



P. O. Box 1265
Beverly Hills, California 90213-1265

February 9, 2012

Dear Commissioner:

On behalf of the Benedict Canyon Association, the oldest homeowners association in Los Angeles, I urge the Redistricting Commission to reconsider the untenable proposal to split our community in two, as indicated in the preliminary redistricting plan.

Benedict Canyon is a cohesive community of nearly three thousand homes located in the Santa Monica Mountains north of Beverly Hills. Benedict Canyon is the center canyon of a contiguous hillside and canyon region, with Coldwater Canyon and Laurel Canyon to the east, and Beverly Glen and Roscomare Road to the west. United by commonality of geography, topography, history, shared irregular margins and similar issues of concern; we are the only conduits, other than the Freeways, connecting the San Fernando Valley to the City. These heavily trafficked routes through our overwhelmingly residential Canyons cause traffic and public safety problems like none other in any part of the city.

Our hillsides require constant vigilance to shared challenges: the prevention of fires and soil slippage; maintenance of brush clearance; preservation of ridge lines and wildlife corridors; observation of grading, haul routes, and retaining walls for adherence to hillside codes; and assurance of safety and emergency vehicle access on narrow, steep winding roads. We have maintained and preserved the integrity of our hillsides through decades of history, unity and collaboration. There is no dividing line.

The proposed bisection of Benedict Canyon to create an arbitrary division in our indivisible community of interest is fraught with negative consequence. To place half of Benedict Canyon, and the Canyons east of us, into a new district combined with far distant areas that know nothing about us, have no common interests with us, or we with them, will create profuse problems and serve only as a major long-term disruption to the lives of thousands of citizens. Continued cooperation among the canyons in our community of interest, within one Council District, is an absolute necessity.

We trust that when the final redistricting map is issued, certainly Benedict Canyon will remain whole and the integrity of the Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council region, serving the canyons and hillsides from Laurel Canyon to the 405 Freeway, from Mulholland Drive to Sunset Blvd., will be preserved in entirety, all within Council District #5.

Nickie Miner

President, Benedict Canyon Association

Coalition of Homeowner Associations-Council District 5

Preserving & Protecting Our Neighborhoods

Bel-Air Association
Master Association of the Bel Air Crest HOA
Bel-Air Ridge
Bel-Air Skycrest Property Owners Association
Benedict Canyon Association
Benedict Hills Association
Benedict Hills Estates Association
Beverly Crest Residents
Beverly Glen Park Homeowners, Inc.
Beverly Wilshire Homes Association
Beverlywood Homes Association
Bracefield Improvement Association
Burton Way Homeowners Association
California Country Club Homes Association
Carthay Circle Neighborhood Association
Carthay Square Neighborhood Association
Castle Heights Neighborhood Association
Castle Heights Neighborhood Association
Century Hill Association
Century Park East Condominiums
Century Towers Association
Cheviot Hills Traffic Safety Association
Cheviot Hills Homeowners Association
Citizen's Advisory Council
Crest Association
Crestview Neighborhood Association
Encino Property Owners Association
Glenridge Homeowners Association
Greater LA Condominium Association
Hollywood Crescent Property Owners, Inc.
Hollywood Heights Association
Holmby Hills Homeowners Association
Holmby-Westwood Property Owners Association, Inc.
Homeowners of Encino
Laurel Canyon Association
Le Parc Condominiums
Melrose Action Committee
Melrose Neighborhood Association
North Beverly Drive/Franklin Canyon
North Westwood Village Residents Association
Park Place Condominiums
Residents Of Beverly Glen
Roscomare Valley Association
Roxbury Homeowners Association
Save Our Strip
Save Westwood Village
Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association
South Carthay Neighborhood Association
Studio City Residents Association
Tract No. 7280 Association
Valley Village Homeowners Association
West of Westwood Homeowners Association
Westwood Gardens Civic Association
Westwood Hills Property Owners Association
Westwood Homeowners Association
Westwood South of Santa Monica

February 21, 2012

Re: Redistricting Concerns Regarding the Contiguous Canyon Communities

Dear Commissioner:

On behalf of the Coalition of Homeowner Associations – Council District 5, I am writing to express our concerns regarding the splitting of canyon communities between Council District 5 and Council District 4, as described in the preliminary redistricting plan. We respectfully request that sincere and intensive attention be given to this matter by the Commission and that the boundaries of Council District 5 be re-drawn to include Benedict and Laurel Canyons in their entirety.

For example, Benedict Canyon includes a network of almost 3,000 homes that over the past many decades of working together have formed into a unified community. These homes are nestled into the Santa Monica Mountains, and along with other canyon communities, continue to address various public safety and quality of life issues that these like communities share. These canyon communities extend from Laurel Canyon on the east to Sepulveda Boulevard on the west. Collectively, they continuously work on:

- Fire prevention, brush clearance issues and the need for access of fire trucks and equipment on narrow, steep and winding canyon roads
- Public safety, emergency planning and responsiveness for residents in canyon communities
- Environmental issues, such as soil slippage, retention of ridge lines and wildlife maintenance
- Development issues, such as hillside grading, haul routes, inappropriate and unsafe retaining walls, building that endangers the hillside and existing residential properties and enforcement of city codes and zoning rules
- Traffic issues of cross-canyon roads (Roscomare, Beverly Glen, Benedict Canyon, Coldwater Canyon, and Laurel Canyon) that have become popular thoroughfares for crossing the Santa Monica Mountains, especially in light of freeway construction

A key reason these canyon communities have been successful in their efforts for public safety and maintaining quality of life is because these like communities have been unified within one council district. Working with a single councilmember and his staff has been a facilitating factor in preservation of the canyon communities. The proposed splitting of the contiguous hillside communities will severely hamper these efforts, and in fact, could risk public safety and preservation of the environment. Thus, we respectfully request that you and your associates on the Redistricting Commission reassess the importance of keeping these canyon communities within Council District 5, and at a minimum, not split Benedict Canyon into two separate council districts.

In advance, thank for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Marcia Selz, Ph.D.

Founder, Coalition of Homeowner Associations - Council 5



Building A Better Community

PO Box 252007, Los Angeles, CA 90025

Tel: (310) 479-6247 Fax: (310) 479-0458 www.babcnc.org

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: (213) 922-7740
FAX: (213) 922-7707
Email: redistricting.LACity@lacity.org

Dear Commissioners:

As a lifetime resident of the Fifth Council District, I urge you to please maintain the current boundaries of the Fifth Council District in the final outcome of the redistricting process.

I currently serve as president of the Bel-Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council, chairman of the LAPD West Bureau Traffic Committee, chairman of the LA County Highway Safety Commission and Co-Chair of the WLAPD Community Police Advisory Board as well as other boards and committees in the Fifth Council District. Working within the current boundaries of the Fifth Council District we have made substantial progress on crime, planning and land use, transportation and traffic issues which not only benefit our area but the entire City as well.

The Fifth Council District unites three adjacent, interconnected communities all sharing a common interest. They all are bound together by the Santa Monica Mountain Range. It is important that the integrity of this topographical, geographical, economic and socially cohesive boundary be maintained and not altered by redistricting. Preserving the interconnecting relationships between our communities is the best interest of the District, the County and is within the letter and spirit of the Voters Rights Act. Any change to the Fifth Council District boundaries would dismantle communities with common interests, surely this would be in violation of the Voters Rights Act.

We do not want to see our neighborhoods, communities and cities divided into separate districts. The Fifth Council District boundaries, as currently drawn, should be maintained. Split communities could result in changes to the service quality and timeliness we have come to expect from the City. My question to the City Council Redistricting Commission is why would take a risk and change what works so well with something that you can't guarantee will work any better?

As president of the Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council it is imperative that the boundaries of Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council need to be respected in the re-districting process and remain in the 5th Council District as we are a community of interest.

I hope the City Council Redistricting Commission will seriously consider this input, as any redistricting changes would have a huge impact on our community. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely your,

Robert A. Ringler, President
Bel-Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Municipal Building
1645 Corinth Avenue, Room 103-4
Los Angeles, California 90025
Office: (310) 479-6247
Office Fax: (310) 479-0458
Mobile: (310) 365-5723
raringler@babcnc.org



Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Coalition

President: Bob Gelfand

Vice President: Leonard Shaffer

Secretary: Daniel Wiseman

Treasurer: Glenn Bailey

PUBLIC STATEMENT

On February 4, 2012, the LANCC voted to oppose the “first draft” of the maps which were made public by the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) on January 25, 2012. The recently prepared (February 25, 2012) “final” map (“the map”) of the LACCRC was presented and discussed, in detail, at the regular meeting of the Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Coalition (LANCC) on March 3, 2012.

These deliberations raised a series of concerns for the procedures and practices of the LACCRC by which they arrived at this “new” set of City Council Districts (the map) for the City Council. LANCC recognizes that the map is the core recommendation of the Commission to the City Council.

1. LANCC is concerned that the “first draft” of the “final” map was made in three parts, each part proposed five City Councils. These three sub-groups did not coordinate their efforts citing Brown Act concerns.
2. LANCC is concerned that the first of the three groups created five San Fernando Valley Districts which remained unchanged and apparently “unchangeable.” This limited the flexibility necessary to create the remaining ten City Council Districts.
3. LANCC is concerned that this “final” map shows so little change from the “first draft.”
4. LANCC is concerned that it was the LACCRC’s practice to limit the time for each speaker in the Public Comments section of the Commission’s Public Meetings to 1-2 minutes.

Often, the Commission chair did not allow speakers to complete their “last” sentences in a purported effort to “hear everyone.” It is true that the Brown Act requires that Public Comment be a part of all California governmental committees but there is no requirement that the committee do anything with the testimony received. The LACCRC listened to over 4,500 Public Comments and over 6,500 people attended their 22 Public Meetings but very little of this massive testimony was evident in the map.

5. LANCC is concerned that reports from many NCs and from several Commission members, themselves, testify that the full array of written testimony and proposed maps was not readily available and, in a number of instances, may not have been placed into the public record, at all.
6. LANCC is concerned that only a very few NCs were contacted by LACCRC staff or by the Commissioners during their deliberations. Therefore, an important and valuable exchange of information related to and effecting the processing of the proposed boundaries was absent..
7. LANCC is concerned that, before the Commission began to develop the map, the LACCRC Outreach Committee recommended that the NCs be considered as an important Community of Interest and urged that maximum care be taken to avoid dividing NCs between two or more proposed Council Districts.


LANCC believes that the map and the Commission's own data show that 32 of the 101 NCs were divided, that small pieces of one NC were often used to connect larger ("assets" or "jewels") areas and the fact that at least 4 NCs were placed in CDs where they did not want to be and where they had specifically told the Commission that they did not want to be is strong evidence that the LACCRC did not act on the advice of its own Outreach Committee or respect the wishes, the relationships or the integrity of the NCs.

8. LANCC is concerned that the LACCRC guidelines, published on January 11, 2012, were not in adequate detail, were not publicized and were not effective in establishing legal, opened and transparent guidelines for the Commission's actions.
9. LANCC is concerned that the proposed City Council Districts show more evidence that they were created with the apparent intention of gathering "assets," often referred to by several Commissioners as "jewels". These "assets" or "jewels" tended to be voting blocks, economic centers and tourist attractions, etc. rather than neighborhoods which had common interests and identifiable needs.
10. LANCC is concerned that, in at least one case (that is; CD08), changing the boundaries resulted in a decrease in an African-American potential majority (CVAP of 65.7%) to below 50% ... a possible violation of the Voting Rights Act.

After hearing these concerns the LANCC made and PASSED by a UNANIMOUS MAJORITY the following MOTION:


Whereas, the current redistricting map was created in a manner that does not conform to law and does not serve the interest of the public, LANCC opposes the current map.

Benedict Canyon Must be in District 5!!! Please move the 900 residents east of Benedict Canyon Drive back into District 5 from District 4



West Hills Neighborhood Council

February 8, 2012



Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Redistricting Los Angeles City Council – West Hills



First in the Valley

P.O. Box 4670
West Hills, CA
91308-4670

mail@westhillsnc.org
www.westhillsnc.org

OFFICERS

Stephen Lenske
*President
Co-Chairman*

Edwin Dockus
*Vice-President
Co-Chairman*

Carolyn Greenwood
Secretary

Bobbi Trantafello
Treasurer

Bob Brostoff
Controller

PAST PRESIDENTS

Chuck Gremer
Stephen Lenske
Ed Youngblood



Dear Commissioners,

At a regularly scheduled general meeting of the West Hills Neighborhood Council on Wednesday, February 1, 2012, the West Hills Neighborhood Council discussed the final draft of the proposed Los Angeles City Council redistricting maps. Those maps have placed the West Hills community entirely into CD 12 without consideration of the community's needs or input.

West Hills has traditionally been drawn as a community that has been divided by Roscoe Boulevard, with only a very small parcel of less than 10% (north of Roscoe Boulevard) geographically located in CD 12. While a majority of Board members and some community stakeholders voted for the option of having West Hills continue to be in two districts, the greater majority vote was for West Hills to be solely in CD 3. At no time did the West Hills Neighborhood Council vote to be completely in CD 12. It was not a practical option and therefore unanimously rejected.

West Hills includes the majority of the Chatsworth Nature Preserve which is indicated on your maps as a separate census tract with no population. It is very confusing to City agencies that the majority of this property - which is mostly owned by the LADWP - the rest by the City of Los Angeles - is really a part of West Hills. If you include the whole of West Hills in CD 3, and you must not divide the census tract which includes the nature preserve, then by doing so, all of the nature preserve should logically move into CD 3 with West Hills. There are

many reasons to maintain the Chatsworth Nature Preserve, a.k.a. the Chatsworth Reservoir, in West Hills and to keep West Hills entirely in CD 3.

First, there are the services in West Hills that will be necessary if there is a disaster that takes out the 911 system downtown. West Hills, with its 911 Center, LAFD Station 106, the support helipad in the Chatsworth Nature Preserve, and the Topanga LAPD station in nearby Canoga Park, will all become the hub for the first responders. The West Hills Neighborhood Council currently works with all of these agencies in matters of emergency preparedness and environmental issues. Members of the West Hills Neighborhood Council had a special tour of the Chatsworth Nature Preserve with the LADWP last year to understand how the LADWP is preserving that property. The West Hills Neighborhood Council hopes to continue their relationship with the LADWP, the LAFD, and the Department of Recreation and Parks on future plans for that property.

Second, West Hills is currently in the South City Planning District. It is currently a part of the Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan. Based on maps that have been drafted, we would support being in CD 3 with Canoga Park, Woodland Hills, Tarzana, and Encino.

Third, West Hills is more closely aligned with the southern planning areas due to the fact that we have a combined Canoga Park – West Hills Chamber of Commerce. West Hills has traditionally aligned itself with Canoga Park in staging major community events. West Hills was formerly a part of Canoga Park before it became recognized as a separate city in 1987.

Fourth, West Hills residents heavily use the 101 freeway, the Orange line, and also share bus lines with Woodland Hills. These are major transportation corridors which West Hills residents share more with CD 3 than with CD 12. Many local activities are located on Valley Circle Boulevard which is the main corridor for north and south travel for both West Hills and Woodland Hills residents.

Fifth, West Hills share schools with Woodland Hills that are in both communities including Pierce College, El Camino and Canoga Park High Schools, and Chaminade High. We also share middle schools and elementary schools. We share shopping centers like Westfield Topanga Plaza, the Fallbrook Mall, and Platt Village. We even share the Platt Library with Woodland Hills. West Hills also shares hospitals with Woodland Hills and Canoga Park like West Hills Hospital and Kaiser Hospital. We share LAFD stations 105 and 106 with Woodland Hills, and the Topanga Police Station with Canoga Park and Woodland Hills. These are all services and activities in CD 3 not CD 12. In comparison to CD 3, there are very few services and activities in CD 12 that draw large numbers of West Hills residents.

Sixth, West Hills residents attend events like the Memorial Day Parade with Canoga Park, and the 4th of July event at Warner Center Park with Woodland Hills. These are all major events in CD 3. Our annual Fall Fest event in West Hills draws its attendance from Canoga Park and Woodland Hills.

Seventh, West Hills demographics for ethnicity, cultural diversity, and religious faiths is most similar to that of Woodland Hills, Tarzana, and Encino.

Eighth, a large population of CD 12 has an emphasis on large horse properties and the use of trails in less densely populated areas – which is a concern in other North Valley communities. This is not a primary issue of the West Hills community which is a closely knit and primarily single family residential community consisting of smaller residential lots.

Respectfully submitted,




STEPHEN A. LENSKE
President/Co-Chair

West Hills Neighborhood Council

SAL: mlr

cc: West Hills Neighborhood Council Board

Redistricting Ltr. 1.wpd



SOUTH VALLEY AREA

COUNCIL DISTRICTS:
3 & 12

WEST HILLS NC

CERTIFIED: 01/22/2002

Department of
Neighborhood Empowerment
(213) 485-1360 or dial 311
www.lacityneighborhoods.com

- P** Police Station
- F** Fire Station
- L** Library
- Park
- Recreation Area
- Water
- Freeway
- Street



NOT TO SCALE

Copyright (C) 2007 City of Los Angeles
Prepared by AEGEIGIS MAPPING DIVISION : 08/2007
This shall not be copied or reproduced, all or any
part thereof, whether for distribution or resale, without
the prior written permission of the CITY ENGINEER
Streets Copyright (C) 2004 Thomas Bros. Maps



ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA
MAYOR


WEST HILLS

NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD EMPOWERMENT
CITY OF LOS ANGELES



GARY LEE MOORE, P.E.
CITY ENGINEER



NORTH VALLEY AREA
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 12
CHATSWORTH NC
CERTIFIED: 04/29/2003
 Department of
 Neighborhood Empowerment
 (213) 485-1360 or dial 311
www.lacityneighborhoods.com

- P** Police Station
- F** Fire Station
- L** Library
- Park
- Recreation Area
- Water
- Freeway
- Street



Copyright (C) 2007 City of Los Angeles
 Prepared by AEO/EGIS MAPPING DIVISION : 08/2007
 This shall not be copied or reproduced, all or any part thereof, whether for distribution or resale, without the prior written permission of the CITY ENGINEER
 Streets Copyright (C) 2004 Thomas Bros. Maps



ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA
 MAYOR

CHATSWORTH
 NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
 DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD EMPOWERMENT
 CITY OF LOS ANGELES



GARY LEE MOORE, P.E.
 CITY ENGINEER

Chris Rowe. This resolution has not been voted upon due to the date of this meeting. CR

**RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE COMMUNITY OF WEST HILLS
REMAINING IN LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 3**

WHEREAS the community of West Hills is celebrating its 25th Anniversary in 2012 as a community of interest;

WHEREAS the community of West Hills was formerly a part of the community of Canoga Park;

WHEREAS the community of West Hills is a part of the southern City Council Planning area for the San Fernando Valley;

WHEREAS the community of West Hills is a part of the Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan dated August 17, 1999;

WHEREAS the majority of West Hills has been a part of Council District 3 since 1957 (see Patrick D. Mc Gee – CD 3 which included Woodland Hills, Encino, Tarzana, Northridge, Reseda, and Canoga Park);

WHEREAS parts of Tarzana and Woodland Hills have been a part of CD 3 since 1953 (see Robert M. Wilkinson);

WHEREAS the community of West Hills north of Roscoe is in the Chatsworth – Porter Ranch Community Plan;

WHEREAS the Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan calls for West Hills to be “a primarily single family oriented neighborhood;

WHEREAS the Chatsworth – Porter Ranch Community Plan dated September 4th, 1993 makes no mention of the community of West Hills;

WHEREAS the mandate of Redistricting is for communities to be “communities of interest”, to be contiguous, and to be compact;

WHEREAS the community of West Hills shares historic ties with Canoga Park, and has a Canoga Park West Hills Chamber of Commerce;

WHEREAS West Hills shares its hospitals, schools, streets, libraries, more with the communities of Canoga Park, Woodland Hills, Winnetka, and Tarzana;

WHEREAS the West Hills Neighborhood Council is the first Neighborhood Council in the San Fernando Valley and under the City Charter the West Hills Neighborhood Council acts as an Advisory Body to the City of Los Angeles;

LET IT BE RESOLVED THAT the West Hills Neighborhood Council recommends to the City Council of Los Angeles that the community of West Hills remain completely whole in Council District 3.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Rowe

West Hills Neighborhood Council

Redistricting Los Angeles City Council WHNC Spokesperson



North Hills

Chatsworth

West Hills

*West Hills
Boundary
all south of
here*

Plummer St

Chatsworth
Oaks Park

Valley Cir Blvd

Box Canyon

Valley Cir Blvd

Chatsworth
Reservoir Site

Valley Cir Blvd

Chase St

Eccles St

Chase Park

Roscoe Blvd

Roscoe Blvd

Circuit Ranch
Horticultural
Center Park

Roscoe Valley
Circle Park

Shoup Ave

Fallbrook Ave

Woodlake Ave

Ingomar St

Valley Cir Blvd

2000 N OUTPOST DR

Font: A A A +/-

Address/Legal

Site Address	2000 N OUTPOST DR
Site Address	1988 N OUTPOST CIR
ZIP Code	90068
PIN Number	150B181 1405
Lot/Parcel Area (Calculated)	15,024.8 (sq ft)
Thomas Brothers Grid	PAGE 593 - GRID D3
Assessor Parcel No. (APN)	5549016039
Tract	TR 10853
Map Reference	M B 188-39/40
Block	None
Lot	5
Arb (Lot Cut Reference)	None
Map Sheet	150B181

Jurisdictional

Community Plan Area	Hollywood
Area Planning Commission	Central
Neighborhood Council	Hollywood Hills West
Council District	CD 4 - Tom LaBonce
Census Tract #	1897 02
LADBS District Office	Los Angeles Metro
Building Permit Info	View


Planning and Zoning

Special Notes	None
Zoning	RE11-1
Zoning Information (ZI)	None
General Plan Land Use	Very Low II Residential
General Plan Footnote(s)	Yes
Hillside Area (Zoning Code)	Yes
Baseline Hillside Ordinance	Yes
Baseline Mansionsization Ordinance	No
Specific Plan Area	None
Historic Preservation Review	No
POD - Pedestrian Oriented Districts	None
CDO - Community Design Overlay	None
NSO - Neighborhood Stabilization Overlay	No
Streetscape	No
Sign District	No
Adaptive Reuse Incentive Area	None
CRA - Community Redevelopment Agency	None
Central City Parking	No
Downtown Parking	No
Building Line	None
500 Ft School Zone	No
500 Ft Park Zone	No

Assessor

Assessor Parcel No. (APN) 5549016039

Ownership (Assessor)



March 6, 2012

Dear City Council Redistricting Committee:

We are writing regarding the redistricting plans recently finalized by the Redistricting Commission and under review by the City Council. The currently proposed district lines have evolved very favorably in terms of uniting the communities of interest of Shadow Hills, rural Sun Valley/Stonehurst, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland/Tujunga and Lake View Terrace in one council district (CD7). We appreciate and commend the work of the Commission and the various council offices in accomplishing that important objective.

In reviewing the newest maps, we would like to bring two issues to your attention and submit our request and recommendation as we understand these changes involve census block issues that only the City Council can address. The first relates to two residential neighborhoods in our Shadow Hills/Stonehurst community that, due to census block configurations, were placed in CD6 and were separated from other residential communities grouped into the new CD7.

The second issue relates to multiple "heavy industrial" properties located in adjacent or nearby census blocks that were placed in CD6 but that are within a few hundred yards of the residential communities of Shadow Hills/Stonehurst and La Tuna Canyon in CD7. These properties are either undergoing state/city environmental review presently or will be in the near future. Our residential community, along with city agencies, Council offices, the Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council and the Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, has invested several years, and hundreds, if not thousands, of hours of work, in providing input and testimony to foster public safety and environmental protection for such properties/projects – we seek the best means of ensuring continuity in the review and permitting of those projects.

Residential Properties Issue

The new CD7 includes nearly all the residential areas within the "community of interest" outlined above. However, two small portions of the residential community of Stonehurst are NOT in the same CD7 district as neighboring residential communities (they have been placed in CD6). We've been advised this is due to the inability of the Redistricting Commission to deal with "census block" issues. We request inclusion of these additional residences (affecting approximately 200 people) within the Shadow Hills/Stonehurst community in CD7:

- Allegheny Street running alongside of Stonehurst Park
- Several cul de sac streets located near the intersection of Peoria and Stonehurst (Elinda Way, Elinda Place, Clybourn Street).

Heavy Industrial Properties Issue

The second issue relates to development of several neighboring "heavy industrial" sites within a few hundred yards of residential Shadow Hills/Stonehurst and La Tuna Canyon. There is no buffer between our residential areas and these heavy industrial uses. The heavy industrial uses are characterized by

gravel pits, waste transfer and recycling stations, truck maintenance facilities, truck storage yards, the City's own "East Yard," etc.

Presently, these properties are planned to be in CD6 once the new Council lines are implemented while our residential communities will be in CD7. As happens in such cases, the environmental review, permitting and zoning stages of such projects span many years and we find ourselves in the middle of such processes now. Thus, there are issues of continuity to be concerned with as our community has worked closely with city agencies, council members and their staffs for several years to promote public safety and environmental protections in the area for the closest and most impacted residential neighborhoods.

Our concern is heightened as once before, during the period of time when CD2 was unrepresented (after Councilwoman Greuel became City Controller and many months ensued before Councilman Krekorian took office), very onerous provisions for one of these projects was nearly expedited through the city approval process because there was no "city council representative or watchdog".

Thus, our recommendation is for these most proximate heavy industrial properties to be included in CD7 to create, in effect, a buffer, and to ensure continuity and a continued, close working relationship between city agencies, Council offices, nearby residential neighborhoods, and the applicants/property owners. Our recommendation is for the area within the following street boundaries to be included within CD7 to the maximum extent possible:


- Stonehurst on the east
- Branford on the north
- Sunland on the south
- Glenoaks on the west.

We thank you for your consideration of these requests which are made in the name of both uniting residential communities of interest and to fostering the best public safety and environmental protection in this area where there is no effective buffer between our residential communities and the heavy industrial uses referenced earlier.

Sincerely,

*Shadow Hills Property Owners Association
by William E. Eich, Land Use Chairman*

Shadow Hills Property Owners Association



**VALLEY VISION TOWN HALL
MEETING NOTICE:
ON
DEVELOPMENTS IN THE SOUTHEAST VALLEY**

**WE WOULD LIKE YOUR INPUT ON VARIOUS PROPOSED
DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD**

**UNIVERSAL/MTA PROJECT
VALLEY PLAZA**

**NOHO ART-WAVE
LAUREL PLAZA
UNIVERSAL VISION PLAN**

**NOHO COMMONS
NOHO ARTWALK**

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2008

6:00 to 9:00 pm

(View Development Project Models and Renderings at 5:00 pm)

**BEVERLY GARLAND HOLIDAY INN
4222 Vineland Avenue, Studio City 91604
(\$4.00 Parking, Carpooling or Public Transit Encouraged)**

- Presentations By -

**DEVELOPERS CITY & STATE AGENCIES
POLITICAL LEADERS**

**Bring your ideas, comments, questions and vision:
submit questions & comments in advance:
sfvalleyvision@gmail.com**

Be a part of our future community vision

Contact your Neighborhood Council for further details.

**SONC.INFO.ORG / MIDTOWNNOHO.ORG / GTLNC.ORG / MYVALLEYVILLAGE.COM /
GREATERVALLEYGLENCOUNCIL.ORG**



CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES

TOM LABONGE
COUNCILMEMBER 4TH DISTRICT

ROOM 480, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
(213) 485-3337
FAX (213) 624-7810

February 7, 2012

Ron Meyer, President
NBC Universal
100 Universal City Plaza
Universal City, California 91608

Dear Mr. Meyer,

I have always appreciated the opportunity to discuss with you my vision and concerns regarding the two proposed NBC/Universal projects.

As you know, I have always opposed the proposed project at the MTA Red Line Subway location because I felt it was much too large, and was pleased to hear that the project was abandoned. I would like to meet with you to discuss the future of the subway site with a housing component at that location. I also will be meeting with area residents to solicit their thoughts for the MTA site as the slate seems to be clean.

I also have had serious reservations about NBC/Universal's "Evolution Plan." I strongly agree with Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky in his recent communication to you. In fact, at the December 13, 2010 draft EIR public meeting, if you recall the public testimony, I stated that I could not support 3000 housing units on the current Universal backlot due to the intensity of the proposed project which would impede what is most important: the production of movies and television at Universal. I would hate to see overdevelopment that would stop the rolling of cameras. But I do want to see balanced development and would support a hotel to welcome even more visitors to Universal City.

As you know, I have always been a strong supporter of the film industry, as well as tourism. I will continue to support NBC/Universal in your plans to expand the theme park with new features like the exciting Harry Potter attraction. I was also pleased to hear about the adaptive reuse of the Technicolor Building for KNBC and Telemundo.

Ron, timing is everything in life. I would ask that you reconsider putting housing on your backlot. The final EIR will be available shortly, with public hearings to follow. Now is the time to re-evaluate the Evolution Plan before any public hearings are held (just like your talented film editors, cut the housing and leave it on the cutting room floor).

You indicated to me that you would like to have all your facilities on the Universal property. I fully agree and in addition, I would like to see you expand your studio campus. Let's work together on an Evolution Plan that deletes the housing portion of the project and one that will not conflict with the studio operation.

As we look to the future, I would much rather see jobs – jobs – jobs in production and tourist-related activity.

Please call me at (213) 485-3337 and we can get together at your convenience.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tom Labonge', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

TOM LABONGE
Councilmember, 4th District

Cc: Hon. Zev Yaroslavsky, Supervisor, County of Los Angeles
Michael LoGrande, Director of Planning, City of Los Angeles
Jon Foreman, Senior City Planner, City of Los Angeles

Lisa Sarkin, Studio City Neighborhood Council Vice President and Chair of Land Use Committee

Rules Committee

Item 1

March 6, 2012

I am here to give you facts about the flawed process that produced the Redistricting Commission's Final Map Recommendation. I will focus specifically on the manipulation by Andrew Westall, Executive Director:

- 1. As you know, Mr. Westall was a senior deputy of CD10's staff. At the time of his appointment, the commissioners were not told that he is the President of the Greater Toluca Lake Neighborhood Council. That fact was revealed on January 16, when the Redistricting Commission was in closed-door sessions to draw the boundaries of the initial draft map.**
- 2. Mr. Westall manipulated the circulation of information. He refused to circulate 107 emails from Studio City stakeholders, but he circulated emails from Toluca Lake stakeholders to every member of the Ad Hoc Regional Line Drawing Committee that was drawing the boundaries for CD4.**
- 3. After the Redistricting Commission adopted certain adjustments at their February 15 meeting, Mr. Westall misled the commissioners and altered the map to favor Toluca Lake, to the detriment of Studio City and the rest of communities in CD2. Specifically, he took a far larger chunk of Studio City from CD2, including the Metro Station located in Studio City, than was necessary to connect Toluca Lake to the rest of CD4.**
- 4. Mr. Westall altered draft maps after the commissioners worked with the Commission's Technical Director, and surprised the Commissioners with maps that were not the same as the ones that the Technical Director had drawn for them.**

The City Council must not rubberstamp the Final Map Recommendation. It has an obligation to protect all the citizens of Los Angeles from the serious flaws in the Commission's map recommendation, including the conflict of interest and manipulation of the process by Mr. Westall.

On Tue, Feb 14, 2012 at 9:31 AM, <hippolady@roadrunner.com> wrote:

Dear Andrew –

I am writing to your city email address because nobody replies to their Greater Toluca Lake NC emails.

Personally, I find it insulting that your community of Toluca Lake feels that it needs to be within CD4 to deal with NBC/Universal. Toluca Lake is not the only community subjected to the issues of that property. Frankly, according to the two DEIRs all of the southeast valley would be affected and actually, it went way further than that.

In order for Toluca Lake to be part of CD4, Studio City will have to be in two districts, at least. We have had to endure three council districts the last 10 years and it reduces our effectiveness. Unfortunately, Studio City isn't even listed on Tom's website as part of his district, a problem we have been trying to get repaired since 2008.

Since you were not involved with the DEIR responses, that I know of, are you interested to meet so you can see what Studio City submitted?

I hope you will see the light soon, because two districts coming over the hill again reduces the Valley's ability to get what is coming to us.

Sincerely, Lisa Sarkin (818) 980-1010 (818) 439-1674 cell

Subject: Westhall Email

Andrew Westall <andrew.westall@lacity.org>
hippolady@roadrunner.com

Subject: Re: Redistricting
Priority: Normal Date: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 10:18 AM Size: 368 KB
Attachments: GTLNC- Universal Evolution Letter- Final v.2.doc (357.2 KB)
Lisa,

As you can imagine, I have been very hands off on this issue in particular due to my role as the Executive Director of the Commission. That being said, the GTLNC took a position in May of 2011 on state, congressional, and city redistricting which included the desire to stay in CD 4. As you know, that position is also held by the Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce and Toluca Lake Homeowner's Association.

As a resident and homeowner of Toluca Lake for the last 5 1/2 years, I understand where my fellow Tolucans are coming from. It is the general belief of our community that we are not part of, and do not identify with, the San Fernando Valley and feel more affinity and spend more time in the Hollywood Hills, Hollywood, Griffith Park, Los Feliz, and Burbank than we do in Studio City or North Hollywood. Our biggest concerns are what occurs at Universal City, Griffith Park, Hollywood, and Burbank ... and of course, traffic.

I would also state that regardless of Neighborhood Council lines, our community does not believe that Studio City is east of the 101 Freeway. As I've been told, during the certification process, Tony Lucente who was on BONC at the time, bullied the Tolucans into accepting the boundaries as they are today, or risk not getting certified. To the best of my knowledge, Tolucans are the stewards of Weddington Park and Campo de Caheunga, not Studio City residents.

Lastly, the GTLNC did submit a seven page letter with respect to the DEIR for Universal Evolution (see attached) which I wrote as a member of our Planning Committee. We have also been involved in the Forest Lawn DEIR as well, and before my time, the DEIR for the Universal Metro station build out.

Once again, I have not been involved in the organizing efforts of the Toluca Lake communities, and this is just my opinion based on what I know or has been related to me over the last five-plus years.

Hope all is well!

Best, Andrew

Tony Lucente <tony@lucente.com> hippolady@roadrunner.com
<hippolady@roadrunner.com>

Subject:Re: Westhall Email

Priority:NormalDate:Saturday, February 18, 2012 7:44 PMSize:18 KB

Lisa:

Thanks for sharing this e-mail.

Mr. Westhall's assertion that I "bullied" the Tolucans into accepting the boundaries which included parts of Studio City east of the 101 is patently absurd. Here are a few facts which support the inclusion of this area as part of Studio City:

1. The original Toluca Lake residents were not interested in this area. In fact, the original Studio City boundaries extended further east as this area had been largely ignored by Toluca Lake.
2. The Studio City Residents Assn. (SCRA), a key Studio City stakeholder, had a long and active interest in the area around Campo de Cahuenga including negotiating conditions on a large multi-family development on the site of the former post-office, working on Universal City and Metro Rail issues, routinely working on crime & safety issues in Weddington Park with the LAPD, fighting graffiti in the area (soundwalls adjacent to the park), and negotiating with the Toluca Lake baseball league on the use of Weddington Park, all with the active support of Councilman John Ferraro and then Tom Labonge's office.
3. The SCRA has always had board members from the area of 70+ homes adjacent to the Metro Rail site on its board of directors
4. The SCRA represented this site when the LAUSD coveted the site adjacent to the Metro Rail station for a new school

Furthermore, the BONC, was not directly involved in the boundary negotiations. Toluca Lake and Studio City representatives negotiated in good faith and the current boundaries are the result of those discussions.

For issues as serious as redistricting, it is my hope that facts would take precedence over hearsay, innuendo or rumors.

Tony Lucente

From: "hippolady@roadrunner.com" <hippolady@roadrunner.com>
To: tony@lucente.com
Sent: Saturday, February 18, 2012 2:56 PM

From: "Andrew Westall" <andrew.westall@lacity.org>
To: <helen.kim@kattenlaw.com>; <glmckean@aol.com>; <Mizdown@aol.com>; <davidaroberti@gmail.com>; <bobbieja@earthlink.net>; <rob@ori.ucla.edu>; <cellison@eaalawfirm.com>
Cc: <nboyle.laccrc@gmail.com>; <rani.woods@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2012 5:23 PM
Subject: Fw: Proposed Redistricting Map - Toluca Lake
 FYI

From: Richard Bogy <rboq=@bogycompany.com>
To: bar=y.johnson@studiocityresidents.org <barry.johnson@studiocityresidents.org>
Cc: Richard Bogy <rboq=@ogycompany.com>; peter.=artz@adelphia.net <pete=.hartz@adelphia.net>; <Steve@hamparproperties.com>; Andrew Westall <andrew.westall@lacity.org>; Tom LaBo=ge <tom.labonge@lacity.org>
Sent: Mon Jan 16 10:34:50 2012
Subject: Proposed Redistricting Map - Toluca Lake

January 16, 2012

Dear Barry:

I am contacting you as Government and Community Affairs Chair for the Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce. We understand that you have prepared and proposed a map for submission to the City of Los Angeles Redistricting Commission that would move the community of Toluca Lake from the current Council District 4 to Council District 2. We also heard that it may have been stated or implied at public gatherings that the community of Toluca Lake has been contacted and or supports the map and a change of Council District for our community. That is not accurate information. Both of the recognized Toluca Lake Community Organizations - The Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce and the Toluca Lake Homeowner's Association - have taken positions opposing any change in our representative Council District and also stating our desire to remain in Council District 4.

The stated motion of the Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce is:

The Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce, in consideration of cultural, historical, economic, transportation and shared communities of interest, choose to remain in Council District 4. We support the connection and common cause of city and valley residents in CD4.

The Toluca Lake Homeowners Association voted the same motion. For purposes of the motion, both organization have defined the community of "Toluca Lake" as those stated boundaries of the Greater Toluca Lake Neighborhood Council.

I know of no Toluca Lake organization or Toluca Lake community leader who has supported a change in Council District for Toluca Lake. &nb=

We appreciate the leadership role you have taken in the community of Studio City, however we ask that you remove the community of Toluca Lake from your proposed new Council District 2

map and that you make it clear that the community of Toluca Lake does not support - and never has support - any change in Council District for our community.

The City of Los Angeles Redistricting Commission has been made aware of the motions set forth by both the Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce and the Toluca Lake Homeowners Association.

Thank you.

Richard Bogy

Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce

Past President

Chair - Government and Community Affairs Committee

cc: Steve Hampar, President - Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce

 Peter Hartz, President - Toluca Lake Homeowner's Association

Andrew Westall, President - Greater Toluca Lake Neighborhood Council and

 Executive Director, Los Angeles Redistricting Commission

Th Hon. Tom LaBonge - 4th District Councilmember, City of Los Angeles

From: "Andrew Westall" <andrew.westall@lacity.org>
To: <helen.kim@kattenlaw.com>; <glmckean@aol.com>; <cellison@eaalawfirm.com>; <bobbieja@earthlink.net>; <davidaroberti@gmail.com>; <rob@ori.ucla.edu>; <Mizdown@aol.com>
Cc: <nboyle.laccrc@gmail.com>; <rani.woods@lacity.org>
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2012 5:23 PM
Subject: Fw: Proposed map calling for change of Council District for Toluca Lake
=font color="navy" face="Arial"> Commissioners:

At the request of Commissioner Mckean, I am forwardin= you this email as well as a second one I received today.

In full d=sclosure, I am the President of the Greater Toluca Lake Neighborhood Council and the Neighborhood Council took the same position in May of 2011. As P=esident, I did not vote on the motion due to our bylaws which state that I=only vote when there is a tie. It passed on unanimous consent.

Best,

Andrew

From: Steve Hampar <>
To: 'Andrew Westall' <andrew.westall@lacity.org>
Cc: Peter Hartz <peter.h=rtz@tlhoa.org>
Sent: Mon Jan 16 08:27:07 2012
Subject: Proposed map c=lling for change of Council District for Toluca Lake

Date: J=nuary 15, 2012

To: &=bsp; Andrew Westall, Executive Directors - Los Angeles C=ty Redistricting Commission

= &n=sp; President, Greater Toluca Lake Neighborhood Council

From:&=bsp; Steve Hampar, President

&nbs=; The Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce

Re: &nbs=; Proposed map calling for change of Council Distr=ct for Toluca Lake

Dear Andrew:

3/6/2012

I am writing to you as President of the Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce. We have just recently learned that a proposed redistricting map has or will be submitted to the Los Angeles City Redistricting Commission, which is being offered by a community member of the Studio City area. We understand that map proposes moving the community of Toluca Lake from Council District 4 to Council District 2, and that it has been stated or implied that the community of Toluca Lake supports that proposed map and council district change. Toluca Lake does not support that proposed map, and Toluca Lake does not wish to be moved from Council District 4.

The Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce and The Toluca Lake Homeowners Association, the long-time recognized business and residential community organizations of Toluca Lake, have both voted overwhelmingly to remain in Council District 4.

The Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce has passed the following motion:

The Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce, in consideration of cultural, historical, economic transportation and shared communities of interest, chooses to remain in Council District 4. We support the connection and common use of City and Valley residents in CD4.

The Toluca Lake Homeowners Association has passed a similar motion this past week.

The Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce was established more than 70-years ago and represents both the business and interrelated residential interests of Toluca Lake. The Toluca Lake Homeowners Association was established more than 40 years ago and represents the residential interests of Toluca Lake. Both organizations enjoy strong support throughout the Toluca Lake community, and provided the leadership in creating the Greater Toluca Lake Neighborhood Council.

We believe that the Greater Toluca Lake Neighborhood Council may be presented with a request to support the aforementioned proposed map and change of Council District at its regular monthly Board meeting this coming Tuesday, January 17, 2012. We ask that you advise the Directors of the GTLNC of the opposition to any change in Council District by both the Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce and the Toluca Lake Homeowners Association, and that you accept this as our request that the GTLNC support Toluca Lake remaining in Council District 4 in the future.

Thank you, Andrew.

Respectfully,

Steve Hampar

President, Toluca Lake Chamber of Commerce

cc: Peter Hartz, President - Toluca Lake Homeowner's Association

Councilmember Tom LaBonge - City of Los Angeles

Dear Redistricting Commissioners:

Thank you for giving your valuable time to represent your districts at these important redistricting meetings.

Last night's meeting brought up many issues not heard at the meetings I have attended. My thoughts are many, but I will hone in on just a few:

The stakeholders of Toluca Lake have attended the commission meetings to state that their community is not part of the Valley or CD2 because of several issues. One very important issue they cite are the proposed developments at the Metro Red Line Station in Studio City and the NBC/Universal Evolution plan. These issues unite the communities of Studio City, Toluca Lake, Valley Village, North Hollywood and Valley Glen as no other issues can.

In February 2008, these communities united and conducted a Town Hall meeting of which more than 500 stakeholders attended. The purpose of this Town Hall was to bring to the attention of our stakeholders the proposed developments along Lankershim, Laurel Canyon, city and county properties in and around Universal City. The proposed Metro/Universal and Evolution developments were allowed to conduct separate Draft Environmental Impact Reports in an area with current and continuing major traffic issues. A second Town Hall meeting was held during the spring of 2009 to further discuss these issues.

All of the communities currently in the draft CD2 map opposed the Metro/Universal and Evolution plans. The Studio City Neighborhood Council developed more than 200 pages of questions and supporting documents for our conclusions that these two proposed developments would create major impacts, to the southeast Valley, that were un-mitigatable.

How much more commonality is needed to keep the southeast Valley, with seven whole Neighborhood Council together in CD2? These seven areas fit the requirements of all aspects of the redistricting laws. We request only the small tweaks switching the Sherman Oaks and Valley Village areas. I want to reiterate that NBC/Universal is not in Toluca Lake, it is in the county (91608) expect two properties next to the 101 Freeway in Studio City.

Lisa Sarkin

SCNC BOARD

Jeffrey Carter
Ben Di Benedetto
Wayne Kartin
Remy Kessler
Ben Neumann
Richard Niederberg
Lisa Sarkin
Lana Shackelford
Gail Steinberg
Ron Taylor
Pasha Vafae
Rita C. Villa
John T. Walker
Denise Welvang



4024 Radford Ave.
Edit. Bldg. 2, Suite 6
Studio City, CA 91604
(818) 655-5400

PRESIDENT
John T. Walker

VICE PRESIDENT
Lisa Sarkin

TREASURER
Remy Kessler

SECRETARY
Rita C. Villa

**CORRESPONDING
SECRETARY**
Lana Shackelford

www.studiocitync.org

March 1, 2012

Los Angeles Council President Herb Wesson
200 Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SENT BY EMAIL, FAX AND USMAIL

Re: Redistricting Commission

Dear Honorable President Wesson:

We the undersigned, all Presidents of organizations that represent 240,000 Stakeholders within CD2, want to bring to your attention something that needs to be corrected.

According to the Commissions' rules of Redistricting, a district should be: compact, contiguous, communities of interest, keeping Neighborhood Councils whole, in one district, and diverse.

One community does not recognize itself as being in the Valley, Toluca Lake. The Commission has relocated them from draft Map CD2, to CD4. We cannot argue what a community wants however, this move created a spillover, which has taken away important areas of Studio City, specifically the Metro and the Campo De Cahuenga, which are located in Studio City. Since Studio City will suffer the consequences and incur the most negative impact of any future development of the Metro, we respectfully request that you keep both the Metro and the Campo in CD2.


In order for Toluca Lake to be in CD4, may we also request that you reexamine the boundaries/lines and not cut so deeply into areas that are of great importance to our communities.

Thank you for your consideration on this urgent matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully,



John T. Walker, President
Studio City Neighborhood Council



Judy Price, President
Valley Glen Neighborhood
Association



President
Studio City Residents Assoc.



Anthony Braswell, President
Neighborhood Council,
Valley Village

Mary Garcia

Mary Garcia, President
Mid-Town North Hollywood Neighborhood Council
For Northeast and Northwest North Hollywood Neighborhood Councils

SCNC BOARD

Jeffrey Carter
Ben Di Benedetto
Josh Gelfat
Victor Helo
Wayne Kartin
Remy Kessler
Ben Neumann
Richard Niederberg
Todd Royal
Lisa Sarkin
Lana Shackelford
Gail Steinberg
Ron Taylor
Rita C. Villa
John T. Walker
Denise Welvang



4024 Radford Ave.
Edit. Bldg. 2, Suite 6
Studio City, CA 91604
(818) 655-5400

PRESIDENT
John T. Walker

VICE PRESIDENT
Todd Royal

TREASURER
Remy Kessler

SECRETARY
Rita C. Villa

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY
Lana Shackelford

www.studiocitync.org

May 21, 2011

Re: California, Los Angeles County and Los Angeles City Redistricting

Honorable Representatives of Studio City,

At its regular meeting on May 18, 2011 the following motion was passed:

MOTION 2011.05.18.14A: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council opposes splitting of Neighborhood Council areas into more than one of the following: United States House of Representatives, California State Senate, California Assembly, State Board of Equalization, Los Angeles County Supervisor, Los Angeles City Council to maintain each Neighborhood Council within its community of interest.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,

John T. Walker, President
Studio City Neighborhood Council

LTW/Is