

**Neighborhood Council Valley Village
Board Meeting
07-28-04**

Approved 08-25-04, 11-0

The meeting was called to order by NCVV President Peter Sanchez at 6:33 pm.

Mr. Sanchez welcomed the audience in attendance and thanked the Board and public for their participation in the NCVV. Mr. Sanchez gave a brief background of the Neighborhood Council process and history, and informed the audience members of the process to speak during public comment portions of the agenda, or to any item on the agenda at the point during which the item was in discussion.

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order, Roll Call and Welcoming Remarks. Mr. Sanchez asked the secretary to call roll. Board members in attendance were: Mr. Tony Braswell (residential renter), Ms. Ginny Hatfield (community senior organization), Mr. Paul Hatfield (at large), Ms. Jody Hidey (residential homeowner), Mr. Walter Katz (residential renter), Mr. Greg O'Connor (education), Mr. Tom Paterson (residential renter), Mr. Nick Pool (business), Ms. Breice Reiner (community service organization), Mr. Peter Sanchez (residential homeowner), Mr. Stuart Simen (business), Dr. Daniel Wiseman (faith based). Board member excused absent was Ms. D.J. Harner (cultural organization). Absent Board members were Ms. Ann Hull (business representative) and Mr. Chris Pechin (residential homeowner).

Mr. Sanchez asked the secretary to call the agenda posting roll for the May meeting. Beth Hillel Temple, (Mr. Simen), yes; Shaarey Zedek Congregation, (Dr. Wiseman), yes; The Hemster, (Ms. Hidey), yes; East Valley Senior Center, (Ms. Hatfield), yes; Jon's Market, (Mr. O'Connor), yes; Steven's Nursery, (Mr. Simen), yes; Valley Photo, (Ms. Hull), absent; Marie et Cie, (Mr. O'Connor), yes; Bank of America, (Mr. Braswell), yes; Botique Voila, (Ms. Hull), absent; 7-11, (Mr. Pool), yes; Newspapers, (Ms. Reiner), yes.

Agenda Item 2 – Approval of Minutes. The minutes of the June meeting were sent by email to the Board, and copies were available for the public at the meeting. *A motion was made by Dr. Wiseman to accept the minutes and seconded by Mr. Pool. The minutes were approved by a vote of 12-0.*

Agenda Item 3 – Chairman's Comments, Introduction of Distinguished Guests. Mr. Sanchez reminded the Board of the need to "move around" the agenda to accommodate some of the guest speakers, and asked that the agenda move to item 4, public comment.

Agenda Item 4 – Public Comment on Agenda Items. Mr. Sanchez introduced Lori Dinkin, President of the Valley Village Homeowners Association. Ms. Dinkin thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. She stated that she was contacted by Dianne Trion from Wendy Greuel's office, and that they would re-do the center aisle at Highway 101 exit, the entrance to Valley Village. Originally a 4 ½ foot Welcome "marker" sign

was requested, as was different vegetation. This would be corrected by Ms. Greuel's office. There will be a meeting August 11 at Ms. Greuel's office involving the city's landscape architect. Ms. Dinkin and Mr. Paterson will attend the meeting. Ms. Reiner stated she will attend as well. Ms. Dinkin added that this meeting was contingent on the completion of issues related to the carwash located on Laurel Canyon. She then stated she was leaving the NCVV Board meeting to attend an inclusionary zoning meeting as part of a valley coalition.

There were no further public comments, and Mr. Sanchez thanked Ms. Dinkin for her involvement and asked that the agenda move to item 9f.

Agenda Item 9f – Gateway Sign for Valley Village. Mr. Sanchez asked Ms. Hatfield if this answer met her request for information. She stated that it did. Ms. Hatfield asked if the Board could comment on adding banners to utility poles within Valley Village. Mr. Paterson asked if the NCVV could “adopt” the underpass at Highway 101 at the entrance to Valley Village. Mr. Sanchez stated the idea was good, but asked if it was allowed by the City. Mr. Paterson felt it might be a question for CalTrans, and agreed to follow up with them and report back to the Board.

Mr. Sanchez responded to Ms. Hatfield's question by distributing information on a company that currently contracts with the City of Los Angeles to produce utility pole banners. Ms. Reiner stated that the original intent of these banners was public service information, not for-profit advertising. Mr. Katz stated that approximately 18-20 months prior there was a case of advertising “creep” toward commercial endorsement, which violated the intent of the banners. It seemed to “peak” with banners for The Emmy awards. These banners are currently being monitored to ensure they are marketing the non-profit intent without inappropriate corporate sponsorship.

Mr. Sanchez asked who NCVV Board members should contact if they find any banner content objectionable? Mr. Paterson stated the call should be placed to The City Cultural Affairs office.

Agenda Item 8 – Reverend Dan Clark. Mr. Sanchez introduced Reverend Dan Clark from the First Presbyterian Church of North Hollywood. Rev. Clark thanked the Board for their involvement with NCVV, and stated that the church had been supportive of the process from the beginning meetings, adding that the church has made available and continues to offer space for NCVV meetings. Rev. Clark introduced Joe Gallagher, chair of the church's building committee. Together they presented plans for renovation of the church main sanctuary. Rev. Clark reminded the Board that the original sanctuary was damaged beyond repair in the 1994 Northridge earthquake. The new sanctuary will seat 300, and replace two buildings currently on the campus. Blueprints were shown to the Board.

Rev. Clark demonstrated that great effort had been made to create a building that fits in with the architecture of the community. Within the building would be a sanctuary, 2 offices, and a reception area. The church wants to be a part of the community. Rev.

Clark stated that the new plans will not increase parking requirements or spaces available, and that all demolition would be by hand with no mechanical effort. The church building committee is currently discussing whether to use wood or steel construction. They have not submitted their application for construction. The next step is to proceed to the zoning committee for an extension of the church's conditional use permit, then to the architect for final drawings, then to the city for permits. The construction is planned to be debt free.

Ms. Dinkin stated that the presentation has been well received by the Homeowners Association. Mr. Paterson asked what needed approval? Rev. Clark replied that the church has been operating with a conditional use permit for 61 years. The old sanctuary exceeded the 36 foot height restriction of the site plan. There are also setback issues. At this time an R-1 zoning exists but this was not so in the original property use. Ms. Hatfield stated that the Senior Center operates at this location, and asked if current parking will be restricted during construction. Rev. Clark said some parking will be displaced during construction. Mr. Sanchez asked if anything was really needed from NCVV? Rev. Clark stated that a letter of support would be very helpful.

Mr. Paterson motioned that NCVV approve a letter of support for the project. Ms. Hidey seconded the motion. The motion was approved 11-0. Mr. Paterson stated he would produce the letter for Mr. Sanchez's signature.

Rev. Clark asked that the letter be addressed to the corporate parent. Mr. Sanchez asked for clarity of the name of the church. Rev Clark replied that the church has officially changed their name to Faith Presbyterian Church of Valley Village. Mr. Sanchez thanked Reverend Clark for including Valley Village in the church name.

Agenda Item 9b1 – Car Wash. Mr. Robert Lamishaw was introduced by Mr. Sanchez. Mr. Sanchez then gave a verbal background on the issue to the audience. Mr. Lamishaw thanked the Board for their ongoing attention to the Laurel Canyon site issue and reiterated that the introduction by Mr. Sanchez was correct. The original plans for the site were “over-done” for the space. The property owners have come before the NCVV Board to propose an alternative use as a self-storage facility. Mr. Lamishaw presented the plans to the Board. He noted that the above ground area used by the facility will be very similar to the original plan, and the building will be constructed to appear to be a three-story office building with faux windows and a total ground to roof height of 34 feet. The public entrance will be on the side of the property. There will be an architectural element that extends to 38 feet. There will be one-way traffic circulation. A median on Laurel Canyon will limit access to southbound traffic only.

Ms. Reiner asked if the faux windows would be glass. Yes. There will, however, be no light from the inside or no view onto adjacent property. The other materials used for construction will be concrete and stucco.

Ms. Hatfield asked if there would be office space for the administration of the storage space? Yes. Ms. Reiner asked if there were examples of similar building techniques that NCVV Board members could see. Mr. Lamishaw directed the Board to a storage facility on Ventura, and mentioned that he distributed pictures of the Ventura facility at the June meeting. Mr. Paterson stated there is a storage facility on Santa Monica Boulevard that is well designed. Mr. Pool asked how many stories would be in the building? Five. Three above ground and two below ground. How many square feet? 83,000 square feet. Mr. Pool asked for more information on the selection of the architectural style. Mr. Lamishaw stated that the office style fit more with the area building design than the apartment style presented as an alternative plan. Mr. O'Connor asked if there was any motor gate at the access? No. Mr. Katz asked the distance from the back of the building to the west wall? 20' clearance, a 5' planter, and a 1' wall. Mr. Pool asked if the footprint would be moved? It will be moved 18" forward to accommodate the plan. Mr. Katz asked if there has been any contact with neighboring residences regarding their line of site to the east. Mr. Paterson stated he hand-walked flyers to the homes in the area. Mr. Katz asked if the flyer indicated the height of the building? Yes.

Ms. Reiner asked if more detailed drawings would be presented to the Board as the project proceeds? Yes. Mr. Lamishaw will stay in touch with the Board as the project proceeds.

Mr. Braswell asked if the architectural element presented in the plan which exceeds the height limit of the site plan is acceptable? Mr. Paterson stated that exceptions for architectural elements are permitted.

Mr. Simen asked what signage will be used for the building. Mr. Lamishaw expects there will be a sign at the very top of the building.

Mr. O'Connor asked if there would be a parapet on the building? Mr. O'Connor explained that a parapet is the architectural feature which disguises any equipment which would otherwise be visible on the roof of the building. Mr. Lamishaw stated there would be parapet materials on the building. He further stated that the Board could request that the project plans include a provision for no visible rooftop equipment.

Mr. Sanchez asked if there would be any significant changes in the plans once the Board took action? No. Ms. Hatfield asked what type of trees would be used. Mr. Paterson explained that should be part of the overall plan. Mr. O'Connor clarified that the drawings currently before the Board would be about the most detailed that could be presented, and there would not be more detailed presentations that could be made.

Mr. Lamishaw left the architectural drawings with the Board as an exhibit (marked and dated clearly by Mr. Katz) for his presentation. Mr. Pool asked if Mr. Lamishaw would be seeking specific variances? Mr. Lamishaw stated the height variance for the architectural feature is an example of the type of variance they would be seeking. Mr. Sanchez asked if there would be a land use variance? Yes. Mr. Lamishaw added that there are many exceptions that will be needed for the project.

Mr. Paterson stated that it was his opinion that the project had been properly amended, the presentation well made, and improvements sought related to landscaping had been committed. Mr. Sanchez asked if the homeowners association had reviewed the proposal? Mr. Paterson and Ms. Dinkin replied yes. Ms. Dinkin asked if there would be subterranean issues with the Los Angeles River? Mr. Lamishaw stated that this was not an issue he was qualified to address, but he was certain there was a geologic assessment by engineers that would be a part of the project. Ms. Dinkin stated that the Homeowners Association preferred the office building design for the project.

Mr. Katz asked if the subterranean spaces would be accessed by elevator or vehicle? Elevator. Is there a specific list of variances that has been put together? No. Mr. Lamishaw further stated that if the Board did not approve the concept it would not be necessary to identify variances that would be needed.

Mr. Pool asked if any of the exceptions that would be needed are “controversial?” Mr. Lamishaw replied “Not that I’m aware of.” Ms. Reiner stated that NCVV would want to see that list of exceptions as the project moves forward, and the NCVV Board should reserve the right to ameliorate its decision. Mr. Paterson stated there would be appropriate opportunity to do that during public hearings.

Mr. Paterson motioned that NCVV endorse the concept of public storage for the Laurel Canyon site, and that the drawings submitted by Robert Lamishaw and marked exhibit A in the July NCVV Board minutes be the basis of the project design and that there be no visible roof top equipment. Ms. Hatfield seconded the motion. She asked that an amendment be added that NCVV specify that the office design was selected, and that we approve the plan for the office design and landscaping. Mr. Paterson accepted the amendment.

Mr. Katz, during discussion on the motion, stated he was uncomfortable that the motion included no language regarding any variance from the specific plan, adding that “we are glossing over the specific requirements.” He further stated that the NCVV Board has been very consistent with its enforcement of the specific plan and that effort should continue.

Mr. Paterson asked if it may be worthwhile to recognize in the motion that there will be exceptions to the specific plan? *He then motioned a second amendment stating the current project, as proposed, will be subject to multiple specific plan exceptions that will be addressed by this Board in public meetings.*

Mr. Lamishaw stated his concern that the project will require many exceptions, and if there are any community objections to the owner’s ability to request and expect approval for the exceptions it could “kill the project.” Mr. Paterson replied that NCVV is negotiating in good faith and that should be noted by the owner. Mr. Katz asked for a review of the timeframe related to the project. Mr. Lamishaw felt that if he received approval of NCVV Board at this meeting, he would file for permits within 2-4 weeks, there would be an environmental hearing within 4-5 months, a second environmental

hearing a month later, and action on the request 2 months after that. That would of course be discretionary approval. He felt the entire process would be 6 – 8 months.

Mr. Katz and Mr. Simen expressed their concern about lack of NCVV involvement in the public hearing process. Mr. Katz went on to express his concern that the Board was lending their approval to the project without full knowledge of what the exceptions to the plan would be. He again reminded the Board of their strong history protecting the specific plan for Valley Village.

Mr. Lamishaw asked the Board to “buy into” the concept of the proposal and support it, and at some future time review all of the specific plan exceptions. He further stated that if the owner has to wait for final concepts and drawings to bring to NCVV, then the input of the Board is meaningless and NCVV has no participation in the planning process.

There was then a discussion among the Board as to the purpose of the specific plan, and the need for the Board to remain active in the process of all proposed projects. Mr. Lamishaw interjected, as the representative of an owner seeking approval of a project, “If I am going to have to fight you it would be better to do that in the development or the planning process.”

Ms. Reiner asked if NCVV approved the project as presented, would the Board be giving up its right to object later? Mr. Paterson replied that from a practical standpoint we do not want to give approval and then retract that later. We should expect that there will be exceptions that will be addressed as the project proceeds. We are approving the concept. Mr. Katz reiterated that, even with approval, if the NCVV Board disagrees with the project direction later in the process it could “kill” the project. Mr. Lamishaw said that was correct.

Mr. Simen called the question. Mr. Katz asked for clarification on exactly what Mr. Lamishaw was asking of the Board? He replied that he is seeking approval of the plan with expectation of exceptions that would involve feedback of the Board at future dates. After further discussion, Ms. Hatfield withdrew her second of the original motion, as well as her amendment. Mr. Simen then seconded the motion as well as the amendment. The President called for a vote.

Mr. Braswell restated the motion: *NCVV endorses the concept of public storage for the Laurel Canyon site, and that the drawings submitted by Robert Lamishaw and marked Exhibit A in the July NCVV Board minutes be the basis of the project design and that there be no visible roof top equipment, with an amendment that NCVV specify that the “office design” was selected, and that we approved the plan for the office design and landscaping, along with a second amendment stating the current project, as proposed, will be subject to multiple specific plan exceptions that will be addressed by this Board in public meetings.*

Mr. Katz asked that the vote be a roll call vote. Voting in the affirmative were Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Simen, Mr. Katz, Mr. Pool, Mr. Braswell, Ms. Reiner, Mr. Sanchez, and

Mr. Paterson. No Board members voted no. Four Board members abstained, Ms. Hidey, Ms. Hatfield, Dr. Wiseman and Mr. O'Connor. The motion was approved 8-0-4. Dr. Wiseman requested a point of order, asking the parliamentarian, Mr. Simen, what an abstention vote meant. Mr. Simen stated that an abstention vote is not a vote in favor or opposition of the motion, but a vote where a member does not wish to take a position one way or the other. Dr. Wiseman stated that in fact an abstention is tacit approval of a motion, and merely states that the Board member does not wish to register their vote at this time.

Mr. Paterson asked Mr. Lamishaw if this was an acceptable vote for his client. He replied No, that he would inform his client that there is still some reservation at the NCVV Board level. Mr. Lamishaw asked for a letter from the Board officially stating the NCVV action. Mr. Braswell will send the letter to Mr. Sanchez for him to forward to Mr. Lamishaw.

Agenda Item 6 – Treasurer’s Report. Mr. Hatfield distributed a spreadsheet detailing the first quarter financial activity for NCVV. He stated that a formal action was need from the Board to approve the next quarter’s funding, and relevant expenses for National Night Out. The original motion approved in March did not specify and amount, as required by DONE. *Mr. Hatfield motioned that the current fiscal year first quarter budget be approved for \$12,500. Dr. Wiseman seconded. The motion was approved 11-0.*

Mr. Hatfield reported that the Board spending process was working appropriately. Approximately \$2500 has been spent on National Night Out. Two of the three spending categories have expenses – operating and outreach – and improvements have planned expenses in the future. Ms. Hatfield asked if the funding for National Night Out is outreach expenses, and Mr. Hatfield replied yes, the funds were for outreach. Mr. Hatfield explained that as the Board is now spending money, we should take care to use the prepaid card provided by the city. It functions as a credit card (purchases up to \$1000) or a debit card (for cash advances). If budgeted approved expenses are to be incurred, Mr. Hatfield asked that the Board contact him to secure the card. If the expenses are greater than \$1000 there will need to be a check requisition to the City. If cash is needed Mr. Hatfield will get cash from the petty cash account and give that to a Board member. Ms. Hatfield asked how long it takes to secure a cash advance? Mr. Hatfield said the city stated they will do it quickly, but expect that it will be time consuming. NCVV is limited to \$500 per month cash advance on the card, and it should be used as petty cash. Also, Mr. Hatfield pointed out that any transaction with a vendor will require city mandated vendor qualification forms. All will be part of the planning/budget process on any project and should be coordinated with Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Paterson asked how much discretion the Board maintains over spending? He stated he would like to purchase a “property owned” database for Valley Village. Mr. Hatfield reminded the Board that any project that falls into the project categories established by the Board and has an approved budget can be funded by NCVV funds. Once approved the Board member(s) responsible for any program should come to Mr. Hatfield with their

expense budget to ensure adequate and timely funding. Mr. Paterson will submit his request to the Board at the August meeting.

Mr. Pool raised questions about the financial report submitted to the Board by Mr. Hatfield, and Dr. Wiseman asked that the report be tabled until the Board had time to review. Mr. Hatfield stated the report was not submitted for Board action but for Board information. The current financial statement as of June 30 should be approved by the Board, and at the end of the quarter a summary report will be submitted to the Board for approval. This will occur at the September Board meeting. He thanked the Board for their patience as we are in the first year of our Board and financial development and we are working through process issues as well.

Mr. Hatfield motioned that the financial statement of June 30, 2004 be approved by the Board. The motion was seconded by Dr. Wiseman. The motion was approved 12-0.

Mr. Katz left the meeting at 8:15.

Dr. Wiseman asked to be allowed to introduce Deanna Tryon, with Councilwoman Wendy Greuel's office; and Deanna Stevenson with DONE. Dr. Wiseman also introduced Diana Lipari, representing Citizens Organized for Smart Transit (COST). Ms. Lipari thanked the Board for the opportunity to present her organization's effort to halt the construction of The MTA Orange Line. COST has filed legal action to halt the construction of The Orange Line in favor of Multiple Rapid Bus Routes. COST feels this would be a much better use of funds, and more environmentally sound. It also would be in their opinion, a better transportation solution. It would also improve origin to destination times, which in this project have been understated by MTA at 22 minutes. Since COST feels the Board of Supervisors never considered alternatives to The Orange Line, COST is legally requesting an immediate halt to the project. She stated that Board members, as citizens, need to be concerned about the project. She drew comparisons to similar projects in Houston and Miami. In particular she stated that Houston has experienced significant car/train accidents at crossing areas along their system. COST expects there will be significant accidents along The Orange Line corridor.

COST is requesting that there be a new plan for multiple rapid busways, and that The Orange line corridor be used for bike/pedestrian pathways.

COST is requesting that Board members, as citizens, and members of the Valley Village community, pay attention to this issue. The organization needs public support.

Mr. Pool stated that Valley Village residents and businesses have made significant sacrifice to accommodate this project. His business on Laurel Canyon and Chadler is losing \$1100 per day in revenue because of construction. What will happen if we stop the project now? Mr. Paterson additionally requested if COST could provide figures that demonstrate multiple rapid buses are cheaper than The Orange Line?

Ms Lipari stated that 37% of The Orange Line is completed, and yet the entire project is almost over budget at this stage. The completed project is now expected to exceed \$330 million. COST's proposed solution would only cost \$120 million total. That added to the MTA funds already spent are a significant financial savings less than the now projected \$330 million for The Orange Line.

Mr. Sanchez thanked Ms. Lipari for her presentation.

Agenda Item 7 – Web Site. Mr. Sanchez reminded the Board that Mr. Braswell emailed a request to individual Board members asking that they forward specific items to Mr. Sanchez for inclusion in the web-site. Mr. Ciccarelli is waiting for this information to bring the web-site “live”. Mr. Sanchez asked that Mr. Braswell resend the requests to him so that he could follow up with the appropriate Board members.

Ms. Hatfield asked when we would have business cards and a logo? Ms. Reiner is working on the logo, and Mr. Sanchez hopes to have more information on both issues prior to the August Board meeting.

Agenda Item 9a – Soundwalls. Deferred to August.

Agenda Item 9b – Planning and Land Use. Mr. Paterson stated that the Board needs to take action related to inclusionary zoning. The issue is not the concept of affordable housing, but the lack of specifics in the proposal as well as the impact on communities with specific plans. This legislation would kill the specific plan process. Mr. Paterson gave a visual presentation with pictorial examples of the value of the specific plan, with tangible examples of how the specific plan had improved the Valley Village community. He reminded the Board that the specific plan is a criteria, a guideline that allows you to consider variations that still meet the spirit of the specific plan.

At the August meeting, Mr. Paterson will ask the Board for action on a motion to advise the City regarding citizens who do not remove their trash cans in a timely manner.

Ms. Hatfield asked if the Code Watch program could help. Many Board members replied that the program is not currently working. Mr. Paterson also raised the issue of an open sewer drain at the intersection of Laurel Canyon and Chandler, on the southwest corner. This is a health hazard caused by MTA construction, and the city has not responded to multiple requests to intervene. It was roundly agreed this is more relevant with recent news related to The West Nile Virus.

Mr. Sanchez thanked Mr. Paterson for his detailed report, and reminded the Board of their role as liaisons to city departments. Breice Reiner, as liaison to the Department of Public Works, should relay this information on behalf of NCVV. Ms. Reiner stated she would contact DPW and suggested they present at the August NCVV Board meeting.

Mr. Paterson motioned *“The Neighborhood Council Valley Village (NCVV) recognizes the need to increase and retain existing affordable housing. We do not support the*

proposed Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance as a reasonable and responsible solution to the affordable housing crisis. We request the City Council reject this proposed ordinance in its entirety and direct all neighborhood councils to become involved in an alternative proposal. It is a poorly thought through proposal with substantial negative land use consequences and without proper evaluation of its impact on existing city infrastructure. It's an attempt to rezone, in effect, substantial areas of the City without neighborhood input, and would undermine or destroy the many neighborhood Specific Plans developed to address the existing poor Los Angeles City planning." The motion was seconded by Dr. Wiseman. The motion was approved 10-0-1.

Mr. Paterson will draft the letter to the City and Mr. Braswell will record the letter on NCVV stationary for Mr. Sanchez's signature.

Mr. Paterson will attend all meetings related to Inclusionary Zoning on behalf of NCVV.

Agenda Item 9d – Signature Event. There has not been feedback from The City related to our request for permits to host this event.

Agenda Item 9e – National Night Out. - Ms. Hidey gave an update on plans for National Night Out, August 3, from 7 – 9 pm, at Valley Village Park on Westpark Drive. She thanked Mr. O'Connor, Mr. Simen, Ms. Mimi O'Keefe, and Officer Manny Arreygue for their work on this committee. The event is scheduled and all plans are in place to be very successful. A mailing of 2500 was produced to remind residents of the event. Ms. Hidey gave Board members flyers to distribute to businesses. Ms. Greuel will attend, Mayor Hahn's office and Councilman Weiss' office will be represented, and food will be served. There will be a strong police presence and a parade through the neighborhood at 8:00 pm. Ms. Hatfield added that NCVV will be introducing the Neighborhood Watch signs sponsored by NCVV. Mr. Sanchez thanked the committee for their hard work, and reminded the Board that this event focuses on three key areas – getting to know your police department, supporting your neighborhood and neighborhood watch, and publicizing NCVV. It is very important to get word out to your neighbors about this event. Mr. Hatfield commended the committee for maintaining the event within the budgeted expenses.

Agenda Item 9h – Election Procedures. Ms. Hatfield presented the election procedures developed by The Election Committee, composed of Ms. Hatfield, Mr. Simen and Mr. Braswell. The committee incorporated guidance from DONE into the procedures, as well as the elements of the successful election procedures from the 2003 NCVV election. Ms. Hatfield reviewed the document, and explained that it must be approved by NCVV, then submitted to DONE for approval. There is a time table attached to the procedures for the 2004 NCVV election. Mr. Simen restated that the major change in this year's election procedures was that both candidates and those voting must prove stakeholder status. *Mr. Paterson motioned to approve the Election Procedures as presented, and the motion was seconded by Ms. Hidey. The motion was approved 11-0.*

Agenda Item 13 – Public Comment. Mr. Sanchez recognized Ms. Gooley. She stated that as a resident of Valley Village, she has been very unhappy with the Orange Line construction. She was present to speak to The MTA (who was not present), and stated that the project has been “like a bull in a china shop” and has not been fair to the community. Mr. Sanchez thanked Ms. Gooley for sitting through the meeting and for her comments.

Agenda Item 12 – Future Agenda Items. Dr. Wiseman stated that some committees are operating “with a membership of one” and they are not true committees. He asked that committee structure be added to the August meeting.

Mr. Paterson asked that public comment be discussed, specifically where it falls on the agenda. Mr. Sanchez stated it was an agenda item in the June meeting, and could be reviewed again in the August meeting.

Mr. Hatfield asked for a budget review at the August meeting. Ms. Hatfield asked that there be some discussion on dead birds in the community and possible link to the West Nile Virus.

Agenda Item 15 – Adjournment. There being no further business, Mr. Pool motioned to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paterson. The meeting adjourned at 9:14 pm.