Welcome

6:34 PM start

1. Roll Call

Attending

Susan Swan  Tom Meredith  Sheila Irani  George Skarpelos  Jim Van Dusen  Erin Penner
Brandi D’Amore  Matt Wait  Andrew Chadsey  Michael Connolly  Robert Morrison  Tony Zimbardi
Bianca Cockrell  Theresa Gio

Excused

Luis Saldivar  Coyote Shivers  Margaret Marmolejo  Fouzia Burfield  Marshall Cobb  Maureen Diekmann

2. Review and possible motion to approve the 2021-2022 Fiscal Year Administrative Packet

Motion Made: Motion to approve the 2021-2022 Fiscal Year Administrative Packet

Motion: Sheila Irani  Second: Tom Meredith  Vote: Yes-13, No-0, Abstain-1, Recused-0, Ineligible-0

Yes

Bianca Cockrell  Brandi D’Amore  Erin Penner  George Skarpelos  Jim Van Dusen  Matt Wait
Michael Connolly  Robert Morrison  Sheila Irani  Susan Swan  Theresa Gio  Tony Zimbardi

Abstain

Andrew Chadsey


Erin clarifies what the letter is about and gives a very brief synopsis of the Zoo incident. George read the letter out loud as well as a letter to the board from Sarah Tandberg, a letter to the Oaks HOA from Sarah Tandberg/CD4 office, and a letter to HUNC from Ground Game.

A stakeholder from Oaks HOA says that the letter/response she received from Sarah Tandberg was in fact different from the letter Sarah forwarded to George.

Sam says that safety, fires and transparency is crucial to stakeholders and he is grateful we are having this meeting. He says that there is a video of Tabatha Yelos in a video saying “All cops are bastards”, and Councilmember Raman has not denounced this behavior.

Rudy says that we need to embrace some tough love with unhoused people and that this is a public safety issue. He says we cannot allow camping in Griffith Park and we need to find a better place to house the homeless.

Caleb feels this letter is profoundly incorrect and would recommend it be avoided. He thinks the claims against Raman are unsubstantiated.

Kay is concerned about the Ground Game director. She feels there should be a larger discussion with Ground Game to have some
clarification on these issues and that has not happened.

Missy Kelly says the issue is not Ground Game or who wrote the letter. She says the issue is that everyone could die if the park goes up in flames.

Annie G. says that this issue is definitely a public safety concern and it’s also for the protection of the unhoused community. She feels Raman also really needs to take a leadership role and her staff cannot do things while saying they’re representing her.

Kate says that she was on the ground and this letter has false and misleading information. She says that she has videos to prove that this information is false. She is also concerned that the letter is libelous against Ashley Bennett.

Kristina, President of Lake Hollywood HOA, says rangers need to feel safe to do their job without aggression from city employees. She also says that absolutely none of this should have happened regardless of who is being named in the letter.

Steven on behalf of Argyle Civic says that they support the letter, it is even tempered and appropriate.

John P. who was also on the ground at the encampment site says that the LA Times article was full of misinformation and he feels Chief Losorelli lied multiple times. He says that kids were throwing firecrackers by the Old Zoo all day and no one cared. He also says that Ashley Bennett never claimed that she worked for CD4.

Caroline S. speaking on behalf of the Oaks HOA feels the political tone of this discussion is wrong. She says her neighborhood borders on the park and this is very dangerous and the HOA fully supports sending this letter.

Kristina says that Lake Hollywood HOA also supports this letter.

Scott M. says that he encourages us to send the letter as is as nothing is slander. He feels Ground Game’s letter should not be intimidating whatsoever. He says no one should say they didn’t feel they weren’t invited to any meetings as they are all public and no one gets special invites. He feels we need answers from the CD4 office.

Wendy from the Hollywood Dell says she’s more concerned with the in-fighting between Ground Game and CD4 and it’s an upsetting personality conflict. She feels Ground Game should step back and listened to what stakeholders are afraid of in regards to fire.

George shows letter from Christine Mills O’Brien from the Hollywoodland Homeowners Association.

Matt says that it sounds like Raman does not support camping in parks and it seems the office has addressed the issue and it feels like a political ploy. He feels this letter is the reason people are making it political.

Jim feels the point about Ayman Ahmed could be left out of the first paragraph. He feels the history of Ms. Bennett at LAHSA should be left out and he thinks some of the letter is a political statement and it could also be left out.

Theresa feels we have a couple of options: She thinks we first no longer have to send the letter as the office already received it. She says we could also remove names before sending and make sure we have facts before we send the letter out.

Sheila says that each HOA and Civic Association is in favor of this letter and so is she. She feels it’s absolutely a public safety issue and we need to be clear about conflicts of interests. She does not want this letter hushed, silenced, or not sent.

Robert says he can’t support the letter as it’s written tonight but he does support a letter that helps the elected officials hear the views of all stakeholders.

Michael feels we should leave out Ayman and Ashley Bennett, but we should include Tabatha as she works directly CD4. Michael says that he had no idea there was even a Recall Nithya campaign and it didn’t even happen until after we wrote the letter.

Tom feels we should remove the beginning and respectfully request a public statement from Councilmember Raman. He also feels we need a statement about Raman’s ties with Ground Game and a conflict of interest with her and staff members.

Erin says that she completely agrees with Robert’s comments and that we often gloss over the potential environmental impact and having this many people camping in the park would have a major environmental impact.

Andrew feels the letter should stand the way it is and it’s very concerning that the CD4 office isn’t here as well as the rangers. He says that these are absolutely not political issues and this is a very, very dangerous situation.

Matt would support a letter that just reiterates our concerns of fire safety and that is it.

George feels the tone of this letter shouldn’t name names. He feels it should say that staff participated and this action shouldn’t be
tolerated and the staff should act in a legal way. He also feels naming Ground Game LA takes this outside and that’s not the point. He feels if Ground Game wants to go to the park and protest, that is their right but staff should be mindful of conflicts of interest.

Motion Made: Motion to approve the letter as written during the meeting and send to CD 4 and other relevant agencies for requested action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion: Sheila Irani</th>
<th>Second: Tom Meredith</th>
<th>Vote: Yes-12, No-1, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Chadsey</td>
<td>Brandi D’Amore</td>
<td>George Skarpelos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Morrison</td>
<td>Sheila Irani</td>
<td>Jim Van Dusen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Erin Penner</td>
<td>Tom Meredith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Susan Swan</td>
<td>Michael Connolly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjournment at 9:50 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.