



## Greater Valley Glen Council ("GVGC")

13654 Victory Blvd., #136, Valley Glen, CA 91401

[www.greatervalleyglencouncil.org](http://www.greatervalleyglencouncil.org)

### SPECIAL VIRTUAL BOARD MEETING

May 27th, 2020 at 7:30 p.m.

#### VIRTUAL MEETING TELECONFERENCING NUMBER FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In conformity with the Governor’s Executive Order N-29-20 (MARCH 17, 2020) and due to concerns over COVID-19, the Greater Valley Glen Council meeting will be conducted entirely telephonically. Every person wishing to address the Neighborhood Council must dial **(669) 900 - 9128** and **enter 818 9856 4723** and **then press #** to join the meeting. Instructions on how to sign up for public comment will be given to listeners at the start of the meeting.

#### Officers

<b>Mickey Jannol</b>	President
<b>Vacant</b>	Vice President
<b>Anthony Sipp</b>	Treasurer
<b>Alex Silva</b>	Secretary

#### Board Members

<b>Joseph Barmettler</b>	At-Large Rep	<b>Cosmo Moore</b>	District 4 Rep
<b>Joanne D’Antonio</b>	District 1 Rep	<b>Sloan Myrick</b>	District 5 Rep
<b>Walter Hall</b>	Community Organizations Rep	<b>Andrea Schmitt</b>	District 6 Rep
<b>Mickey Jannol</b>	At-Large Rep	<b>Robin Shafer</b>	Community Organizations Rep
<b>Artur Manasyan</b>	Youth Rep	<b>Alex Silva</b>	District 1 Rep
<b>Jah Milton</b>	Education Institutions Rep	<b>Anthony Sipp</b>	District 6 Rep

#### Meeting Agenda appears on the following page. Please note the following:

- 1) A copy of this Agenda is posted on the GVGC website and GVGC Facebook page. It is physically posted at Uncle Tony’s Pizzeria, Erwin Street Elementary School, Monlux Elementary School, Kittridge Street Elementary School, and the baseball backstop at Valley Glen Community Park.
- 2) A Quorum of at least 13 Board members present is needed to discuss/consider/vote on Official Actions.
- 3) With a Quorum, Official Actions other than Bylaw changes are approved by Majority of the sum of Ayes and No votes cast. Abstentions are not considered. Bylaw changes require a 2/3 vote of the seated Board.
- 4) The public is invited to this meeting by accessing the Zoom information above. Pursuant to the Agenda, the Public is invited to comment on items as called for in the Agenda.



## AGENDA

### 1. Call to Order.

### 2. Roll Call.

### 3. Remarks from EmpowerLA Neighborhood Empowerment Advocate (“NEA”) Jasmine Elbarbary.

### 4. Remarks from President Mickey Jannol.

### 5. General Public Comment on non-agenda items. Please see Disclosures, page 2.

### 6. Nominations and elections for vacant board seats.

- Nominations
- Nominee Comments
- Public Comment
- Board Comment
- Roll Call Election by Board. Nominee receiving majority of votes becomes Board Member.

### 7. Nominations and election for Vice President.

- Nominations
- Nominee Comments
- Public Comment
- Board Comment
- Roll Call Election by Board. Nominee receiving majority of votes becomes Vice President.

### 8. Nominations and election for Secretary.

- Nominations
- Nominee Comments
- Public Comment
- Board Comment
- Roll Call Election by Board. Nominee receiving majority of votes becomes Secretary.

### 9. Motion to amend Bylaws. M. Jannol, President

The Board currently has 25 seats: 12 Residential Reps, 4 At-Large Reps, 2 Business Liaison Reps, 2 Commercial Property Owner Liaison Reps, 2 Community Organization Liaison Reps, 1 Religious Institutions Liaison Rep, 1 Education Institutions Liaison Rep, and 1 Youth Rep (appointed by the President). Motion is to amend Board composition to read as follows: 12 Residential Reps, 12 At-Large Reps, and 1 Youth Rep (appointed by the President). Current Business Liaison Reps, Commercial Property Owner Liaison Reps, Community Organization Liaison Reps, Religious Institutions Liaison Rep, and 1 Education Institutions Liaison Rep automatically become At-Large Reps, in addition to the existing At-Large Reps.

- Motion Second
- Public Comment
- Board Comment
- Possible Motions/Amendments handled in accordance with Rosenberg’s Rules of Order (“Rosenberg”)
- Call the Question
- Roll Call Vote. 2/3 of the seated Board required to pass.

### 10. Treasurer’s Report and Motions – A. Sipp, Treasurer

Each Treasurer’s motion is followed by:



- Motion Second
  - Public Comment
  - Board Comment
  - Possible Motions/Amendments handled in accordance with Rosenberg
  - Call the Question
  - Roll Call Vote. Majority of Ayes and Nos required to pass.
- a) Motion for approval of MERS for the months of October 2019 through March 2020 with BACs
- a. **October 2019:** <https://clkrep.lacity.org/ncfunding/mer/BC1B2D07-781B-457C-B0AF-9F67B9469961L.pdf>.
  - b. **November 2019:** <https://clkrep.lacity.org/ncfunding/mer/A6FE3659-28C2-4D0F-B629-A59F581CA79AL.pdf>
  - c. **December 2019:** <https://clkrep.lacity.org/ncfunding/mer/742C9477-763D-411B-9F41-4ACEC2CAB5ACL.pdf>
  - d. **January 2020:** <https://clkrep.lacity.org/ncfunding/mer/F44C940B-29E0-4208-9317-965328938313L.pdf>
  - e. **February 2020:** <https://clkrep.lacity.org/ncfunding/mer/EE8D8BCD-F612-40DD-A71C-D8A6C4B2982EL.pdf>
  - f. **March 2020:** <https://clkrep.lacity.org/ncfunding/mer/0F0381F9-DCBB-4851-A049-B4469BCBACDEL.pdf>
- b) Motion for approval of Affidavit for the incurred expenditure of \$129.47 at Uncle Tony's Pizzeria ("UTP") on 9/9/2019 and \$79.55 at UTP on 11/26/2019. Both expenses were for food for general meeting and committee meeting.
- c) Motion for the payment of previously approved ad in the VGNA newsletter, Valley Glen Voice. Payment to be no more than \$400.00.
- d) Motion for reimbursement to Board member M. Jannol for expenditure of \$45.00 for food at PLUM Committee meeting.
- e) Motion for reimbursement to Board member J. D'Antonio for expenditure of \$22.10 for food at Parks, Medians, and Improvements Committee meeting.
- f) Motion to pay \$43.79 expenditure at UTP for committee meetings on 10/8/2019.
- g) Motion to pay \$45.00 to Constant Contact, submitted 4/10/2020 expenditure at UTP for committee meetings on 10/8/2019.
- h) Discussion and possible motions related to payment and resolution of the following past due invoices: one from BMC Landscape for \$325 in October 2019, and \$650 from Victory Plaza Shopping Center "Personal Storage" to cover January through May 2020.
- i) Discussion and possible action to approve up to \$2,500 to Valley Glen based Jewish Family Services to provide meals primarily to seniors in response to the COVID-19 pandemic
- j) Discussion and possible action to approve up to \$2,500 to North Hollywood Interfaith Food Pantry to provide inventory to feed needy families in response to the COVID-19 pandemic

#### 11. Parks, Improvements & Medians Committee- M. Jannol, Chair

Each motion is followed by:



- Motion Second
- Public Comment
- Board Comment
- Possible Motions/Amendments handled in accordance with Rosenberg
- Call the Question
- Voice Vote or Roll Call Vote if a money motion. Majority of Ayes and Nos required to pass.

**Motion 1:** GVGC approves up to \$10,000 as its contribution towards construction of a shade structure to provide shade to the Playground at Laurel Grove Park. For information purposes, GVGC's contribution could be in the form of a joint project with CD2, DWP, and Recreation and Parks Department to install a photovoltaic structure, or a joint project with Quimby funds and/or other conventional funding sources to install a shade cloth structure.

**Motion 2:** Board approval of the expenditure of up to \$11,000 to clean up, remove ant moguls, grade and mulch the Victory Blvd. and Whitsett Ave. Medians (mulch delivery, water, and watering included). GVGC authorizes entering into a contract with Stay Green for \$11,000 to clean up and mulch the Medians (not including dead tree removal if any). Said contract to be subject to City approval.

**Motion 3:** Approval of the expenditure of up to \$1,750 per month for the maintenance of the Medians, on an as requested basis. This includes regular watering to preserve the mulch work with the understanding that we will get quarterly approvals from the Board for actual payment of the work. This motion funds 7 months of work. To cover the full year, CD 2 will contribute \$8,400, roughly 5 months of work.

## 10. Government Relations Committee – W. Hall, Chair

Each motion is followed by:

- Motion Second
- Public Comment
- Board Comment
- Possible Motions/Amendments handled in accordance with Rosenberg
- Call the Question
- Voice Vote or Roll Call Vote if a money motion. Majority of Ayes and Nos required to pass.

**Motion 1:** GVGC favors the proposed report from the Department of Water and Power relative to the feasibility and costs to underground electric distribution facilities in high fire zones, but to additionally report on the feasibility and costs to use insulated conductors as an alternative solution to undergrounding, and on additional practices that would minimize possible utility-caused fire-starting points. (CF 19-1361) [**For if Amended**]

**Motion 2:** Blocking sidewalks by businesses and street vendors is a problem within the footprint of our neighborhood council and in surrounding areas. The Greater Valley Glen Council supports the City Council motion (19-1334) that requests development of an ordinance that would facilitate the citing of non-permit holders from creating violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act. [**For**]

**Motion 3:** For residents of Greater Valley Glen, the proposed joint development project at the Metro North Hollywood Station appears less than user-friendly. Without adequate and easily accessible parking, riding the Red Line in lieu of freeway use by our constituency is problematic. As proposed, parking for public transit users is to be scattered about various project structures, with a smart phone app listing of site-specific parking availability. With no guarantee that a spot will remain available, especially as traffic within and about the project will cause delays, finding parking becomes difficult and uncertain and ultimately sours Red Line



ridership by those not within walking distance of it. The Greater Valley Glen Council approves sending a letter to project management asking for a redesign of parking facilities and the building of more parking near the station. Additionally, this letter will communicate our objection to the project's proposed felling of many mature trees and ask for a redesign to save as many, if not all, of those trees.

**Motion 4:** The GVGC approves transmittal to the Bureau of Street Service its opposition to a Tree Blitz Program in place of one of two annual Pothole Blitz efforts as we find that City streets continue to demand attention and repair. We find the Tree Blitz proposal to be piecemeal in nature and lacking thoughtful planning with no analysis of possible benefits versus the time and dollars that would be expended on it. Accordingly the GVGC recommendation is that, before any such Tree Blitz effort be undertaken, the Street Tree Inventory be conducted first and an overall Urban Forestry Master Plan with ecological consultation from the scientific community be subsequently created and adopted so that future tree planting is done in a systematic and responsible way.

**Motion 5:** The Greater Valley Glen Council supports preparation of an ordinance that would restrict parked vehicle idling and preparation of a marketing campaign to publicize the health consequences of needless idling. The ordinance, when prepared, should include emphasis on strict enforcement and carry significant financial penalties for non-compliance. (CF 19-0604) **[For if Amended]**

**Motion 6:** The GVGC approves sponsorship of this year's ONEgeneration Senior Symposium at a cost of either \$300 or GVGC's previous contribution, whichever is greater.

**Motion 7:** The GVGC supports the proposal at City Council to allow Park Rangers to, after necessary training, carry firearms, CF 20- 0190. **[For]**

**Motion 8:** The Greater Valley Glen Council recommends passing CF 15-0499-S1 with the simple addition that the division of biologists and horticulturalists proposed in the motion extend their consultation to the management of the City's street trees as well as to the private tree population as indicated in the motion. It is crucial that all trees in the City benefit from this added expertise. **[For if Amended]**

## 7. Planning and Land Use Committee

Each motion is followed by:

- Motion Second
- Public Comment
- Board Comment
- Possible Motions/Amendments handled in accordance with Rosenberg
- Call the Question
- Voice Vote or Roll Call Vote if a money motion. Majority of Ayes and Nos required to pass.

a. **Motion 1:** Approval to support a zoning variance requested by Chan Thai Spa, at 12838 Victory Blvd., to operate a spa business in a C-1 (commercial/retail, not including spa businesses) zone.

b. **Motion 2:** Opposition to possible grant of Conditional Use Permit to permit an 18-bed congregate living health facility (sanitarium) in the R Zone. Additionally, the GVGC opposes the issuance of an Exemption from the CEQA guidelines Address for this project is 6254 N. Ranchito Avenue.

c. **Motion 3:** Opposition to possible grant of variance for the subdivision at 5731 Colbath/Ranchito subdivision of the property into three single family homes. GVGC additionally recommends that the secondary access from the existing driveway from Ranchito Avenue be converted to only pedestrian access. The recommendation, if adopted, will be sent in writing to the LA City Planning Hearing Officer.

d. **Motion 4:** Opposition to possible grant of variance to allow construction of three single-family dwellings in a



single-family dwelling lot. Project address is 6304 Allot Avenue.

#### **8. Community Outreach Committee – R. Shafer, Chair**

- a. **Motion 1:** Approve encumbrance of no more than \$3,000 for 3 “Movies in the Park” for the months of July, August, September 2020. This motion supersedes any previous motion made and approved August 2019.
- b. **Motion 2:** Approve no more than \$750 for a full-page ad in the next Valley Glen Voice newsletter to be published in August 2020.

#### **9. President’s Motions**

Each motion is followed by:

- Motion Second
- Public Comment
- Board Comment
- Possible Motions/Amendments handled in accordance with Rosenberg
- Call the Question
- Voice Vote or Roll Call Vote if a money motion. Majority of Ayes and Nos required to pass.

**Motion 1:** Approval of no more than \$2,000 to support outreach efforts by Valley Glen Neighborhood Association to update and manage its website and Facebook page for a 6-month period.

**Motion 2:** Approval of no more than \$2,000 for LAPD Van Nuys Division to install activated light displays to the rear of two of its Reserve Officer vehicles for the purpose of deterring criminal activity.

**Motion 3:** Approval to send the attached letter which comments on the Sidewalk Repair Program’s Draft Environmental Impact Report (SRP DEIR). The proposed letter is attached to this agenda as pages 7-9. The comments will be sent before the May 31, 2020 comment deadline to the Sidewalk Repair Program Environmental Supervisor with copies to other officials appearing on page 9.

**Motion 4:** Approval to support the mixed use commercial and multifamily development at 13716 Victory Blvd. Motion approved at October Regular meeting but no minutes to that effect.

#### **10. President’s Comments**

**11. Board Comments on items not covered in this Agenda.** Please see Disclosures , page 6.

**12. Second call for Public comments for items not covered in this Agenda.**

**13. Possible motions regarding scheduling subsequent Board meetings in June.**

- Motion Second
- Public Comment
- Board Comment
- Possible Motions/Amendments handled in accordance with Rosenberg
- Call the Question
- Voice Vote or Roll Call Vote if a money motion. Majority of Ayes and Nos required to pass

#### **14. Motion to Adjourn**



### **Attachment to Agenda item #9, Motion 3**

(If GVGC Board members or stakeholders have any questions regarding the content in this letter, I can clarify – email [jdantonio@greatervalleyglencouncil.org](mailto:jdantonio@greatervalleyglencouncil.org) or call Joanne D’Antonio, Sustainability Representative, 818 387-8631)

### **Sample Letter on GVGC Letterhead**

Shilpa Gupta  
Environmental Supervisor I  
City of Los Angeles Public Works  
Bureau of Engineering Environmental Management Group  
1149 South Broadway, Suite 600, Mail Stop 939  
Los Angeles, CA 90015

### **RE: Sidewalk Repair Program Draft Environmental Impact Report Comments**

Dear Shilpa Gupta:

**Greater Valley Glen Council (“GVGC”) submits this letter to state our position that the draft environmental impact report (“DEIR”) for the sidewalk repair program (“Project”) falls short of an adequate environmental review.** An EIR is an environmental ‘alarm bell’ whose purpose it is to alert the public and its responsible officials to environmental changes before they have reached ecological points of no return. As explained below, this DEIR will not be adequate unless and until the Project’s impacts are fully described and the analysis of its various impacts completely revised. The City’s blinkered approach to environmental review must be abandoned and replaced with a thorough analysis of the full scope of Project and its impacts.

The DEIR fails to consider impacts by the loss of tree canopy and other environmental benefits. The City is proposing to adopt a project that projects the loss of 12,860 street trees. The DEIR says the City would get back to the amount of tree canopy cover it had in 2017 after 30 years by incorporating replacement trees into the Project and therefore there are no significant adverse impacts. This view makes no sense considering the fact tree canopy cover is significantly reduced as soon as mature trees are cut down and replaced with smaller trees. Even if one were to accept that the 2:1 and 3:1 replacements of each of these trees will offset the lost tree canopy cover at the end of the 30 years, assuming they survive and grow for the next 30 years, there will be a period of harm due to the reduced benefits. If multiple trees are cut down on a block, entire neighborhoods will be burdened by the loss of tree canopy cover. Also, the DEIR would allow removals of 12,860 without consideration for environmental (stormwater capture, wildlife habitat, noise and air pollution reduction).

**The DEIR’s analysis is inadequate given that it is based on a tree replacement approach that is speculative.** The proposal relies on a tree replacement approach, it characterizes as “Project Design Features,” to mitigate lost canopy cover that is not certain to occur. For instance, the DEIR uses an 8% mortality rate for a street tree in the first three years of planting in our semi-arid environment. But peer-reviewed, published data from similar climates clearly show that an 8% mortality rate for newly planted street trees is too low. A major planting in Berkeley and Oakland had a 34% mortality rate after only two years (Nowak et al. 1990). A previous study in Oakland found 60 -70% survival after 6 years (Sklar and Ames 1985). A more recent study of newly planted trees in Oakland found a 25% mortality rate over 3 years (Roman et al. 2014). In the study about Los Angeles’ million tree program (E. Gregory McPherson, et al., 2008), a low mortality scenario projected that 17% of newly planted trees would be dead after 35 years, and a high mortality scenario projected 56% mortality. An excellent survival rate for newly planted trees would be 80% (Matthew Wells, City of Santa Monica Landscape Manager, 2019 Los Angeles Tree Summit). The DEIR states, “young street trees must be able to withstand slight



to moderate drought or other stress.” However, arboriculture dictates young trees are not drought tolerant. The document fails to state what further mitigation will be required if replacement trees end up failing at a rate higher than the 8% mortality rate used by the DEIR. The DEIR also fails to state whether it will replace failed trees after the Project’s commitment to replace young trees that do not survive in the first three years.

**The DEIR fails to disclose or analyze the impact of the downsizing (replacing large stature trees with smaller stature trees) of our Urban Forest that would be created by the Project.** The 12,860 street trees projected to be removed during the Project is based on 244 unspecified trees it cut down for sidewalk repairs during the first year (2017 to 2018) of the Willits Settlement implementation. However, removals and replacement trees listed on the City’s tree removal notifications and NavigateLA show the majority of trees removed are large trees that have been replaced with smaller trees as part of the sidewalk repair program already in implementation. As illustrated in the 2019 First Step Los Angeles Urban Forest Management Plan by Dudek, large trees contribute exponentially higher urban forest benefits. Likewise, the Center for Urban Forest Research has studied large, medium, and small trees in a number of locations throughout the West and found that small trees like crape myrtle, commonly planted in the City’s sidewalk repair projects, deliver up to eight times fewer benefits than large trees. Hence, getting back to the amount of tree canopy cover what the City had in 2017 is unlikely to be achieved by planting two, three, or even four (as some people suggest) smaller tree species for every large tree cut down. In fact, the Project’s tree replacement approach may ironically create a smaller and less effective urban forest.

**The DEIR’s analysis is also inadequate given that it is based on mitigation measures that are largely undefined.** It is impossible for the DEIR to provide an accurate description of the impacts (visual/aesthetic, environmental) of the Project given that the design of most of the streetscape at the landscape-level is not yet developed or certain. For instance, the DEIR claims to include a tree species selection list in Appendix D, but there is no such list in the appendix, nor is there a description anywhere else in the document. Instead, the Project would allow replacement of existing tree species at the discretion of the City. Although the DEIR states street tree species selection at a given location is generally determined by the existing predominant street tree species on a block, the City’s tree removal notifications and NavigateLA show a trend of selecting replacement tree species that are not the same as the predominant species on a block. Because concrete details of the tree removal and replacements of the Project appear to be unplanned and therefore unknown, its environmental impacts cannot be accurately analyzed, nor can effective mitigation be identified. With so little detail a reader is left with no idea of what the streetscape of the City will look like at the end of the Project. The fog of uncertainty surrounding this aspect of the Project and its impacts leads inevitably to vague or deferred analysis and mitigation.

**The DEIR analyzes an inadequate range of alternatives and fails to analyze alternatives that reduce impacts.** The DEIR states, “retain existing street trees that are the cause of sidewalk barriers to the extent feasible” as the City’s first additional project objective. For most projects, multiple solutions are required to retaining trees. But the DEIR offers only 4 solutions for retaining trees, each with limitations that would either disqualify or minimize implementation. For instance, the DEIR states the root pruning alternative to cutting down a tree may be hazardous to a street tree’s structural stability and health, or would destabilize the tree. In other words, root pruning is a remedial alternative effort to cutting down a tree. The DEIR further admits that following International Society of Arboriculture’s Best Management Practices would preclude root pruning as a street tree retention method for nearly all of the City’s large trees (Project Description 2.4.4.3). While ramping over tree roots is an alternative to removing a tree, the DEIR states that “utilization of ramping may void the sidewalk warranty.” The DEIR rejects consideration of meandering on the grounds that acquiring additional property as part of the requirement to implement meandering is “incompatible with the Project objective to complete all required sidewalk repair segments without acquiring additional City ROWs.” If retaining existing street trees “to the extent feasible” is an objective of the Project, then the DEIR must analyze a robustly





defined set of alternatives that focus on retaining existing mature trees and prevention of sidewalk tree conflicts that could eliminate or greatly reduce the environmental costs of tree removals, such as lowered sites, curving or offset sidewalk, asphalt, expansion joints, pavers, pervious concrete, reinforced or thicker slab, beveling, Rockery/Wall, shims, mudjacking, increasing parkway planting space, tree curb pop-outs or bulb-outs, suspended paving systems (aka soil cells).

**Conclusion.** Given the foregoing deficiencies and uncertainties, the DEIR must be revised and recirculated. The present DEIR cannot properly form the basis of a final EIR.

Thank you

---

Joanne D'Antonio  
GVGC Sustainability Representative

---

Mickey Jannol  
GVGC President

With copies to:

[Robert.Vega@lacity.org](mailto:Robert.Vega@lacity.org)  
[Julie.Sauter@lacity.org](mailto:Julie.Sauter@lacity.org)  
[amber.elton@lacity.org](mailto:amber.elton@lacity.org)  
[gary.lee.moore@lacity.org](mailto:gary.lee.moore@lacity.org)  
[Fernando.campos@lacity.org](mailto:Fernando.campos@lacity.org)  
[Kevin.james@lacity.org](mailto:Kevin.james@lacity.org)  
[aura.garcia@lacity.org](mailto:aura.garcia@lacity.org)  
[mike.davis@lacity.org](mailto:mike.davis@lacity.org)  
[teresa.villegas@lacity.org](mailto:teresa.villegas@lacity.org)  
[jessica.caloza@lacity.org](mailto:jessica.caloza@lacity.org)  
[adel.hagekhalil@lacity.org](mailto:adel.hagekhalil@lacity.org)  
[martin.schlageter@lacity.org](mailto:martin.schlageter@lacity.org)  
[Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org](mailto:Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org)  
[councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org)  
[councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org)  
[david.ryu@lacity.org](mailto:david.ryu@lacity.org)  
[Paul.koretz@lacity.org](mailto:Paul.koretz@lacity.org)  
[councilmember.Martinez@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.Martinez@lacity.org)  
[councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org)  
[councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org)  
[councilmember.price@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.price@lacity.org)  
[councilmember.Wesson@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.Wesson@lacity.org)  
[councilmember.bonin@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.bonin@lacity.org)  
[Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org](mailto:Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org)  
[councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org)  
[councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org)  
[councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org)  
[mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org](mailto:mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org)



## Disclosures:

**\*PUBLIC ACCESS OF RECORDS-** In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all the board in advance of a meeting may be viewed at Uncle Tony's Pizzeria, 13007 Victory Blvd Valley Glen, CA 91606, at [www.greatervalleyglencouncil.org](http://www.greatervalleyglencouncil.org) or at a scheduled meeting. If you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact Mickey Jannol, Board President, at [mjannol@greatervalleyglencouncil.org](mailto:mjannol@greatervalleyglencouncil.org) or at (818-613-6311).

**PUBLIC INPUT AT NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL MEETINGS** – The public is requested to dial \*9, when prompted by the presiding officer, to address the Board on any agenda item before the Board 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 Board's jurisdiction will be heard during the General Public Comment period. Please note that under the Brown Act, the Board 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 Board meeting. Public comment is limited to 2 minutes per speaker, unless adjusted by the presiding officer of the Board.

**THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT** - As a covered entity under 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, assistive listening devices, and 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 you wish to attend by contacting the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment by email: [NCSupport@lacity.org](mailto:NCSupport@lacity.org) or phone: (213) 978-1551.

**SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN** - Si requiere servicios de traducción, favor de avisar al Concejo Vecinal 3 días de trabajo (72 horas) antes del evento. Por favor contacte a Alejandro Silva de la Mesa Directiva, al [vgcalexsilva@gmail.com](mailto:vgcalexsilva@gmail.com) o por correo electrónico avisar al Concejo Vecinal.

**Notice to Paid Representatives** - If you are compensated to monitor, attend, or speak at this meeting, City law may require you to register as a lobbyist and report your activity. See Los Angeles Municipal Code §§ 48.01 et seq. More information is available at [ethics.lacity.org/lobbying](http://ethics.lacity.org/lobbying). For assistance, please contact the Ethics Commission at (213) 978-1960 or [ethics.commission@lacity.org](mailto:ethics.commission@lacity.org)

Inquiries may be directed to Mickey Jannol, Board President, at [mjannol@greatervalleyglencouncil.org](mailto:mjannol@greatervalleyglencouncil.org) or at (818-613-6311).