hosting service. In addition, the approval of \$41.94 to GoDaddy for back-up service, and additional email addresses.

E. General Motions and/or Resolutions:

1. Discussion and/or Possible Action for the Greater Echo Park Elysian Neighborhood Council Board of Governors to adopt the Community Impact Statement for Council File 14-00020S4 that supports the L. A. City Council Resolution as submitted by Koretz-Cedillo to halt the Congressional “Fast Track” process of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) Agreement that involves 12 Pacific Rim nations. (See Attachment C, City Council resolution.)
2. Discussion and/or Possible Action for the Greater Echo Park Elysian Neighborhood Council (GEPENC) Board of Governors to move in support of the approved motion by the Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Coalition (LANCC) Regular Meeting of September 6, 2014 as moved by Jay Handal, and seconded by Don Dwigins with a vote of 37-yeyes, 0-nays, and 0-abstentions. Jointly, we demand that the Los Angeles City Council pass a motion supporting the ACLU lawsuit and Federal Court decision upholding plaintiffs complaint that the Veterans Administration violated the Administrative Procedures Act which states that any leases must be with health-care providers and related entities for the sharing of health-care resources. The Disputed Agreements do not share space that is related to the provision of health-care and are unauthorized by law and therefore void. The LANCC Motion hereby demands the City Council to direct the VA to use this land exclusively for permanent supportive housing and healthcare for Veterans.
2. Request to Address September 23, 2014 BOG Meeting on efforts already underway to authorize and activate drones in the City of Los Angeles. The Coalition to Stop LAPD Spying Requests 5 minutes to speak on the threat that the current concentration of additional powers and technically-based spying presents to the rights of the citizenry, and the need for Neighborhood Councils and other community-based organizations to speak out against this trend. GEPENC will be asked to write letters to the Mayor, the City Council and the Police Commission opposing the activation of drones in the City of Los Angeles.
3. GEPENC should undertake to submit a community impact statement on the Krekorian Plan and Modeled on the LAANC-proposed Community Impact Statement in regard to fixing sidewalks. (See Attachment D at the end of this agenda.)
4. It is proposed that the President initiate the activation of a By-laws Committee to review and propose improvements to the current By-Laws and Standing Rules of GEPENC.
5. The process of forming a grievance committee shall begin at the September 23rd BOG meeting. This committee shall review a complaint filed by Ms. Ida Talalla prior to the April elections.
6. Reports from officers and committee chairs..... 15 minutes
8. Future agenda items..... 3 minutes.
9. Adjournment

ATTACHMENTS

A.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

06/11/14

After 6 months of research and outreach, **Los Angeles Parking Freedom Initiative** is putting forward its parking system reform plan for the city. It will be presented at the first meeting of the Mayor's "Working Group on Parking Reform" on June 12th.

The proposed plan is designed to be revenue neutral--**even revenue positive**--for the city government. It accommodates further enhancements to alternative modes of transportation and a transition to an advanced, multi-modal transportation infrastructure while providing for an effective automobile parking system that facilitates commerce, ease of transit and livability for drivers, residents and businesses.

The essential components of the new parking system include:

- **Caps fines** for violation of regulations which have no public safety component at the Bureau of Labor Statistics median hourly wage (currently \$23.00)
- Establishes the **Los Angeles Parking Services Administration**, encompassing the current city offices pertaining to parking policy and administration
- Traffic Officers will be **neighborhood-centric liaisons** between the city and the public operating with a clear public service mandate
- Creates a neighborhood **stakeholder based input and review process** for the establishment and alteration of local parking regulations and fees
- **Separates parking ticket revenue from the general fund** by placing it in the Special Parking Revenue Fund (SPRF)
- New **Special Parking Revenue Fund** becomes a strategic transportation infrastructure investment trust
- **Widens the mission of the SPRF** within the service area of SPRF projects to include sidewalks and curbstone repairs, parking and street signage, bicycle parking, pedestrian boardwalks and walkways, carshare parking, electric vehicle charging stations and DASH and shuttle van stops
- Mandates programs and technologies that alleviate parking bottlenecks by **bringing existing latent parking supply and demand together** in the market
- Fund **generates positive returns** on its investments in the form of fees and tax revenue

- Institutes a **fund management and administrative structure** that is independent of, yet responsive to, the City Council
 - Authorizes **public-private partnerships** between the fund and private developers
 - Authorizes the fund to **sell investment bonds** in its projects
 - **Restricts transfers from the fund** to emergency situations involving imminent municipal bankruptcy
 - Authorizes the sale of **Revenue Offset Bonds** by the city to cushion the loss of revenue to the general fund in the first years of the new system
- We will continue to work to influence the new Mayor's office to appropriately change parking enforcement abuses via administrative means and we will work with the City Council to voluntarily adopt our reform plan. To the extent the City of Los Angeles does not adopt these effective and necessary reforms, we will craft a municipal ballot measure, collect the required signatures, and place it on the ballot for a vote by the citizens. Currently we are targeting the March 2015 election. For more details and background on many of the above proposals, see our web site.
Web Site:

B.

REQUEST TO LIFT GANG INJUNCTION:

SUPPORTING BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Date:

Text of Motion on the Agenda: The Greater Echo Park Elysian Neighborhood Council moves to request that the Los Angeles City Attorney lift the *Glendale Boulevard Corridor Gang Injunction Project*.

Describe the request in detail.

1. **The GEPENC condemns the criminal activity of all "unincorporated associations" as defined by the *Glendale Boulevard Corridor Gang Injunction Project*, more commonly characterized as "gangs."**
2. **The *Glendale Boulevard Corridor Gang Injunction Project*, or *Injunction*, does not cover areas of violent criminal activity but rather corresponds with development projects along the Glendale Corridor.**

Echo Park has the lowest rates of crimes and murder since 1960s. Within the Safety Zone, the last gang related murder was four years ago.

On August 6, 2013, before the *Injunction* was granted, there was a shooting in Bellevue Park¹, outside of the proposed Safety Zone. The shooting on June 5, 2014 at Del Taco on Sunset² was also outside of areas covered by any injunctions.

The recent murder at *Echo Park Rising*³, inside the Safety Zone, is still under investigation, but to our knowledge from a leading community gang expert, this murder was not gang related.

The *Injunction* has been ineffective in dealing with these violent crimes.

The *Injunction* Safety Zone does, however, coincide with areas of heavy development. The *Injunction* straddles Glendale Boulevard and the SR2/Glendale Freeway Terminus Improvement Plan.⁴ The *Injunction* coincides with intense development areas along the valuable river front property in Elysian Valley, the Glendale Corridor and along Temple Street where it intersects with Glendale. Residential lots in these low-income areas are highly sought after by developers.

It is thought by some in the community that the *Injunction* is not a tool to reduce crime but instead to force out families who have lived in the area for generations, some who were originally forced out of Chavez Ravine by the Dodger Stadium Development.

3. Racial profiling, as explicitly articulated in the *Injunction*, has no place in a public document.

*Each of the ["Defendant Gangs"] is a violent turf-based predominantly Hispanic criminal street gang.*⁵

In the suit filed by the Office of the Los Angeles City Attorney "gangs" are defined as "predominantly Hispanic." This characterization of gang members sends a message to the community that Latino people are more likely than other people to be gang members and are to be feared.

Indeed, it has been the experience of many community members that racial profiling has increased in our neighborhoods since the institution of the *Injunction*, with a very negative effect on our youth.

4. The *Injunction* violates constitutional rights of due process and free association.

Gang injunctions are being challenged on constitutional grounds throughout the country and the plaintiffs are winning in state and federal court. Here are some recent cases.

CURFEWS

The LAPD ceased enforcing gang injunction curfews in all of its areas with injunctions, according to an order issued by Earl Paysinger, LAPD assistant chief, director of operations, after a lawsuit was filed with the U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Community member Alberto Cazarez, who recently died in an automobile accident, was a plaintiff in the federal class action suit challenging curfews in gang injunctions.⁶

ORANGE COUNTY

"The federal appeals court ruled that the injunction's provisions were so sweeping that enforcement of them constituted a 'heavy burden' on an individual's basic freedoms.

“It was also found that the Orange County District Attorney's means of determining OVC gang affiliation carried a ‘considerable risk of error.’

“‘The OCDA and other law enforcement agencies can no longer go behind closed doors and unilaterally decide who is a gang member,’ says Belinda Escobosa Helzer, director of the ACLU's OC office. ‘This ruling brings to light the complexity of identifying active gang members and underscores that the Constitution cannot be ignored.’

“The ACLU believes that this week's ruling may also have ramifications beyond Orange County.”⁷

SANTA BARBARA INJUNCTION STRUCK DOWN

On July 21, 2014 California Superior Court Judge Colleen Sterne struck down a similar injunction in Santa Barbara.⁸ The Judge wrote,

In short, Santa Barbara is not a community beset by substantial and unreasonable gang related interference with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property by an entire community or neighborhood, or any considerable number of persons... There is no evidence that residents of the proposed Safety Zones in Santa Barbara are prisoners in their own homes, remain indoors at night, prevent their children from playing outside, or whose relatives and friends refuse to visit.

Lawyers in Los Angeles have filed suit against the *Glendale Boulevard Corridor Gang Injunction Project* with the US 9th Court of Appeals.

5. The *Injunction* is ineffective.

Since the *Injunction* was granted on September 26, 2013 only one person has been served – an 18-year-old man in Silver Lake living with his parents. He works two jobs to support his girlfriend who is pregnant. He is not involved in any criminal activity and he has filed with the City Attorney to be removed from the *Injunction*.

The LAPD has many tools at its disposal for investigating crime and arresting perpetrators. The drop in “gang” activity and crime in general can, in large part, be attributed to the effectiveness of the LAPD using traditional means. Most old “gang” members have left the gangs, moved out of the area, or are incarcerated.

The *Injunction* does not cover areas of higher crime, not does it include tagging and skate crews active in the area. These areas and crews are policed with traditional methods.

6. Promised intervention and prevention programs have not materialized.

What we need now is intervention and prevention programs to keep our youth out of crews and gangs. Councilman Mitch O’Farrell, Council District 13, wrote last year of the *Injunction*,

*The City Attorney and I stand together on this issue. The two of us firmly believe that tools like this injunction partnered with meaningful, and comprehensive programs for prevention and intervention are needed in order for Angelenos to continue seeing a significant reduction in serious crimes.*⁹

A request to Councilman O’Farrell’s office to learn more about the “meaningful and comprehensive programs for prevention and intervention” that have been instituted in partnership with the *Injunction* was acknowledged but remains unanswered.

Though the Councilman calls for intervention and prevention, the Mayor’s GRYD program (Gang

Reduction and Youth Development) was shuttered in Echo Park because there was not enough gang activity to warrant the allocation of resources.

7. The *Injunction* damages the neighborhoods.

Echo Park, Elysian Valley, and Silver Lake are all the target of intensive development. Allegations in the *Injunction* document depict these neighborhoods as crime-ridden and extremely dangerous.

Our very safe neighborhoods, like those in the Santa Barbara injunction, are portrayed as areas where residents “*are prisoners in their own homes, remain indoors at night, prevent their children from playing outside, or whose relatives and friends refuse to visit.*” This vision of our neighborhoods does not square with reality. If this were the case developers would not be falling over each other to build here.

On August 27th, 2013 the GEPENC voted 15-0-3 to “not support the gang injunction” and yet the City Council Member Mitch O’Farrel ignored and disregarded the neighborhood council who is suppose to most represent the voices and needs of the very community impacted by the Glendale Corridor Injunction.

In addition, on August 19, 2013 the SLNC hosted a very well publicized town hall on the *Injunction* and the vast majority of the neighborhood spoke out against it.

8. Opposition to the *Glendale Boulevard Corridor Gang Injunction Project*

Public officials and organizations have spoken out against the *Injunction*.

Police Commissioner Sandra Figueroa-Villa¹⁰ is the director of El Centro del Pueblo in Echo Park, an organization specializing in gang intervention and prevention services. An article in the LA Times quoted Figueroa-Villa,

“Figueroa-Villa, whose organization provides gang prevention services to the city, said it is ‘easy to get on’ a list of gang members that is kept by the LAPD and later used to file injunctions. Many people on that list have gone on to get jobs and raise families, she said.

“‘There’s a lot of opposition, there’s a lot of fear, there’s a lot of concern’ about the Echo Park injunction, Figueroa-Villa told the council’s Public Safety Committee. ‘I know many kids that are on that list. I also know there’s many kids that should not be on that list today.’

“Despite those statements, Figueroa-Villa told The Times she and her organization have no formal position on the Echo Park injunction.”

The LA Times¹¹ came out against the *Glendale Boulevard Corridor Gang Injunction Project* in an editorial, “*Does Echo Park need a gang injunction?*” dated August 18, 2013,

“*The situation in Echo Park falls well short of the sort of crime emergencies that led Los Angeles, and then other cities, down the path of gang injunctions 30 years ago. Then, there was at least the perception among city lawyers and police that entire neighborhoods had become hostages to gangs and that there was little else they could do about it. But court pleadings in favor of the new injunction fail to specify any particular crimes or to include figures that show Echo Park has*

more of a gang problem than other neighborhoods in or outside an injunction zone. Nor do they make an argument for why the situation could not be handled by traditional crime-fighting methods or show that the benefits of an injunction would outweigh the negative consequences for so much of the community.”

For all of these reasons we believe that the *Glendale Boulevard Corridor Gang Injunction Project* has proven ineffective and unnecessary and should be lifted.

NOTES

NOTES

1. Silver Lake shooting at recreation center leaves one man injured (August 6, 2013)
<http://www.theeastsiderla.com/2013/08/silver-lake-shooting-at-recreation-center-leaves-one-man-injured>
2. Leads sought in Hollywood murder
<http://parklabreanewsbeverlypress.com/2014/06/leads-sought-in-hollywood-murder>
3. Police investigating Echo Park stabbing death
www.theeastsiderla.com/2014/08/echo-park-stabbing-victim-dies
4. SR2/Glendale Freeway Terminus Improvement Plan
http://www.metro.net/projects/state_route_2
5. Case No.: BC511444, Complaint For Injunctive Relief To Abate A Public Nuisance Caused By The Conduct And Activities of Six (6) Criminal Street Gang Including Big Top, Crazy's, Diamond Street, Echo Park, Frogtown, and Head Hunters
<https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B3DYpmjCdwyFcGdiU0U5Wk9YMXc&usp=sharing>
6. Lawsuit aims to curb L.A.'s use of gang injunction curfews
<http://www.dailybreeze.com/general-news/20130914/lawsuit-aims-to-curb-las-use-of-gang-injunction-curfews>
7. 9th Circuit Court Rules OC DA's Gang Injunction in Orange Violates Due Process
http://blogs.ocweekly.com/navelgazing/2013/11/orange_varrio_cypress_gang_injunction_2013.php
8. People of the State of California, Plaintiff, City of Santa Barbara, a municipal Corporation, Plaintiff and Real Party in Interest, vs. Eastside, a criminal street gang as an unincorporated association, Westside, a criminal street gang as an unincorporated association, et al., Defendants.
<http://www.santabarbaraview.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Injunction.pdf>
9. Glendale Corridor Gang Injunction, Office of Councilman Mitch O'Farrell
http://www.cd13.com/glendale_corridor_gang_injunction
10. Gang injunction debated as L.A. police commissioners are confirmed, August 30, 2013 | By David Zahniser
<http://articles.latimes.com/2013/aug/30/local/la-me-ln-la-city-council-signs-off-on-mayor-garcettis-new-police-commissioners-20130830>
11. Does Echo Park Need a Gang Injunction, August 18, 2013
<http://www.latimes.com/opinion/editorials/la-ed-echo-park-20130818-story.html>

What is the total budget for the project? No funds are required.

How will this motion be implemented, and by whom?

Upon approval the secretary of the SLNC will send the following letter with a copy of this motion the Los Angeles City Attorney.

September XX, 2014

Los Angeles City Attorney Mike Feuer
800 City Hall East

200 N. Main Street

Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Feuer:

The Greater Echo Park Elysian Neighborhood council voted on September _____ in a vote _____ to request that you lift the Glendale Boulevard Corridor Gang Injunction Project.

Please see that attached motion for a more detailed explanation of this decision.

Sincerely,

The Greater Echo Park Elysian Neighborhood Council

C.

RESOLUTION
JAN 10 2014

RULES, ELECTIONS & INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

WHEREAS, any official position of the City of Los Angeles with respect to legislation, rules, regulations, or policies proposed to or pending before a local, state, or federal governmental body or agency must first have been adopted in the form of a Resolution by the City Council with the concurrence of the Mayor; and

WHEREAS, the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) is being negotiated between the United States and eleven Pacific Rim countries by the U.S. Trade Representative in secret, without any consultation with the Los Angeles City Government, nor through the National League of Cities,

nor the U.S. Conference of Mayors; and
WHEREAS, the text of the TPP is being drafted with advice from transnational corporations who will greatly benefit from its rules; and
WHEREAS, the TPP text has not been made available to the public or even to local elected officials; and
WHEREAS, the Obama Administration expects Congress to approve the Trans-Pacific Partnership under "Fast Track" procedural rules, which forbid Congress from amending it and which requires an up-or-down vote in 60 days; and
WHEREAS, reports on the substance of the TPP indicate it would have direct, potentially undesirable consequences for our City's residents, local businesses and environment; and
WHEREAS, the Investment Chapter of the TPP, which was leaked in 2012, would allow foreign corporations to sue the U.S. government over nearly any law or regulation which would reduce their future profits and therefore, potentially rob the City of Los Angeles of needed protections for our people, local businesses and our environment, and that such an agreement would represent an improper intrusion on the sovereignty of our City and our State; and
WHEREAS, TPP financial rules would weaken or prevent regulation of risky financial products such as "interest rate swaps," thereby threatening the financial stability of our government and, more broadly, the stability of our overall economy; and
WHEREAS, U.S., state and local food safety rules could be challenged by foreign corporations as "illegal trade barriers" if found to be more stringent than standards in the TPP, thus threatening the health of our residents and potentially raising health care costs; and
WHEREAS, the TPP would provide large pharmaceutical firms with new rights and powers to increase medicine prices and limit access to cheaper generic drugs, which would have a negative financial impact on Los Angeles residents; and
WHEREAS, the U.S. would agree to waive "Buy American" or "Buy Local" requirements aimed at enhancing our local economy and creating local jobs, which have been previously adopted by the City of Los Angeles; and

JAN 1 0

WHEREAS, the City of Los Angeles would have no right or ability to represent its interests before the foreign tribunals which would have the authority to hear cases brought by corporations under the TPP; and
WHEREAS, such tribunal rulings might require taxpayer compensation, which could impact the financial health of the City of Los Angeles and its residents; and
WHEREAS, two dozen environmental organizations, including the Sierra Club, Food & Water Watch, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Environment America, Oceana, Physicians for Social Responsibility, EarthJustice and the League of Conservation Voters, have already officially expressed concerns that the TPP must contain a strong, binding, enforceable environment chapter to encourage marine conservation, protect fisheries, prevent illegal logging and associated trade, and protect biodiversity by preventing wildlife trafficking, and yet many TPP countries are opposing such rules; and
WHEREAS, "Fast Track" procedures make it impossible for our elected representatives to adequately study and assess the Trans-Pacific Partnership Treaty presented to them in order to determine if this proposed Agreement is in the best interests of the American people, in general, and the people of Los Angeles, specifically; and
WHEREAS, this review is especially important since the Trans-Pacific Partnership attempts to supersede current federal, state and local law and prohibit our representatives from taking certain actions to better our society and economy in the future; and
WHEREAS, using similar rules in other free trade agreements, corporations such as Exxon Mobil and Dow Chemical have launched more than 500 cases against 95 governments -- many attacking common-sense environmental laws and regulations, such as regulations to protect communities and the environment from harmful chemicals or mining practices; and
WHEREAS, the Los Angeles City Council regularly takes actions to improve the lives, health, well-being and environment of the people of Los Angeles, whether or not those decisions impact Trans-National Corporations; and
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, with concurrence of the Mayor, that by adoption

of this Resolution, the City of Los Angeles hereby includes in its 2013-2014 Federal Legislative Program SPONSORSHIP/SUPPORT for legislative or administrative action to halt the "Fast Track" process of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and instead, to allow the Trans-Pacific Partnership a fully transparent, public debate in Congress until its impacts are fully assessed by all stakeholders, in order to protect the rights of the people of Los Angeles, the best interests of our local businesses and workforce, the health of our environment and the sovereignty of the Los Angeles City Government(" ""{A- f"U, /, /i <::) K-il

PRESENTEDB :
PAUL KORET
Councilmember, 5th District
SECONDED BV--""

D.

LANCC UPDATE Sidewalk Community Impact Statement

 Friend on Facebook

 Follow on Twitter

 [Forward to a Friend](#)



Los Angeles Neighborhood Council
Coalition

A Coalition of Councils

Community Impact Statement

Website: www.lancc.org

WEB-BLOG (Notices, etc.):

lanccreports.blogspot.com

Send emails (questions, comments):

LANCC@EMPOWERLA.ORG

Terrence Gomes
Chair

Fred Mariscal
Vice Chair

Glenn Bailey
Treasurer

Connie Acosta
Secretary

September 8, 2014 (updated)

LANCC Sidewalks Committee

LANCC has formed an ad hoc committee to review, analyze, and oversee the repair of our sidewalks, consider who is responsible for the repair of the sidewalks, and develop financing alternatives.

Paul Krekorian has proposed a Sidewalk Repair Program (see below) and has asked for Community Impact Statements by **October 1, 2014**.

Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement

On September 6, 2014, LANCC passed the following Community Impact Statement.

The _____ Neighborhood Council supports a “fix and release” plan for the repair of our tree damaged sidewalks. The City will issue bonds to finance the repair. There will be no new taxes. The City may develop alternative plans (50/50 program, loan fund, Assessment Districts) that rely on the voluntary participation by Property Owners. Property Owners and the City may retain independent contractors and managers. The City will assess the status of our sidewalks and prioritize the necessary repairs. The City will establish a well-funded, independent Oversight Committee to ensure transparency throughout the process.

The City estimates that 40% (4,600 miles) of its 10,750 miles of sidewalks are in some state of disrepair.

The estimated cost to repair the 4,600 miles of damaged sidewalks is \$1.5 billion.

Paul Krekorian commented that a February 2008 Street Services report indicated that 38% of the City's parcels had sidewalks in need for repair. His rough calculus was that only 12% of our sidewalks are in need of repair.

http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2005/05-1853_rpt_boss_2-12-08.pdf

So what is the status of our sidewalks and how much will it cost to repair?

Who will pay for the repair of our sidewalks?

The City assumed the responsibility for tree damaged sidewalks in 1973, overriding a 1911 state law that assigned responsibility to the property owners. The City, citing a lack of money, is suggesting alternative financing schemes.

The reinstatement of the 50/50 program that was discontinued in 2009.

A no or low interest revolving loan fund.

Assessment Districts.

New "revenue streams" (otherwise known as a tax).

The City is considering increased enforcement.

Citations.

Point of sale.

Point of permit.

Questions:

Should the City develop an operating plan to repair our sidewalks?

Should this plan prioritize the repairs depending on the level of disrepair?

The City has budgeted \$27 million this year for the repair of our sidewalks, in large part because of the potential liabilities associated with the Willits federal class action lawsuit alleging the City has violated the American With Disabilities Act. The City is proposing to devote this allocation to the repair of City owned sidewalks. Is this a proper allocation?

Should residential and commercial property owners be treated differently?

Should property owners be able to hire private contractors?

Should the City be required to reimburse property owners for the repair of tree damaged sidewalks if they use an independent contractor?

Should property owners be responsible for tree damaged sidewalks?

The Los Angeles Times endorsed a “fix and release” program where the City would pay for the repair of the sidewalks, after which the sidewalks would be the responsibility of the property owner. Is this an acceptable policy?

Should the City outsource the management of the Sidewalk Repair Program? Or should it rely on the Bureau of Street Services?

Should the City hire independent contractors as was proposed in the Save Our Streets LA plan?

Should the City allow the repair of only damaged segments of a property’s sidewalk?

Should the City consider the use of alternative materials and methodologies to repair our sidewalks?

Should the City develop a program to require the repair of sidewalks that are not the result of tree damage?

Should the City consider a Sidewalk Tax? This new tax could be a parcel tax, a parcel tax based on the length of the sidewalk, a new property tax, and/or an increase in the sales tax.

Should the City consider financing the repair of the sidewalks through the issuance of long term bonds that will be the obligation of the General Fund?

If the City proposes a Sidewalk Tax, should it be

contingent on meaningful budget reform?

What is the role of Neighborhood Councils, homeowner associations, and other organizations?

Paul Krekorian – A snapshot of the proposed Citywide Sidewalk Repair Program:

Repair buckled sidewalks at private residences and commercial properties by:

1. Reconstituting the 50/50 shared cost sidewalk program to repair broken sidewalks at private homes, with 50% of the cost of repair paid by the city and 50% by homeowners;
2. Developing a low- or no-interest revolving loan program from which homeowners can borrow to make sidewalk repairs and repay over a fixed term;
3. Establishing a Sidewalk Repair Trust Fund to help pay for future sidewalk repairs at private homes;
4. Developing a complaint-driven mapping and prioritization system to identify and coordinate repairs to sidewalks most dangerous to pedestrians;
5. Creating an enforcement mechanism to ensure commercial property owners comply with existing sidewalk laws; and
6. Developing a plan to create design and construction standards for sidewalks to maximize mobility.
7. Repair public sidewalks at parks, municipal

buildings and community facilities.

Ready for Repairs

The time is right to implement a comprehensive sidewalk repair program that has an end game in sight. Unlike in years past, the city has the resources to begin right now.

Mayor Garcetti and the City Council have appropriated more funding to fix sidewalks than at any time in recent memory. This fiscal year, there is \$27 million available to complete much-needed repairs: \$20 million budgeted by the Mayor and an additional \$7 million in unspent funds allocated by the Budget and Finance Committee.

As our economy continues to improve, the city will prioritize continued funding to fix sidewalks in future budgets until every necessary repair is made. But money alone is not enough. Los Angeles must have a clear program in place to make certain the money appropriated for sidewalk repairs is used efficiently and effectively to benefit residents.

We Need Your Input

Your voice is critical to the success of this proposal. Only with your input and support will the program accomplish what we're setting out to achieve.

For those reasons, I hope you will do the following three things:

(1) Attend the Joint Hearing on Sidewalk Repair: On Monday, Aug. 18, 1:30 p.m. at City Hall, the Budget and Finance and Public Works and Gang Reduction committees will hold a special joint hearing on the proposed program. In subsequent months, the committees will hear reports from staff on program specifics and consider stakeholder input before sending the final product to the full City Council for a vote.

(2) Opine Online: Read the sidewalk motions and let me know whether you agree with them.

(3) Adopt a Community Impact Statement: The opinion of your Neighborhood Council is important. That's why I urge your NC to adopt a Community Impact Statement in support of our Citywide Sidewalk Repair Program. Please weigh in as soon as possible.

I realize that your NC may need some time to draft and approve a CIS. Please submit your CIS to the city by Oct. 1, 2014. After you do, please also email me a copy. councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org

Thank you in advance for your support. I believe that this comprehensive, sustainable program will pave the way for better, safer sidewalks in all of Los Angeles.

Very truly yours,
Paul Krekorian

councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org

Copyright © 2014

Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Coalition (LANCC)

All rights reserved. Volume 14-10 Email Blast

Our mailing address is:

Submit a CIS today!

LANCC@empowerla.org

[unsubscribe from this list](#) | [update subscription preferences](#)

Please see notice on the following page.
Por favor, vea el aviso en la proxima página.

GREATER ECHO PARK ELYSIAN NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
SPECIAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING 4/25/2014
AGENDA

Se les pide al public de llenar una tarjeta con sus datos de dirigir palabra a la mesa directive del concilio en referencia a cualquier asunto de la agenda, y antes de que el concilio tome acción sobre el asunto. Comentario de public sobre asuntos de agenda serán atendidos solamente cuando el respectivo asunto está bajo consideración. El comentario del public sobre otros asuntos que no aparecen en la agenda y están en la jurisdicción de concilio serán escuchados durante el period del comentario del public en general. Por favor note que bajo la ley de "Brown Act", el concilio no puede hacer nada de recomendaciones al respect durante el de un committee. El comentario del public está limitado a dos minutos por participante, amenos de que el limite de uno minute sea suspendido por el official del Concilio que preside la junta.

Las agendas de las juntas del Concilio de la Vecindad del Echo Park Elysian son puestas a la vista del public en general para conocimiento en las siguientes sitios: 1) La Biblioteca de Edendale – 2011 W. Sunset Blvd., LA 90026; 2) La Biblioteca del Echo Park – 1410 W. Temple Street, LA 90026; 3) Masa Café – 1800 W. Sunset Blvd., LA 90026; 4) Chango Café – 1559 Echo Park Ave., LA 90026; and 5) Tienda de almacén (A-Grocery Warehouse) – 1487 W. Sunset Blvd., LA 90026. Las agendas también se pueden hallar en el sitio oficial de GEPENC en la red-electronica www.gepenc.org. El public, y miembros de la vecindad de Echo Park Elysian también pueden suscribir al Sistema de notificación de la ciudad de Los Angeles "Early Notification System" (ENS), a través del le red-electronica de la ciudad www.lacity.org, para recibir noticias de las juntas del concilio de la vecindad del Echo Park Elysian. Para más información, llame a Paul Bowers, Oficial de Información, al telefono (213) 353-4955, o escriba a: cio@gepenc.org.

Como identidad de acuerdo con el Titulo II de la ley "American Disabilities Act" Americanos con incapacidades, la ciudad de Los Angeles no discrimina por ase de incapacidad. Haga su solicitud y se le prove acomodaciones rasonables para asegurar acceso de igualdad a los programas, servicios, y activades. Intérprete de Lenguaje de señas, asistencia con aparatos para oír, o otros aparatos auxiliary y/o sevicios se les pueden proveer através de ser solicitados. Para asegurar disponibilidad de servicios, por favor haga su solicitud a lo menos de 3 dias de trabajo (72- horas) antes de la junta, y pongase en contacto con Paul Bowers, Chief Information Officer, a 213-353-4955, cio@gepenc.org.

De acuerdo con elcodigo gubernamental sección 54957.5, documentos no-exento, que están distribuidas a la mayoría o a todos los miembros del concilio por adelantado de la junta, pueden ser vistos en la junta del concilio o en the red-electronica del concilio www.gepenc.org.

SI REQUIERE SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCION, FAVOR DE NOTIFICAR AL CONCILIO VECINAL 3 DÍAS DE TRABAJO (72 HORAS) ANTES DEL EVENTO. SI NECESITA ASISTENCIA CON ESTA NOTIFICACION, POR FAVOR CONTACTE A PAUL BOWERS, FUNCIONARIA DE LA MESA A CARGO DE INFORMACION, AL 213-353-4955, cio@gepenc.org.

The public is requested to fill out a Speaker Card to address the Committee on any agenda item

before the Committee takes an action on an item. Comments from the public on agenda items will be heard only when the respective item is being considered. Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the agenda that are within the Committee's jurisdiction will be heard during the General Public Comment period. Please note that under the Brown Act, the Committee is prevented from acting on a matter that you bring to its attention during the General Public Comment period; however, the issue raised by a member of the public may become the subject of a future Committee meeting. Public comment is limited to 1 minute per speaker, unless waived by the presiding officer of the Committee.

The agendas for the GEPENC meetings are posted for public review at the following locations: 1) Edendale Library – 2011 W. Sunset Blvd., LA 90026; 2) Echo Park Branch Library -1410 W. Temple Street, LA 90026; 3) Masa Café – 1800 W. Sunset Blvd., LA 90026; 4) Chango Café – 1559 Echo Park Ave., LA 90026; and 5) A-Grocery Warehouse – 1487 W. Sunset Blvd., LA 90026, as well as at the GEPENC's official website at www.gepenc.org. Stakeholders may also subscribe to the City of Los Angeles Early Notification System (ENS), through the City's website at www.lacity.org, to receive notices for GEPENC meetings. For more information, you may also contact Paul Bowers, Chief Information Officer, at 213-353-4955, cio@gepenc.org.

As a covered entity under the Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assisted listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days (72-hours) prior to the meeting by contacting Paul Bowers, Chief Information Officer, at 213-353-4955, cio@gepenc.org.

In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority of all members of the Committee in advance of a meeting, may be viewed at the Neighborhood Council meeting or on the Neighborhood Council website at www.gepenc.org.