Neighborhood Council Valley Village
Board Meeting
January 28, 2009

Draft

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order, Roll Call, Agenda Distribution and Welcoming Remarks – Mr. Braswell – Mr. Braswell asked speakers to fill out a speaker card and please limit their comments to two minutes. He reminded the audience that the meeting will be conducted under the Brown Act and within the guidelines of Robert's Rules of Order.

The roll was called. Board members present were: Dorothy Apple, residential homeowner; Tony Braswell, residential renter; Beth Fulton, education based; Richard Gauthier, business owner; Ginny Hatfield, senior based; Paul Hatfield, at large; Suzanne Lewis, residential renter; Andrew Sacher, business owner; Lory Oberg, residential homeowner; Dave Bate, at-large; Tom Paterson, residential renter; Mark Woersching, community based; Philip Schaeffer, student representative; Dr. Joshua Levy, faith based; Steven Stokes, residential renter.
Board members excused: Greg O'Connor, residential homeowner.

Agenda Item 2 – Approval of December Minutes – The minutes were approved by a vote of 13-0-0. Mr. Paterson asked if there is anyway to mark items that need to be followed up on. Mr. Braswell said that we could list action items at the end of the minutes.

Agenda Item 3 – President's Comments, Introduction of Guests – Mr. Braswell thanked Angulino's restaurant for hosting our 2009 Board Retreat and said he would get the minutes of the meeting to board members this week. Mr. Roosevelt from Councilwoman Wendy Greuel's office gave an update on an event their office is planning with Ms. Lewis. They met with the local business owner of Greener and Greener to plan an Earth Day Event. Several locations are being considered for the event, the final location has yet to be determined. The event will be attended by Los Angeles city services such as LADWP. Mr. Paterson asked if there is anyway to get a Hazardous Collection site for Valley Village. Mr. Braswell asked when the speed limit would be increased on Riverside Drive. Mr. Roosevelt said it would be very soon. Ms. Lewis gave Mr. Roosevelt a copy of a petition signed by seventy (70) families with children at Colfax Charter that are opposed to the speed limit increase. Ms. Larios said that she has been receiving our board members ethics training quizzes; there are still a few board members that need to take the training. The DONE website is being updated so that we will be able to log on ourselves and change our contact information. Ms. Larios gave us the dates and locations of the upcoming Department of Transportation meetings.

Agenda Item 4 – Public Comment on Agenda Items – Bill North, a resident on Chandler Blvd. let us know about an attempted purse snatching and dog kidnapping in his neighborhood. There were signs posted in the area, but the LAPD was not contacted at the time. They now know about the attempted crime. It is important to report crimes when they happen, if not to the LAPD, at the very least call your councilperson.
Griselle Lima, a resident at 11619 Hortense Street, asked if there was anything that could be done about the cost of the streetlights installed on their block. They were originally quoted $1,600 per household in 2005 and now they are charged $3,200 per household. Mr. Roosevelt said he would check with the Bureau of Street Lighting on this problem.

Agenda Item 5 – Mr. Hatfield – We have spent about $27,000 year to date and have about $68,000 remaining in our budget. The expenditures include the request for the Colfax Charter Literary Garden Grant and the books for North Hollywood Library. Bill Canterbury was reimbursed for a Planning and Land Use expense. We will probably exceed $50,000 for the year and should have funds left over to carry over to next year. The new issue of The Bridge was mailed out today.

Agenda Item 3 – Introduction of Guests – Mr. Braswell introduced Joanie Freckman, principal of Colfax Charter Elementary School and presented her with an award on behalf of Neighborhood Council Valley Village and all stakeholders declaring January 28th, 2009 as Joanie Freckman Day in Valley Village. Ms. Freckman thanked all of us for our support and announced that Susana Gomez, the current assistant principal will be taking her place when she retires. Dana Stevens will be the new assistant principal.

Agenda Item 6 – Save LA River/Studio City Open Space (formerly Save Studio City Golf & Tennis) – *Motion: NCVV Board supports the Save LA River – Studio City Open Space concept design as presented by the Studio City Residents Association.* This motion carried forward from a presentation in December. Mr. Braswell asked if there were any added input or public comment. There was none. Motion passed 13-0-0.

Agenda Item 9 – Standing Committee Reports – Planning and Land – Mr. O'Connor and Ms. Fulton – Mr. Woersching gave a presentation on the new Interim Control Ordinance, proposed by the Planning Commission, to prohibit the erecting of new billboards, the conversion of existing billboards to digital billboards, super graphic signs on the sides of buildings and alterations of existing billboards and super graphics signs. *Motion: NCVV Board recommends to the City Council, the Planning Commission, the Planning Department, The Valley Alliance of NC's and the Citywide Congress of NC's that the existing citywide ordinance banning new billboards in LA and accompanying ordinances be retained, revised and repealed as presented.* Copy of Motion – Revisions to the Citywide Billboard Ordinance dated 1-28-2009 is attached. Item seven (7) was revised to read "Discontinue the program in which advertisements are allowed on bus benches and shelters if necessary to satisfy any appeal decision of the ruling in the Metro Lights vs. City of Los Angeles." Motion passed 13-0-0. Dr. Levy suggested that we have a motion to increase the fine to Billboard Companies for violating the ICO. *Motion: Move that NCVV Board recommend to City Council that the fine for any violation to the ICO or any permanent billboard sign ordinance that they approve be increased significantly to create an economic disincentive to violating the ordinance.* Motion passed 13-0-0.

Agenda Item 8 – NBC Universal Town Hall Meeting Update – Mr. Sacher – Mr. Sacher gave some background about the projects proposed at the September 2008 Town Hall Meeting that was held at the Beverly Garland Hotel. NCVV and four (4) other neighborhood councils met to start the dialogue discussing the proposed developments for our area with the developers, government representatives, stakeholders and political leaders. He went on to give an update on the three (3) proposed developments adjacent to Valley Village. The first presentation was the Valley Plaza Project, a large retail complex intended to be "Grove Like" with retail spaces, restaurants and movie theatres. Mr. Sacher asked that the Board pay close attention to the number of parking spaces that are being allocated for each project. Across the street is the proposed Laurel Plaza Project, which has been downsized. It mainly consists of residential space, seven hundred forty (740) units and fifteen hundred (1500) parking spaces. The second proposed development is in the NoHo area. The NoHo Commons is a three (3)-phase project; the nine (9)-story building is already under construction and has seven hundred

(700) parking spaces. There is another project in that same area called the NoHo Art Walk. It is a proposed project of close to three thousand (3,000) units and parking spaces. This is proposed to be three (3) twenty-seven (27) story buildings. The MTA NoHo Art Wave project around the actual MTA station is proposed to be twenty (20) plus stories tall and fifteen hundred (1,500) parking spaces for the MTA and five thousand (5,000) parking spaces for the residents. All of the NoHo proposed projects are in the redevelopment area. The third proposed development is in the Universal Vision Plan Project. The Universal Project, which is proposed to be built on public land, is one million five hundred thousand (1,500,000) square feet. This includes office, studio, hotel and residential space. Two of the proposed buildings are thirty-four (34) stories high and there is an additional forty-five hundred (4,500) parking spaces. The combined data for all three (3) projects as planned is over thirteen million (13,000,000) square feet within two mile radius and thirty-two thousand (32,000) additional required parking spaces. The construction is scheduled in two (2) phases that will take place over seven (7) years.
An organization called Communities United for Smart Growth, a non-profit group, has formed and produced their own vision plan for the area without any cooperation from the MTA, Universal Studios or the City. Essentially, it lowers the height of all of the buildings proposed along the Lankershim corridor; it develops "green space" along the Los Angeles River from Lakeside Golf Course and puts another cluster of buildings on the Universal Studios back lot. This will connect all of the proposed LA River Walks. There are talks currently going on to develop the LA River Walk into a park, where you could take bicycle rides or walk along the river. This could take up to fifteen (15) years to develop. If the project were to go forward the way Universal is suggesting, we would lose the ability to connect the River Walk with other communities. Communities United for Smart Growth is also proposing inflatable dams that would stop a certain amount of water from flowing away so that we could retain water to help create green space along the river. Mr. Sacher suggests that we write letters to John Forman to voice our opinion on the developments as currently proposed. There is an Environmental Impact Report in progress and a second rebuttal for that report coming up. We should have a voice at the EIR meeting and put pressure on the city to help curtail some of the proposed building for our area. Ms. Fulton asked if the Communities United for Smart Growth is primarily focused on the MTA/Universal project. Mr. Sacher said that it was originally formed to address that project, but hopes as they continue to work they will be able to tackle other projects affecting the area. The Town Hall meeting that they had last year addressed everything holistically; the most recent meetings have been addressing the MTA project. Dr. Levy suggested that we need to be looking at the impact that all of these projects will have within Valley Village. Mr. Braswell said that the City Services Committee is already looking into this problem. Mr. Woersching said that a properly prepared EIR should address the cumulative impact of all of those projects. It should have a list of all the projects and the trips they will generate. Mr. Sacher wrapped up his presentation stating that there is logic to developing the area; we just want it to be done intelligently with the best interests of the community at heart.

Agenda Item 7 – Measure B Presentation, March 2009 City Election – per Ms. Hatfield – Possible Board Motion regarding Measure B – Mike Webster, from the DWP, gave an presentation on the Los Angeles Solar Plan (LA Solar). It is a multi-year investment designed to expand solar power in Los Angeles to 10% of the City's energy resources by the year 2020. LA Solar consists of three (3) primary components: 1) Customer Solar Programs, installation of 380 MW by the year 2020, 2) Utility-owned Solar Projects, (Measure B), installation of 400 MW by the year 2014, 3) Large Scale Solar Projects, installation of 500 MW by the year 2020. Dr. Levy asked where the utility-owned solar projects would be installed. Mr. Webster said that they are currently envisioning the

Palmdale property as open space that could be used, DWP owned properties, Port owned properties and LAX and other City properties could also be developed. Ms. Hatfield asked how sun shared power works. Mr. Webster said they would have to find a large rooftop or open space for the homeowners to share. Jeff Bloch, from Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council asked what the costs per kilowatt-hours for the energy will be. Mr. Webster said that once the Huron Study is out we would be able to answer more of your questions regarding costs of solar power.

Kan Mattoo gave a presentation for Yes on Measure B. Measure B mandates that LADWP produce 400 megawatts of solar energy over the next five (5) years, they will own, maintain and control those installations. It establishes a job-training academy in certain communities to generate workers in green collar jobs. With the passage of Measure B, solar manufacturers in Los Angeles get a bid preference for this project. We are still waiting for the Huron report that is due next week to have the final numbers on solar power. Mr. Hatfield asked who would be performing the installation of the solar projects. Mr. Mattoo said the LADWP would perform the installation of the solar panels. Mr. Hatfield asked if the training academy would be open to all electricians or other trades people that perform solar panel installations. Mr. Mattoo replied that the academy would be developed with the LADWP and the IBEW. Ms. Lewis asked about the amount of money that is projected to be spent on this project and who put Measure B on the ballot. Mr. Mattoo said those numbers will be out next week when the Huron report is completed and a coalition of environmentalist's solar energy advocates put the measure on the ballot. Mr. Paterson stated that with respect to the issue of who is going to do the installation of the solar panels needs to be addressed in more depth.

Jeff Bloch from Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council, MOU committee gave a presentation on some of the Measure B issues. He made it clear he was not taking a position either way on the measure. Mr. Bloch stated that the difference in solar thermal and solar voltaic is the amount of money each will cost. He is concerned that we will not have all of the facts until the Huron Report is completed next week. There is also a study coming out next week called the Department of Water and Power Industrial Economic and Administrative Survey. This survey is being done by the Mayor's office, City Controller and City Council. They are obligated under the City Charter to do this report every five (5) years; it was due in 2007. PA Consultants report will be out next week and Mr. Bloch read one excerpt from the report stating that "solar voltaic is expected to cost more than two (2) times the cost of concentrated solar generation and six (6) times the cost of typical wind generation." The sponsors of this measure, Working Californians, include a non-profit political group chaired by Brian Dorsey, the business manager of Local 18. Local 18 has approximately eight thousand (8,000) members working at LADWP. The PA Consultants report will also address the issue of volume discounts and the amount of monies that have to be invested to build the solar plants. All of this information and more is on the LADWP website, it is called Solar LA, and the Los Angeles Solar Energy Plan from Mayor Antonio Villaragosa dated November 24 2008. Mr. Gautier said that there are two main issues involved with Measure B. One is the effect if will have on the ratepayer and the feasibility of getting this done. And two, how did this become a charter amendment. It originated out of the Mayor's office and moved to the City Council, bypassed the Board of Water and Power Commissioners. This should have been investigated by the City Council and the board of Water and Power Commissioners more thoroughly and not rushed to be placed on the ballot.

Jack Humphreville, with GWNC gave a presentation on reasons to oppose Measure B. There are four (4) main reasons to vote no, 1) there are issues with the City charter, 2)

there are issues with clean government, 3) there is the hit to ratepayers, 4) information about jobs. Adopting a City ordinance could do everything that is in Measure B. Instead, they are asking to change the City Charter. This means no bids for solar projects, no bid contracts, eliminates third party providers, eliminates competitive bidding, it means that the City Council can micro manage the DWP. They have allowed three (3) weeks to clear a four (4) billion dollar measure with no input from Neighborhood Councils. Eric Garcetti covered up a report from PA consulting. Taxpayer dollars were spent on the report and the consultant expert advice in the report was suppressed within the council and to the public. The Los Angeles Times whose reporting included information that was very critical to the topic exposed this. There were disingenuous efforts made to deny the existence of the report and to keep this information hidden and secret. They also covered up the IEA study. THE IBEW wants this so it has a lock on all solar business. This is a proposal that has no planning, no financial analysis and no engineering study. The DWP is not up to the job of managing a solar energy this big and this important.
They claim this is going to create jobs, how can this be done when the DWP has a closed shop on jobs and you do not give other companies the opportunity to bid on the job. Measure B is a blueprint for disaster and the public will get the bill.

Mr. Hatfield proposed a motion and Mr. Paterson seconded the motion. *Motion: NCVV unabashedly supports green power and sustainable energy, but NCVV does not support the insufficiently vetted Measure B.* Motion passed 13-0-0.

Agenda Item 9 – Standing Committee Reports – Projects – Ms. Lewis – February NCVV Town Hall Meeting – Ms. Lewis has nothing new to report.

Agenda Item 9 – Standing Committee Reports – City Services – Mr. Gauthier –
Mr. Gauthier would like to defer the issue of door-to-door solicitors until the March meeting. We are in the process of creating an inventory of zoning and infrastructure within the Valley Village borders. Tony Braswell, Jeff Walker, a member of the City Services Committee and I had a meeting with the DOT, Jim Dantona and Sergio Valdez, the transportation engineer for the San Fernando Valley to discuss the issues of traffic effecting Valley Village. Jeff Walker gave us a report on the meeting. The main topic was to educate us on how to go about getting cumulative traffic study done in areas that have had recent developments built. In addition, how we would go about getting a comprehensive overview of the traffic situation in Valley Village, particularly in light of the proposed developments in NoHo and Universal City. On a day-to-day basis, the DOT does not do comprehensive traffic studies. They do a reactive traffic study on a project-by-project basis as they come up. They use a mathematical ratio based on the type of project and number of units to calculate the increase in traffic. They then do manual counts during peak traffic hours of nearby intersections with traffic signals to assess the impact on the level of service. The level of service is the amount of time it takes to get through the signal. Levels of service are graded A-F and the City aspires to meet level D. Level D are delays may be substantial during portions of the rush hours, but enough lower volume periods occur to permit clearing of developing lines to allow clearing of the intersection. If a change or increase in current traffic level exceeds a certain percentage then the City may require or impose mitigation. This is done on a project-by-project basis. We did request and receive a traffic study for the project at Magnolia and Ben Avenue. Traffic studies are largely informative, in other words if a project is consistent with the existing zoning, the results of the traffic study will not prevent the project from being built. The traffic impact was assessed and built-in at the time the City originally zoned the property. From the standpoint of Valley Village, it is the Community Plan that sets the stage for controlling traffic. It is in connection with updates and changes to the

Community plan that the City conducts a comprehensive review of traffic. Our Community Plan was updated in 1996, which was largely just a minor change and did not involve a traffic analysis. Our next update to the Community Plan is due in 2010. Based on the ten (10) year cycle we are twenty (20) years out of date in assessing what the traffic is in Valley Village. We are looking at getting the last comprehensive traffic analysis done and starting to look at what input we can have. Mr. Braswell said that we are going to start working on revisions to the Community Plan.

Agenda Item 9 – Standing Committee Reports – Communications – Mr. Stokes – Mr. Stokes has nothing new to report.

Agenda Item 9 – Standing Committee Reports – Elections – Ms. Hatfield – Ms. Hatfield has nothing new to report. However, she did give us an update on the City of Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Financial Disclosure and Form 54 filing requirements.

Agenda Item 10 – Future Agenda Items – Mr. Braswell let us know that the February meeting will be a town hall meeting. We have invited all of the candidates for City Controller, City Attorney and City Council Five (5) candidates. Mr. Woersching said that by the March meeting the PLU committee should be finished with the Specific Plan Amendments.

Agenda Item 11 – Public Comment – Comments from the Public on Non-Agenda Items within the Board's subject matter jurisdiction – David Compton spoke on Measure B asked if there has been any thought to the additional maintenance costs surrounding the addition of solar panels to rooftops and once the solar panels are no longer viable how will they be disposed off. He also feels that there should be a requirement that all of the solar panels and necessary parts be manufactured in the United States to help create jobs. He also wants to know how the addition of solar panels will affect the height limits in the Specific Plan.

Agenda Item 12 – President's Closing Comments and Adjournment – Mr. Braswell – Mr. Braswell let everyone know that Ms. Apple got the trashcan stickers to help deter people from rummaging through trashcans and they are in the back of the room. The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 pm.