



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 15-0389-S1

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org

Thu, May 16, 2024 at 3:33 PM

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or resolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at empowerla@lacity.org.

***** This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. *****

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: NoHo

Name: Katy Go

Email: katygo@nohonc.org

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(15) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 05/08/2024

Type of NC Board Action: Against

Impact Information

Date: 05/16/2024

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 15-0389-S1

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary: NoHo NC opposes Council Files 15-0389-S2 and 15-0389-S1 which grant unelected and unaccountable Community Councils the same privileges as those afforded to Neighborhood Councils pursuant to Los Angeles Administrative Code Section 22.819. This vote was taken at a Brown Act Compliant Meeting on May 8, 2024, and passed the council 15-0-0. For a more detailed discussion, please see the attached CIS.

Ref:MSG10371568



NoHoNC.org     @NoHoNC

President

Maria Sosyan

Vice President

James Askew

Secretary

Katy Go

Treasurer

Sommerly Simser

Sgt. At Arms

Ken Dorfman

Jorge Aparicio

Laura Barrero

Jillian Burgos

Hunter Gibson

Matt Haviland

Lee Jamieson

Wendy Kheel

Amirah Limayo

Jonathan Martin

Jennifer Montzingo

Jo Ann Rivas

Council File: [15-0389-S2](#)

Title: Community Councils / Same Privileges As Neighborhood Councils / Legal and Charter Considerations / Brown Act Compliance / Los Angeles Administrative Code Amendment

Position: Against

Council File: [15-0389-S1](#)

Title: Addressing City Council, Commissions or Boards / Extend Time Allowance to Non-Certified Community Councils / Los Angeles Administrative Code Amendment

Position: Against

Summary:

While the members of NoHo appreciate the well-meaning intent of the motion referenced by Council Files 15-0389-S2 and 15-0389-S1, granting Community Councils the same privileges as those afforded to Neighborhood Councils pursuant to Los Angeles Administrative Code Section 22.819, NoHo NC must oppose the motion for the following reasons:

All certified Neighborhood Councils are required to comply with the Brown Act, Public Records Act, relevant City ordinances, and the policies and rules of the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners, Department of Neighborhood Empowerment, and the City Clerk's Neighborhood Council Funding Program and Election Division, including several training, funding, and records requirements. In contrast, community councils are not subject to these requirements, which serve to promote transparency, accountability, and public participation.

Neighborhood Councils are prohibited from activities such as raising outside funding,

supporting or opposing candidates and ballot measures, and suing the city. Depending on their status Community Councils may support candidates and ballot measures.

Community Councils can restrict board membership in any way they choose, do not need to give notice of meeting times and locations, do not have to allow the public to attend and address them, or let the public know what they are discussing and deciding. The purpose of the Neighborhood Council System is supposed to be open discussion of issues in a public meeting; Community Councils can meet and decide issues in ways that are opaque and secretive.

Several years ago, the Pacific Palisades Community Council declined to seek Neighborhood Council status, stating it did not wish to comply with the Brown Act and other laws. It also solicits private contributions, which Neighborhood Councils are not allowed to accept. The Brentwood Community Council requires the annual payment of \$150 by each person serving on its Board, contrary to the City ordinance governing Neighborhood Councils. The Westwood Community Council, while unnamed in this motion, operates with “annual voluntary dues” and “contributions,” which Neighborhood Councils are again not allowed to accept. It also exists in an area already covered by two certified Neighborhood Councils, (the North Westwood Neighborhood Council and the Westwood Neighborhood Council). If this motion is implemented, this both could provide an unfair advantage to one community (of double speaking time, CIS filing, etc.) that is not available anywhere else in the City and could also muddle the stance of our area when there are disagreements.

Further, if this motion is adopted by the City Council, it will mean that other Community Councils, Civic organizations and possibly Homeowners organizations throughout the city can demand the same privileges. Will the Council next permit Homeowners Associations and Condo Associations the same rights as Neighborhood Councils? Residents Associations? Chambers of Commerce?

Instead of providing special treatment of community councils (and opening a Pandora’s box of who else gets recognized), the City Council should instead instruct the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment to prioritize the formation of Neighborhood Councils in community council areas where Neighborhood Councils do not now exist, and to facilitate participation by Community Councils in areas where Neighborhood Councils already exist.

Further, if the City Council is concerned with hearing from Neighborhood Council and community voices, it should reinstate telephonic comment at committee meetings and make Neighborhood Council comment separate from public comment. Additionally, the City Council should address the movement of general comment to the end of the agenda, which was done in contradiction of Council rules and without debate or discussion.

Adopted by a vote of 15-0-0 on May 8, 2024, in a Brown Act compliant meeting.