Welcome

6:35 PM start

1. Roll Call

Attending

Susan Swan  Tom Meredith  George Skarpelos  Jim Van Dusen  Margaret Marmolejo  Erin Penner

Adam Miller  Violet Williams  Brandi D’Amore  Danielle Paris  Jeff Ramberg  Matt Wait

Andrew Chadsey

Excused

Sheila Irani  Coyote Shivers

Absent

Chona Galvez  Luis Saldivar

2. Approval of Minutes

George Skarpelos noted that minutes are not verbatim transcripts of meeting events, merely a summary of events that transpired, perhaps with a little color.

Adam Miller requested to strike the first line on the minutes.

Motion Made: Motion to approve minutes from the March HUNC board meeting, with requested part stricken.

Motion: George Skarpelos  Second: Brandi D’Amore  Vote: Yes-11, No-0, Abstain-1, Recused-0, Ineligible-0

Yes

Adam Miller  Andrew Chadsey  Brandi D’Amore  Erin Penner  George Skarpelos  Jeff Ramberg

Jim Van Dusen  Margaret Marmolejo  Susan Swan  Tom Meredith  Violet Williams

Abstain

Matt Wait

3. Public Comment on items not on the Agenda (2 minutes each)

Gerry Hans introduced himself, and said that he does science and conservation for Friends of Griffith Park. He explained that they are
currently involved in a raptor nesting survey; last year they monitored 55 nests with trained community scientists, and want to add more to that this year. He asked anyone with knowledge of hawks and owls to contact him.

4. Comments from any City, County, State or Federal representatives in attendance (5 minutes each)

Shannon Prior introduced herself as a field deputy for David Ryu’s office. The planning department is going to be doing Planning 101 trainings again, focused on their environmental review process, and she will leave flyers about those training sessions. She also wanted to provide an FAQ about the proposed paid parental leave initiative that seeks to augment the current state parental leave program and passed last week after being introduced by Councilmember Ryu’s office. She summarized the benefits to child development and economic security that come with extended paid parental leave, and said that there would be economic studies forthcoming to study the impact of the proposal. Also, the LAPD is celebrating 100 years with an open house event. Finally, the Department of Animal Services is always doing volunteer orientation for people who want to volunteer in shelters around the city, and will have trainings coming up.

Fernando Morales with Sheila Kuehl’s office introduced himself and brought some community guides and county strategies for Measure H. He also announced that the annual budget would be coming before county supervisors within the next week. He also wanted to mention Government Under One Roof, a program being pushed by the supervisor to mitigate frustrations with having fragmented governmental jurisdictions. This time around, the Supervisor held it before a neighborhood council meeting, and Mr. Morales said he would love to arrange one with HUNC. Also, discretionary fund rounds are done by the Supervisor in April and October, and the YMCA and PAL have already submitted, and he asked them to let him know about community organizations who might be able to receive discretionary one-time funding.

Senior Lead Officer Brian White introduced himself. He reiterated that the LAPD is having their 100th anniversary celebration soon and summarized the activities that will be available for attendees. Updates, there was a busy weekend at the Weed Lake house with a successful insertion of vice undercover officers at the location, and they managed to shut down the party. Because of traffic jams, suspects could not leave fast enough. There were a couple upticks in burglaries form motor vehicles, most likely related to tourists coming and leaving things in their cars. They still ask that everyone be diligent and take possessions inside and keep their car locked. The Bridge house opened up at Schrader and Selma as well.

Stakeholder Lee Thompson asked if he could speak to the people at Lombardi House: when they have events, their valets were stopping traffic in two lanes so that there were only two lanes for public traffic, and it caused a ripple effect with people trying to go around. SLO White said he would be happy to talk to them.

A stakeholder said that Saturday they were doing construction in Hollywood that went on until Sunday, and asked whether they had received any notification of it. SLO White explained that they don't get notice of it, and with certain street closings they have to apply in advance.

5. HUNC Committee & Liaison announcements on items not on the Agenda

Margaret Marmolejo reminded stakeholders and board members that they would be holding CERT training soon.

Tom Meredith reminded the board that they still needed two volunteers to attend the Budget Advocate meetings. George Skarpelos agreed. Mr. Meredith added that they can also have stakeholder representatives to the meetings.

6. Executive Committee

A) Report by the President

George Skarpelos said that they have a few items in their office that they really don’t use anymore, and he would like to give them to someone or some non-profit. He talked to Lorenzo, their DONE representative, for clarification, and asked if they could have organization fill out an NPG to be able to receive and use the item. He spoke to someone in Finance, who said no. Lorenzo will bring the issue up with the full DONE meeting.

He also said that it will be pretty new, but they might be able to roll over up to $10,000 from the current year. They will have to have a budget in before being able to spend that money and be in good standing.

Lastly, they've been in discussion with Warner Bros, who want to do a presentation on April 25th for the board.

Motion Made: Report by Committee Chair

B) Review of election and review of the seating of new candidates

George Skarpelos explained that they had an election and that some of the winning candidates were here. The actual certification is not until Wednesday, and they will be seated according to the bylaws after the certification at the May 12th meeting. He
congratulated all who made it, all who ran, and all who came out to election events. He also thanked board members who helped.

C) Approval of Angel Izard as a stakeholder member of the Renters & Housing Committee for a 1 year term

George Skarpelos explained that they met Angel Izard at a CERT class. She introduced herself as a renter in the community, and wants to help serve HUNC.

Motion Made: Motion to approve Angel Izard as a stakeholder member of the Renters & Housing Committee for a 1 year term

Motion: George Skarpelos  Second: Matt Wait  Vote: Yes-11, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-1

Yes
Adam Miller  Andrew Chadsey  Brandi D’Amore  Erin Penner  George Skarpelos  Jeff Ramberg
Jim Van Dusen  Margaret Marmolejo  Matt Wait  Susan Swan  Tom Meredith

Ineligible
Violet Williams

D) Approval of Ellah Ronen as a stakeholder member of the Outreach Committee for a 1 year term

Ellah Ronen introduced herself as a renter in the community. She ran for an unclassified seat in the election. She congratulated Brandi on her win, and said she was happy to be here.

Motion Made: Motion to approve Ellah Ronen as a stakeholder member of the Outreach Committee for a 1 year term

Motion: George Skarpelos  Second: Tom Meredith  Vote: Yes-11, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-1

Yes
Adam Miller  Andrew Chadsey  Brandi D’Amore  Erin Penner  George Skarpelos  Jeff Ramberg
Jim Van Dusen  Margaret Marmolejo  Matt Wait  Susan Swan  Tom Meredith

Ineligible
Violet Williams

E) Approval of Jennifer Davis as a stakeholder member of the Outreach Committee for a 1 year term

George Skarpelos explained that Jennifer Davis has been coming to a lot of their meetings and giving great feedback. Ms. Davis said she was working with the new Grammercy Place project, and that she does outreach all day long. Because she’s talking with community members, she can also talk with them about why they should be at HUNC meetings and involved with them.

Motion Made: Motion to approve Jennifer Davis as a stakeholder member of the Outreach Committee for a 1 year term

Motion: George Skarpelos  Second: Erin Penner  Vote: Yes-11, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-1

Yes
Adam Miller  Andrew Chadsey  Brandi D’Amore  Erin Penner  George Skarpelos  Jeff Ramberg
Jim Van Dusen  Margaret Marmolejo  Matt Wait  Susan Swan  Tom Meredith

Ineligible
Violet Williams

7. Finance

A) Discussion of current fiscal year budget and possible motion for adjustment

Adam Miller explained that he could not generate an MER for this month. George Skarpelos explained that they had to change the MERs so they could change the wording to be more specific, and Mr. Miller explained that they had not removed the flags on the MER.

Mr. Miller brought up the current fiscal year budget on the projector, explaining that everything’s up to date, and that they’re waiting for the City Clerk’s office to remove the flag. He explained that they had bought plug-ins for the website, and the transactions were flagged because the plug-ins were made in foreign countries, and so a small fee was charged for the transactions. The flags should be off the MERs by next month. The Net Available should be closer to $8,000-$9,000 due to some items that have been approved, but the money hasn’t actually been spent. They should have about $3,000 a month for the next three months until they hit the end of the fiscal year.

B) Discussion and vote to approve pending Monthly Expense Report for submission

Tabled

C) Discussion and possible motion for HUNC to be a sponsor of the Hollywood Dell Civic Association Memorial Day Block
Board Meeting Monday, April 08, 2019, 6:30 PM

Party and fund up to $1,000 for various costs

George Skarpelos recused himself since his wife is the president of the Hollywood Dell Civic Association. Tom Meredith also recused himself. Mr. Skarpelos said that they have worked with the Dell for a while, and they have been at the Memorial Day Block Party for years.

Ms. Skarpelos explained that they have been doing the event for 12 years, and this is the 13th year. It's free, with live music and activities for kids. The signature piece of the event is the pet parade. The Council office has always been generous with helping out with rentals and permits, but the more support they get, the better. They do not make money off of the event, rather the event is a way of reaching out to get people to join the organization and pay voluntary dues to fund initiatives like neighborhood cleanup and beautification days. She clarified that they do sell tickets for the food for the event so they can know how much food will be necessary, and to fund the catering. Erin Penner added that HUNC has never supported the event financially, and Ms. Skarpelos clarified that they have never given any money to the neighborhood, and that the association feels that they’ve earned some support.

Ms. Penner then reviewed what the financial support from HUNC would pay for. Adam Miller also clarified that the reason they could support the purchase of ice was that the ice would be used strictly for keeping beverages cool, and was therefore not a consumable. Ms. Skarpelos added that they have tried to get as many items donated as possible, but that there are additional costs, and the event overall costs between $5,000-$6,000 each year.

Jim Van Dusen commented that these kinds of NPGs are excellent outreach avenues, and the more they can do things like this with neighborhood groups, the more beneficial it will be, especially for inter-neighborhood and inter-neighborhood council unity.

Ms. Skarpelos added that they try not to be too business-like, because the event is supposed to be fun, but it’s a great way to bring everyone together.

Motion Made: Motion for HUNC to be a sponsor of the Hollywood Dell Civic Association Memorial Day Block Party and fund up to $1,000 for various costs.

Motion: Erin Penner Second: Adam Miller Vote: Yes-9, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-2, Ineligible-1

Discussion and motion to approve up to $2,000 for the purchase of books for all students grades 3-6 at Cheremoya in conjunction with a Meet the Author series sponsored by the Punk Rock Marthas.

A stakeholder Angie introduced herself as a parent of a Cheremoya student. She had two book fairs there with authors, and has been purchasing books for Cheremoya for about 11 years. She has no children there now, but continues to support it as the only public school in HUNC. This year, the 2016 Caldecott winner came out to send students home with autographed copies of the book. These are books for the students and their home libraries. Unfortunately, for that event last month, they did not have enough time to meet with HUNC to ask for money. Every 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th grader would get an autographed book from a New York Times award-winning author as well as a presentation by the author under the funding provided by HUNC for this agenda item.

Adam Miller said that since they have about $3,000 a month for the next three months, they might want to go through and present all the items before voting on each one to make sure they don’t burn through money on the first two.

Brandi D’Amore asked if $2,000 was absolutely necessary, and if $1,000 would be helpful. Angie said that it was just a question of whether HUNC wants to support a program that continues to be successful in the only public school within their boundaries. George Skarpelos agreed, and thought that partnerships had to be recognized especially since Cheremoya had been so generous in accommodating HUNC in the past.

Margaret Marmolejo asked if the funding for CERT training would have to be covered by the $9,000 they would have left, and Mr. Miller clarified that since the funding had already been approved, it was already reflected in the $9,000 projected budget left.

Motion Made: Motion to approve up to $2,000 for the purchase of books for all students grades 3-6 at Cheremoya in conjunction with a Meet the Author series sponsored by the Punk Rock Marthas.
Motion: George Skarpelos  Second: Susan Swan  Vote: Yes-11, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-1

Yes
Adam Miller  Andrew Chadsey  Brandi D'Amore  Erin Penner  George Skarpelos  Jeff Ramberg
Jim Van Dusen  Margaret Marmolejo  Matt Wait  Susan Swan  Tom Meredith  Violet Williams

Ineligible

Discussion and possible motion to approve up to $500 for the National Tai Chi Chan Association to do a free beginners class for HUNC and all in our area who would like to come

Tabled: Margaret Marmolejo explained that the Tai Chi class wants to become better known in the area. Tai Chi is similar to yoga, but happens up at the Bronson entrance to Griffith Park, and they want to provide a free class to help neighbors and HUNC stakeholders to learn and explore. They have been here for 50 years in the community, and were interested in an NPG because they’re not funded by anyone but people who volunteer to donate. The class is every Saturday morning at the Bronson entrance and lasts for a couple hours. It was presented to the Arts committee of HUNC, and they thought they should have $500.

Brandi D'Amore added that she was at this meeting, and they had a very extensive budget and were specific in what they wanted. They also have a reciprocity that they will be putting HUNC on their literature and their website. They want to become much more a part of HUNC’s community.

Erin Penner asked if the $500 covered one class, and Ms. Marmolejo said it would be used for other important items. Ms. Penner asked if they’d submitted an NPG, and Adam Miller said that they had not.

Tom Meredith clarified that they need to avoid using the word “donation”. They do not provide public money, they buy things.

Jeff Ramberg asked, since they hadn't received an NPG, are they a non-profit they can legally give money to. Brandi D'Amore said that they asked the group to be here, and was surprised they weren’t.

Susan Swan said that before they support it, she would like to make sure that they are permitted to do this in the park. Mr. Skarpelos suggested that Ms. Marmolejo contact them again, have them come to a HUNC meeting with a budget and fill out an NPG.

Discussion and possible motion to approve up to $500 for the Justice for My Sister Collective for a program called The Art of Pitch which provides media based job training to youth, especially youth of color and LGBTQ status

Tabled: Margaret Marmolejo said that nobody from the group was present, but summarized that the group was new, roughly a year or two old, and they’d been doing work in Boyle Heights. They take donations from private individuals. The group helps individuals who don’t have the means to go to schools for training in camera operating, screen writing, etc. to get that training for free. The instructors actually work in the business and help the students get jobs in the industry. The money is to pay the instructors.

George Skarpelos said that he believes in supporting community groups, but that they really should be present to explain exactly what they’ll use the money for. Brandi D’Amore said that while their concept is good, they did not have clear plans as to what they wanted other than that they wanted to start a campus in HUNC that may or may not affect stakeholders, but were unable to specify what they would use the money for. HUNC has not received an NPG either.

George Skarpelos tabled the issue and told Ms. Marmolejo to contact them again to tell them to come to the next meeting.

Discussion and possible motion to approve up to $1,000 for patio set and equipment for Triangle Square/the LGBT Center

Tabled: Erin Penner said that they can table this as well since they are currently working on an NPG for the item. She explained that the center was the biggest low-income housing development for LGBT seniors.

8. PLUM Committee

A) Report by Committee Chair

B) Additional motion regarding 1931 N. Ivar Avenue (6407 Dix Street): Motion approved prior by HUNC and forwarded to the city planning department and applicant: Project: 1931 N. Ivar Avenue (6407 Dix Street). Review of project already
approved by HUNC due to changes requested by applicant. Prior approved HUNC motion submitted to the Planning Department: “Motion to approve with Condition: Project: 1931 N. Ivar Avenue (6407 Dix Street). 12-new single family homes with/attached 2-car garage per dwelling & 1-guest stall per small lot subdivision with a haul route for the export of 1,750 cy. Earth AND a 9-ft bldg. encroachment for proposed lots 1&2 of an ex. 33-ft bldg. line under Ord No. 126979; AND a request for waiver of street dedication(s). Action(s) Requested: 1. A “Vesting Tentative Trach Map 76049” for the construction of 12 new single family homes under the small lot ordinance with attached 2-car garage per dwelling and 1-guest stall, totaling 25 parking stalls with an haul route application for the export of 1,750 cy. of earth. 2. A Haul Route permit application for the removal and export of 1,750 cy. of earth. CONDITION: Haul route staging to be on-site as much as possible. 3. A 9-ft building encroachment for proposed lots 1&12 of an existing 33-ft building line under Ord No. 126979 along Dix Street. 4. A “Waiver of Dedication for By-Right Projects” for a 0-ft dedication on Ivar Avenue in lieu of 3-ft.”

Additional proposed motion regarding 1931 N. Ivar Avenue (6407 Dix Street): The additional actions requested by the applicant regarding this project are approved as follows:

Jim Van Dusen explained the 1931 N. Ivar Avenue project; it was a little unusual presentation in that the council has already approved the project, but Planning had asked for a couple of changes, so they appeared before PLUM to see if they were something they’d want to forward to the whole neighborhood council. The only issue is that the existing motion has already passed, but they are adding a motion for the changes to be reviewed for possible motion. He said that the project was by-right. The zoning administrator had a height issue and a street dedication issue. The project is on a slope, so the height is not always at 34 feet, and explained that the building’s entrances affect the by-right condition.

Secondly, the ZA wanted to widen the street, and PLUM did not approve part of the recommendation, but did approve street dedication waivers and a 9-ft dedication on Dix street in lieu of the 13-ft required. Plum recommends that they approve point one and point two of the motion.

Adam Miller thanked the developers for designing a project that actually looks nice rather than utilitarian, ugly boxes.

Stakeholder Ms. Skarpelos asked how the occupants will enter and exit and where they are going to park. Representative for the architects explained that they will have vehicular access off of Dix, and some of the houses coming off of Ivar will have personal access off of Ivar.

1. Building Heights from 30-ft to 34-ft. (No building goes above 33'-6'”), ZAA required on a technicality as access is taken from Dix Street (Limited Local Street) and not from Ivar Avenue (Hillside Limited Local)

Motion Made: Motion to support building Heights from 30-ft to 34-ft. (No building goes above 33'-6'”), ZAA required on a technicality as access is taken from Dix Street (Limited Local Street) and not from Ivar Avenue (Hillside Limited Local)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion:</th>
<th>Jim Van Dusen</th>
<th>Second:</th>
<th>Brandi D’Amore</th>
<th>Vote: Yes-12, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adam Miller</td>
<td>Andrew Chadsey</td>
<td>Brandi D’Amore</td>
<td>Danielle Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Ramberg</td>
<td>Jim Van Dusen</td>
<td>Margaret Marmolejo</td>
<td>Matt Wait</td>
<td>Susan Swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Violet Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Street Dedication waivers: Dix Street 9-ft in lieu of the 13-ft required

Motion Made: Motion to support Street Dedication waivers: Dix Street 9-ft in lieu of the 13-ft required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion:</th>
<th>Jim Van Dusen</th>
<th>Second:</th>
<th>Brandi D’Amore</th>
<th>Vote: Yes-12, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adam Miller</td>
<td>Andrew Chadsey</td>
<td>Brandi D’Amore</td>
<td>Danielle Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Ramberg</td>
<td>Jim Van Dusen</td>
<td>Margaret Marmolejo</td>
<td>Matt Wait</td>
<td>Susan Swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Violet Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Homelessness & Social Services Committee

A) Report by Committee Chair

B) Update on Hollywood Schrader Bridge Housing
Discuss the impact of homeless encampments around First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood and their pre-school and childcare programs, with a possible letter of support from HUNC for an ordinance requiring people experiencing homelessness to remain 500 feet from any school, pre-school or daycare facility, and with violations being punishable by felony charges.

Tabled: Stakeholder Mary noted that the characterization about what they’re here for in the agenda is not at all accurate. They are asking if LA needs a safe school zone. She is here representing the First Presbyterian Preschool, and the point is to ask HUNC to write to the relevant council offices requesting that the City Attorney draft an appropriate ordinance along the lines of the details presented to the board in an informational packet. They would like the council request the city council to write an ordinance giving a safe zone around schools, the size of which would be up to the city attorney. It should be a reasonable parameter. The exact nature of the schools it protects is also an issue, and they believe it should cover students up to 18 years old and cover public, charter, and private schools. The way of enforcement also needs to be valued by the city attorney. It needs to provide for a verbal notice to move on, then for escalating penalties depending on the number of times someone violates the safe zone. If you don’t have homeless people sleeping besides schools, they won’t be there at 6 AM, so they won’t be there when children get in at 8 AM. She thinks it is important that they address the safety of children.

Stakeholder Pam, director of the Presbyterian Preschool, introduced herself, saying the problem has grown over the last 5 years. Part of the problem is that their enrollment has grown from 150 kids to under 100, and looking at 60-70 children in the fall. She has reached out to Episcopal Schools of LA, and they are supporting this, as well as Cheremoya. They’re all having this problem and need to keep their children safe. The things they see every day are very disturbing: camping directly across the street from the school, fights on Yucca in front of the school, animals roaming around off leash, a gentleman beating a pit bull, and she would hate to see something happen to her students. The enforcement of the tents going down is not happening around them.

Stakeholder Elisa Strather introduced herself, saying she’d lived in the neighborhood for over 20 years. Her daughter goes to Hollywood Presbyterian, and the most concerning thing she’s seen is seeing fights on the side of the street, and people attacking her car. She doesn’t know what else to do, and if they could extend the motor home ordinance of 500 feet from schools to tents, that would be great.

Stakeholder Dawn introduced herself; her daughter goes to Hollywood Presbyterian and described how her daughter was grabbed by someone who was clearly mentally disturbed and screaming from under a blanket, and remains frightened. She wants the support of HUNC to expand the school safe zone.

Stakeholder Zigmas introduced himself as a parent with a daughter who currently attends HP, and says that it’s been a challenging environment, with his kids always asking about the homeless when they go to the school.

Stakeholder Melinda Carmen introduced herself, saying she has a daughter who goes to HP, and says that it’s been a challenging environment, with his kids always asking about the homeless when they go to the school.

Stakeholder John Billingsley introduced himself and explained that he worked for the Hollywood Food Coalition. He wanted to present another perspective, saying that they actually have made a 3-4% reduction in the homeless count by getting to know the community and getting them connected with services. When they send the community running with these kinds of attempts, they lose the ability to help them.

A stakeholder introduced herself as a founder of a homeless coalition who graduated from Hollywood Presbyterian, and said that it was a terrible thing that the children have been going through, but implored them to consider the city-wide implications of this possible ordinance. They are essentially restricting and limiting where homeless people can go, and the penalties they’re suggesting are problematic because they’re levying fines on people who cannot possibly pay them. She implores them to work with their SLO’s and the LAPD on the issue.

Stakeholder Kat introduced herself as an alumnus of the school as well, saying that they should be working with the police department, which they are, but a city-wide ordinance would have far-reaching implications. Because of vehicle-dwelling ordinances already they are limiting where people can live.
Stakeholder Joan Howard introduced herself as an advocate all over LA. She’s asking for practicality, saying that they can’t criminalize people because it denies them services that can help get them off the street. To do this is not the way to do it. It’s a revolving door, and nothing but musical chairs moving the homeless around.

Stakeholder Amy Quigley introduced herself as a director of community outreach for several homeless programs. They’re very much in support of housing; with the tent encampments, in the last year or two they’ve had so much activity from people in tents, and this is a possible route to go to tack on to the RV ordinance. It would govern tent encampments, not homeless people.

Stakeholder Lee Thompson said he opposed any sort of regulation here, and that it was doing nothing to solve the problem. It moves the problem further away, and there are things going on there; they need to enforce the regulations they already have. He has also noticed that when people work with homeless people there, they will clean up there stuff. But they can’t just ignore them and expect them to know what we want.

Shawn from CD13 said that he totally understand the parents’ issues; he drives and walks through the area all the time. When he became a field deputy he made a point of going through homeless encampments every morning to identify with the neighbors around them. It is a city-wide crisis with 34,000 people on the sidewalk every night in LA. The biggest solution is beds, housing, and shelters. That is the only way they’re going to get out of this crisis. The courts have time and time again have struck down ordinances they’ve tried to propose. He has spoken to their policy team, and the difference between the sidewalk and the public right of way in the vehicle lanes is that the city has a responsibility to keep streets clear for emergency vehicles, and people who sleep in their cars have millions of parking spaces to go, so they can regulate that. Also, a lot of the issues they’re dealing with are already illegal. He also emphasized the need for people to follow up LAPD calls through the system to make sure charges are pressed.

Stakeholder Alexa Skarpelos asked why laws aren’t being enforced, and Shawn said he would have to find that out. Ms. Skarpelos said that if the LAPD was ensuring every day from 6 AM to 9 AM that there weren’t homeless people on the sidewalks, a lot of the problems would go away, and she asked why they aren’t doing that.

Stakeholder Mike said that all of the stakeholders present would probably be willing to have that fight in court because they’re children’s safety is at stake.

Adam Miller explained that when it comes to the tents-up, tents-down, there is no teeth to the ordinance. If LAPD leaves after the person takes their tent down, they can put it back up and it doesn’t matter. The 9th Circuit Court of Appeal ruled on it just this week. One of the things is, it’s going to be city-wide, and the ordinance would lead to a city-wide patchwork of 500-foot radii.

Stakeholder Kat said that she thinks it’s important to try all avenues, and that a meeting with the councilmember’s, supervisor’s, and the SLO’s could be productive.

Stakeholder John Billingsley said that the problem with filing a lawsuit that they cannot win is that it costs and wastes money that could be used for resources for the homeless.

Shannon Prior said that she knows the issue is incredibly frustrating and stressful; she does defer to her colleague because most of the areas are not in her district, but she suggests meeting with the Captain of the Hollywood LAPD station. A stakeholder clarified that they had done that, and the LAPD were the ones who suggested the ordinance. Shannon Prior said that their goal should be to enable the LAPD to do what they need to do to enforce laws rather than pursuing the ordinance route. She explained that they cannot criminalize people sleeping on the sidewalks at night until they have places for those people to go.

Shawn also explained that the City is just one of the agencies, and they predominantly bring Sanitation and Law Enforcement resources, but they don’t do anything until the County brings their outreach resources.

Fernando Morales explained that he can’t speak to the enforcement side, but with the passing of Measure HHH and Measure H, they’ve taken a huge step forward, with over 20,000 people housed. He acknowledged that it does not resolve the very visceral issue that the stakeholders are experiencing, and that the idea of criminalizing tents is still potentially criminalizing homelessness. He can talk with Supervisor Kuehl’s office about mobilizing outreach teams to help not only with reaching out to the homeless, but also teaching parents how to talk about it with their children. He also explained that the county has taken steps to mitigate the outbreaks of diseases, and they have not had major outbreaks since those efforts.

Adam Miller said that when it comes to the verbiage on the actual paper, he apologized for any inaccuracies or misrepresentations. His personal opinion is, this is his bread and butter. The reason he brought the map of 500-ft radii around schools in the city, it takes up most of Hollywood, and he only did Hollywood, and that there are more dense areas with more schools like Koreatown. With the ordinance they’re talking about with people encamping on the right of way, it’s a completely different matter. If you look at the map, 500 feet will start shoving people into residential areas, and a lot of their bridge housing they wouldn’t be able to have people around it. Maybe there could be a look at the sidewalks directly adjacent the schools, that they might be able to do, but they would have to talk to the city attorney about it. Because everything is so nuanced and localized,
each population/area has to be treated individually. Also, the LAPD are not legislators or lawyers. Even with the potential adjacent sidewalk ordinance, they will get sued.

Matt Wait wanted to say that the stakeholders have definitely made themselves heard. He thinks everyone there is with them in feeling their frustration and pain; his personal concern with this particular solution is in addition to the issues Mr. Miller brought up, there could be a slippery slope effect, and it could set a bad precedent.

Jim Van Dusen said that one of the issues they’re fighting are that they are fighting communities that are fighting not to have shelters in them. Another issue they can’t lose sight of is that property development is driving a lot of this homelessness, and will increase folks being thrown out on the street. They’re working on changing the Hollywood community plan to increase low-income housing in new development projects. As far as enforcing the 500 ft ordinance, it would be very tough to enforce.

Brandi D’Amore said that in their area alone, there are red streets and yellow streets that restrict parking, so they have no place for these people to go. She explained that she does not drive and is a pedestrian, so she knows the problems around Gower quite well. She asked different schools in the area and their parents, and other parents are not experiencing this. They have an acute problem with having a residential neighborhood next to a freeway. Most schools do not have an encampment problem within 500 ft of them. She has a problem asking the city to make an ordinance that affects a significant group of parents only for one specific population of people.

Andrew Chadsey pointed out that a lot of what the homeless do in their tents are things that other people in the neighborhood do in their homes, only these people don’t have homes. There’s always a push and shove about, “I don’t want to see anything”, but also, “I don’t want tents”. The takeaway he got from Brian regarding the police time, it takes about half their shift to process someone, and in the history of LA they tried to force them into Skid Row and then they tried to arrest their way out of the problem, and it didn’t work. He thinks they should look at recommending a safe zone, but make it adjacent or open, and ask for more enforcement around schools having the problem.

Jeff Ramberg said that he was not sure how the enforcement was going to work, since they’re fining someone without any money, or arresting someone to either throw them in an overcrowded prison system or toss them out on the street with a record that will make it harder for them to access services to help homelessness. Also, the main LGBT homeless youth center is surrounded by three schools, so they would push the most at-risk populations away from the services that they need most.

Erin Penner acknowledged that it is an acute problem unique to this area, and so they need to work with the LAPD. It makes her uncomfortable to not talk about these people as human beings, and as a council, they would be saying to push them to other kids’ front yards and backyards.

Tom Meredith said that he is disappointed that they are dissuaded from asking the city clerk to write an ordinance to promote public safety. He would like to stick to the facts rather than fait accompli, and the facts are that someone has jumped the school fence, children have been terrified and physically accosted. All they are asking them to do is support to ask the city attorney to write an ordinance modeled on what has already been on the books. He gets the feeling that it is an either/or scenario, when they can continue to support housing and a strategy to work with the LAPD in addition to asking for an ordinance.

Susan Swan asked Mr. Miller if the reason the law was enforceable for the vehicles that the city had set up an area for them to go. Mr. Miller said that the ordinance sunsets, which means that at a specific point in time it won’t exist, and the city council has to re-vote on it. The hope was that they would be able to start safe parking programs, and Supervisor Kuehl’s office has done a great job of pushing that. Fernando Morales clarified that Safe Parking wasn’t involved in that.

Mr. Skarpelos said that at some point, they have to move something or do something about this, and thinks that 500 feet is unfair as a huge broad stroke across the city. But if you could say for schools there is a perimeter or frontage roads, is that something they could support. He took a quick straw poll of who could support it, to mixed response.

Ms. D’Amore asked if they could get the city attorney to legally address the stipulation about children. She would support a resolution/finding that asks the city attorney to pursue legal recourses on the specificity of children, education, and schools. She would prefer to see the law actually change.

Mr. Skarpelos suggested the motion could be that the city attorney report back with some kind of remedies that could safeguard children up to 12 in educational facilities.

Stakeholder Mary, responding to the age 12 thing, she believes high schoolers are just as vulnerable to drug use by the homeless around their schools. Ms. D’Amore clarified that the reason she limited the age scope was that it expanded the possible scope of the area where people could move.

Violet Williams said that she was going into high school and did not think that her or her peers were afraid of homeless people. She added that 15% of the homeless population use drugs, and the rest of the 85% just want to get off the street.
Stakeholder Billingsley said that they’re trying to squeeze through a motion in limited time, and that they should vote on the motion that’s been presented to them.

Mr. Skarpelos asked if they’d lost support for the idea of asking the city attorney to report back. Ms. D’Amore suggested “maximize the safety” instead of “safeguarding.”

Mr. Miller suggested if the stakeholders would be amicable to coming to their next Homelessness Committee meeting and meeting with the City Attorney to ask them questions. Mr. Skarpelos added that they have to figure out a way to make the stakeholders feel supported by HUNC and the community, and suggested they continue this discussion at the Homelessness committee, and possibly do a joint Homelessness/Board meeting, in conjunction with the city attorney and CD4 or CD13.

Stakeholder Pam, the director of the Hollywood Presbyterian preschool thanked the board for listening and for trying to work with them. They have been working on the issue for 2 years, and to the extent that they are emotional, it is because their kids are at risk.

Mr. Skarpelos tabled the issue for now, and Mr. Miller suggested they nominate a few stakeholders to come to the next Homelessness Meeting, but invited all to show up if they want.

Shawn apologized to Stakeholder Pam for being disconnected from the school, explaining that he had only recently taken over, and would be in contact.

D) Discussion and possible motion in support of a CIS for CF 19-0126 — 3210 and 3248 West Riverside Drive Crisis and Bridge Housing Program Facility:

Adam Miller explained that it was a council motion regarding an empty lot adjacent to the Griffith Park Adult Community Center. There is talk from Councilmember Ryu about putting a supportive housing project at the empty lot, and the CIS would be in support of this proposal. LFNC has already passed a motion and CIS in support of this, and Mr. Miller thinks that it is a great addition.

Susan Swan asked if it was still DWP land, and Mr. Miller clarified that there were multiple owners who would be working together.

Motion Made: Motion in support of a CIS for CF 19-0126 — 3210 and 3248 West Riverside Drive Crisis and Bridge Housing Program Facility: https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=19-0126
Motion: Adam Miller  Second: Erin Penner  Vote: Yes-11, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-1

E) Discussion and possible motion in support of a CIS for CF 14-1191-S1 — Long Term Strategy for Griffith Park Adult Community Club https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=14-1191-S1

Adam Miller explained that the proposal was a long-term strategy for GPACC to support exploring what happens after the previously mentioned piece of land is no longer utilized. Once the new facility finishes its end goal, what it would be utilized for, and potentially as a senior citizen community center.

Stakeholder Jerry wanted to clarify that it was completely within Griffith Park for the Bridge housing and the adult community center, and was in support of both issues. Mr. Miller said it would be expanding the parkland.

Motion Made: Motion in support of a CIS for CF 14-1191-S1 — Long Term Strategy for Griffith Park Adult Community Club https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=14-1191-S1
Motion: Adam Miller  Second: Jeff Ramberg  Vote: Yes-11, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-1

10. PS&EP Committee

A) Report by Committee Chair

Erin Penner said that the town hall with Hollywood Hills was very successful.
B) Presentation from Linc Gasking in regards to his emergency preparedness app “W4GL” with possible motion of support from HUNC

_Tabled: Linc Gasking was not present._

C) Discussion and possible motion in support of a CIS for CF 19-0002-S45 — AB 1788 (Bloom) / Second Generation Anticoagulant Rodenticides (SGARs) / Statewide Prohibition

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=19-0002-S45

_Stakeholder Gerry Hans from Friends of Griffith Park spoke about state bill AB 1788, which regulates the most potent anticoagulant rodenticides. They are thinking it will probably pass, but are not sure; their assemblymember Laura Friedman is very much on board supporting this. Councilmember Koretz filed a resolution to support AB 1788, so that gives them the chance to put in a CIS to support the resolution. This time, they actually have lobbyists in Sacramento who may help it pass. Mr. Hans has been trying to get letters of support from NGOs throughout southern California._

_Brandi D’Amore spoke on behalf of Andrew Chadsey, saying that he would be in support of it. Mr. Hans clarified that the first step is removing the problem by closing off areas and removing food. He reiterated that the second-generation ones have been taken off the shelves, but can be found online. The pest control companies are the real problem in using them routinely._

_Jeff Ramberg clarified that the anti-coagulants work their way through the food chain to poison other animals._

_Motion Made: Motion in support of a CIS for CF 19-0002-S45 — AB 1788 (Bloom) / Second Generation Anticoagulant Rodenticides (SGARs) / Statewide Prohibition https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=19-0002-S45

**Motion:** Jeff Ramberg  
**Second:** Andrew Chadsey  
**Vote:** Yes-11, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam Miller</td>
<td>Andrew Chadsey</td>
<td>Brandi D’Amore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Ramberg</td>
<td>Jim Van Dusen</td>
<td>Matt Wait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Transportation & Works Committee

A) Report by Committee Chair

B) Update on possible upgrades/beautification to CalTrans properties adjacent to Franklin and Vine offramp

_Brandi D’Amore explained that the CalTrans people said they would be stoning over an area by the tree at the Franklin and Vine offramp._

C) Presentation and discussion of Bird and its product

_Tabled: Bird representatives were not present._

D) Review and possible motion to approve a letter of support for the Ford Theater Viewing Trail to Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, Mayor Eric Garcetti, Councilmember David Ryu and other relevant officials:

_The Hollywood United Neighborhood Council wishes to extend our full support to the Ford Theater Trail for Hollywood Sign viewing. Our neighborhoods are some of the most popular areas for tourists to use as a way to experience the Hollywood sign, and as such are attracting a volume of people on narrow and substandard streets that proves challenging to control and manage. This has created a safety hazard for both residents and visitors alike. The Ford Theater Trail project will direct much needed modernization and viewing access to an alternative site, redirecting traffic to a more responsible and infrastructure rich location, hopefully alleviating some of the pressure being felt along our narrow canyon streets, increasing safety and providing a better viewing experience of the Hollywood Sign for all._

_Jeff Ramberg said that Jerry had been wanting to present an alternative to the Ford Theater Viewing Trail, and he passed around an alternative downsized project. Friend of Griffith Park and their consulting biologists have never advocated to kill the project, but they would like to promote the idea of spending less money. They can reap all the same benefits stated on this agenda they want to put in to the letter of support. Mainly, that they are creating a vista for the Hollywood sign._
By doing a downscaled plan, they’re reducing the environmental impacts tremendously. There was a biological survey done in 2013, the EIR was completed in 2014. He first heard about it in Fall 2014 from Councilmember LaBonge. They didn’t worry about it too much since funding was a big problem. In 2016, the county got funds from a state fund designed to buy and protect mountain lion and endangered species habitat. In 2016, they floated the idea of downsizing the project, then in 2018 CD4 matched the previous 250,000 with some 1290 fund money, which was turned down by the discretionary funds committee.

The downsizing would not affect the vista portion, and the Hollywood sign would still be part of this trail. But the environmental reason for doing this is that there are sensitive floral species, the south way has a much higher potential for meandering off-trail. It also contains another tower which they consider to be an attractive nuisance.

George Skarpelos asked if anyone was interested in supporting this alternate, downsized plan. Susan Swan asked if the Dell had taken a position on it, and Mr. Skarpelos said that he does not think they did. Ms. Swan clarified that the Dell was not properly notified at first of the proposal, and she supports the downsized proposal.

Fernando Morales said that there is still a shortfall on the funding for the project, but in 2020 they expect Parks funding and another pool of funding. They’ve been talking with Ford Theater and they’ve been generous in accommodating potential construction.

Matt Wait said that the only issue he had in the proposal is that it eliminates a trailhead, which would eliminate parking and therefore restrict access to the trail, when it is designed to increase legal access to mitigate pedestrian traffic through residential areas. Mr. Skarpelos clarified that they can still park in both parking lots, but they can walk to the access point.

Jim Van Dusen asked if the loop would not interfere with two potential DWP parcels, and Mr. Hans explained that the idea of the loop going through those parcels died in 2012. He added that they were talking about connectivity of wildlife, so it would be a shame if it did end up happening.

Andrew Chadsey asked if they know if there’s any other purpose the southern trail they’re getting rid of was going to serve. Jeff Ramberg explained that there’s an additional view point, and that hikers like loops so they don’t have to backtrack. Mr. Chadsey also asked to clarify if there was no view of the Hollywood sign from the trail that they were getting rid of, which was confirmed.

Brandi D’Amore asked if Mr. Hans could explain what kind of environmental damage the initial proposed trail could do. He has a shortlist of flora species, including class 1c California native plants that are flourishing in the area more than anywhere else.

Adam Miller asked Mr. Morales if he knows if the bottom of the trail was intended to be an exit route for the trail. Mr. Morales said that the northern part of the trail has most of the parking, so it would be the logical entrance. The northern part was also handicap accessible. Mr. Miller asked, if they did include the Southern part, if the sidewalk would be widened, and how they would get back to their original point.

Danielle Paris asked if the trail would provide access to people who want to hike to the cross, and Mr. Hans said that there is a "user trail" that is technically no trespassing, but people still go on it.

Mr. Skarpelos asked if the board wants to support the entire trail as it exists now, or the modified trail proposed by Mr. Hans. He said that his neighbors would probably prefer not to have the southern portion. The board agreed to support the modified loop.

Motion Made: Motion to approve a letter of support for the Ford Theater Viewing Trail modified as drawn by stakeholder Jerry Hanz to eliminate the southern trailhead. To Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, Mayor Eric Garcetti, Councilmember David Ryu and other relevant officials.

Motion: George Skarpelos  Second: Susan Swan  Vote: Yes-8, No-2, Abstain-1, Recused-0, Ineligible-0

Yes
Andrew Chadsey  Susan Swan
Brandi D’Amore  Erin Penner  George Skarpelos  Jim Van Dusen  Matt Wait
No
Adam Miller  Danielle Paris
Abstain
Jeff Ramberg

12. Outreach Committee

A) Report by Committee Chair

Erin Penner said that they had discussed the success of tabling, and whether it is a successful method of outreach. They said they were going back to the HUNC in the Park idea. There was general agreement that Outreach needs more bodies to implement ideas.
13. Non Profit, Arts & Education Committee

A) Report by Committee Chair

14. Renters and Housing Issues Committee

A) Report by Committee Chair

Matt Wait said that they talked about potentially sending a HUNC delegation to Villa Carlotta who had extended an invitation, and that they should discuss whether to go as representatives of HUNC or as private citizens. Brandi D’Amore thought they should go as a delegation. Susan Swan thought that they’d taken a lot of positions related to the Villa, and that Ms. D’Amore can speak to issues they’d already taken positions on.

Mr. Wait continued by saying that they would probably have a few CIS’s for the next meeting, and that they were working on mapping apartments that they have data for in the area. The Renters Issues Survey is going to have a draft ready soon.

15. Board Member announcements on items not on the Agenda

Brandi D’Amore suggested that there needs to be some addressing of attendance issues for next meeting, not just for full board meetings but for committee meetings. George Skarpelos said he thought that it was incumbent on committee chairs to send out emails seeing who was available. According to the bylaws, notice has to be 24 hours in advance if they are not able to meet. He added that they don’t have an attendance requirement for committees, but suggested that they bring it up for bylaws.

16. Old/Ongoing Business

17. New/Future Business

Adjournment at 10:09 PM

Reconsideration: The Board may reconsider and amend its action on items listed on the agenda if that reconsideration takes place before the end of the meeting at which it was considered or at the next regular meeting. The Board, on either of these two days, shall: (1) Make a Motion for Reconsideration and, if approved, (2) hear the matter and take an action. If the motion to reconsider an action is to be scheduled at the next meeting following the original action, then two items shall be placed on the agenda for that meeting: (1) A Motion for Reconsideration on the described matter and (2) a [Proposed] action should the motion to reconsider be approved. A Motion for Reconsideration can only be made by a Board member who has previously voted on the prevailing side of the original action taken. If a Motion for Reconsideration is not made on the date the action was taken, then a Board member on the prevailing side of the action must submit a memorandum to the Recording Secretary identifying the matter to be reconsidered and a brief description of the reason(s) for requesting reconsideration at the next regular meeting. The aforesaid shall all be in compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act.