



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 20-1376-S4

1 message

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

Fri, Jun 13, 2025 at 1:23 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: James Askew

Email: jamesaskew@nohnc.org

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(11) Nay(0) Abstain(2) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 06/11/2025

Type of NC Board Action: Against

Impact Information

Date: 06/13/2025

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 20-1376-S4

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary: On June 11, 2025, the NoHo NC voted to oppose Council File 20-1376-S4. Please see attached statement for more details.



NoHoNC.org     @NoHoNC

President

Jillian Burgos

Vice President

James Askew

Secretary

Katy Go

Treasurer

Sommerly Simser

Sgt. At Arms

Ken Dorfman

Jorge Aparicio

Jon-Paul Bird

Fareid El Gafy

Hunter Gibson

Letisha Hines

Maria Sosyan

Matt Haviland

Lee Jamieson

Wendy Kheel

Jen Montzingo

Danielle Mudge

Nathanael Roe

Jerry Yang

PASSED 11-0-2 on June 11, 2025

Council File: 20-1376-S4

Title: Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 41.18 / Implementation / Comprehensive Outreach / Unlawful Camping

Position: Oppose

Summary:

On June 11, 2025, the NoHo NC voted to oppose Council File 20-1376-S4.

The NoHo Neighborhood Council opposes the 41.18 policy in place and urges its repeal. We oppose efforts to criminalize our unhoused neighbors and reiterate our past opposition. In particular, we oppose expansion of 41.18, including this proposed action to criminalize homeless individuals for ostensibly refusing shelter.

Surveys in LA show the [vast majority of homeless individuals desire, if not actively seek, housing.](#) While the City's offers of shelter are in fact often woefully inadequate, made under deep duress, or not made at all. This is simply another tool to arrest people instead of housing them.

It is not our goal to force individuals into housing, and certainly not to criminalize their existence. While it is advisable to encourage individuals experiencing homelessness to seek and move into temporary and permanent housing, the wording of this council file fails to take multiple factors into account. What exactly do these offers of housing look like? Who is making them? The very same study linked in paragraph 3 highlights the infrequency of housing offers made to unhoused individuals. Furthermore, why are these individuals refusing shelter? Where is their agency? These questions are totally ignored. Our unhoused neighbors in North Hollywood may choose not to take an offer of shelter miles away from their community, their friends, their significant others, and/or their pets.

[Human Rights Watch](#) highlights the multifaceted failure of the City to solve the homelessness crisis. Housing offers are made at an incredibly low rate to individuals on the street while interim housing and shelters fail to place people in permanent housing given the woeful lack thereof – all this as the City seeks to expand anti-homeless legislation like 41.18, as is exactly the case here and now.

If 41.18 worked, there would not have been a 12% increase in homelessness since its enactment. Until we have robust options of available and affordable housing, we cannot criminalize people for being poor. NoHo NC urges a rethinking of City homelessness policy and a new approach founded on services, housing, and listening to the unhoused.