

**Neighborhood Council Valley Village
Board Meeting
02-25-04**

Approved 3-31-04

Meeting was called to order by NCVV Board President Peter Sanchez at 6:35 pm.

Mr. Sanchez thanked those in attendance and called attention to the very full agenda. He reiterated his goal that NCVV be results focused, goal oriented, and that our number one goal is to be one of the top ten Neighborhood Councils in the city. It was mentioned that NCVV was in the February 25 Daily News, page six.

Board members in attendance were: Mr. Tony Braswell (renter), Ms. Debra "DJ" Harner (cultural organization), Ms. Ginny Hatfield (community senior organization), Mr. Paul Hatfield (at large), Ms. Jody Hidey (residential homeowner), Ms. Ann Hull (business), Mr. Walter Katz (residential renter), Mr. Tom Paterson (residential renter), Mr. Chris Pechin (residential homeowner), 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 absent was Mr. Sean Jasso (education).

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order, Roll Call and Welcoming Remarks. Mr. Sanchez asked the secretary to conduct a roll call. All members were present except for Mr. Hatfield and Mr. Jasso. Ms. Hatfield informed the Board that Mr. Hatfield was due to arrive. Ms. Harner stated that she would need to leave one hour early due to work schedule. (secretary's note: Mr. Hatfield arrived at 7:43; Ms. Harner left at 8:18).

Mr. Sanchez again thanked the Board, other elected officials, presenters and public for attendance, especially in inclement weather. Reminded all in attendance of the time limit on presentations and speaking to any issues, and thanked all for their help in pushing the agenda to complete as much work as possible. Mr. Sanchez noted that speaker's cards were available at the entrance and must be completed to speak to any agenda item.

Agenda Item 2 – Approval of Minutes. The minutes of the January meeting were mailed to the Board, and copies were available for the public at the February meeting. A motion was made by Mr. Pool to accept the minutes, and seconded by Mr. Pechin. The minutes were approved by a vote of 13-0.

Agenda Item 3 – President's Comments, Introduction of Distinguished Guests. Mr. Sanchez recognized Amy Lee Jones from DPW Bureau of Sanitation, Maricela Gomez from Councilwoman Greuel's office, Mr. Jimmy Chen from MTA.

Agenda Item 4 – Follow-up Discussion MTA Chandler Construction. Mr. Sanchez asked Dr. Wiseman to provide the Board with an update on the MTA construction along the Chandler corridor. Dr. Wiseman prefaced his remarks with a brief history of the

pressing issues for The Orange Line project, including irrigation, safety, needs of specific communities (elderly, Orthodox Jewish, pedestrian) and the lack of running/bike pathways. He also commented on specific neighborhood concerns related to the project.

Dr. Wiseman then reported that a "good meeting" was held February 24 with MTA and representatives from many city departments, including sanitation, water, and planning. Dr. Wiseman distributed information to the Board that was presented at the meeting. There are still several issues that are unresolved and need continued input/monitoring by NCVV. Among those are:

Needs of specific communities, water source for the promised irrigation system, and intersection crossings (where they will be and how they will be regulated).

Dr. Wiseman reminded the Board of the urgency of our task; there will be buses running at the completion of the project, which is on schedule to be finished August 2005.

(Mr. Hatfield arrived at 7:43)

Dr. Wiseman stated there will be sidewalks, and that many issues of concern to NCVV had been positively addressed by MTA. However, he reminded the Board that the ultimate goal of NCVV is that Chandler in Valley Village look like Chandler at Ethel. As planned now, the two will look very different Dr. Wiseman said. He completed his statements by saying there is still time to make changes, but we must act quickly.

Mr. Sanchez asked Dr. Wiseman to sum up the goal of the MTA meeting. Dr. Wiseman stated that through support of Councilwoman Greuel and Supervisor Yaroslavsky's offices we have achieved positive changes in the project. Our first goal of obtaining clear planning information and expressing NCVV concerns was met. Second goal was to be certain they heard and acknowledged these concerns. Dr. Wiseman was not sure that goal was fully achieved. The third goal of realizing changes in the plan was not met.

Mr. Pechin stated that the meeting was successful due to the leadership of Dr. Wiseman. With the exception of the addition of a running path, NCVV achieved much and heard good information. Strong turnout and good representation helped NCVV's case.

Mr. Paterson stated that the primary goal was to get a bike path between Ethel and the freeway. A continued challenge is the left turn lanes at major intersections. Devon Brown from MTA gave more information on the issue of bike paths, and clarified the challenge continues to be that all bike/pedestrian paths terminate at major intersections (under current plans).

Ms. Hull stated that she was very pleased with the MTA meeting and that plans she has witnessed are very positive. NCVV needs to maintain pressure on issues related to safety of pedestrians, joggers, and biking. Her impression of the limitation of the plan changes were related to potential liability issues, but she applauded the overall plan and recommended that NCVV continue to push for a pedestrian/bike path to be included.

Ms. Hatfield commented on the conflicting statements made by Ms. Brown at the January Board meeting and the statements of MTA in the Daily News January 29. She felt strongly that there should be better communication to the Board, and that NCVV should continue to push Supervisor Yaroslavsky's office for their support of a pedestrian/bike pathway. Mr. Sanchez added that he felt this plan would produce the most tangible positive results.

Mr. Pool expressed concern on behalf of the business community regarding the manner in which "no left turn" signs were erected along Chandler, and the enforcement of the new restrictions as overzealous on part of the city. The signage was not, according to Mr. Pool, consistent. Mr. Pool stated that he contacted the police department immediately with his concerns and expressed dissatisfaction with the manner in which the changes were made. There was significant upheaval to the neighborhoods and businesses "who basically had their traffic plan changed overnight." He also contacted the construction manager.

Mr. Sanchez asked that these be treated as two separate issues, one related to planning and the other to implementation. This would ensure that both issues received appropriate input.

Mr. Hatfield added his support for pedestrian/bike pathways as a positive impact on property and neighborhood.

Mr. Sanchez asked Dr. Wiseman for closing comments. He stated that NCVV should formally plan to advance our concerns, and made a motion for action to do so. NCVV is the only Neighborhood Council that has taken (any action) on The Orange Line as a project and our effort should be formalized. This will include additional meetings and possibly a committee. Our ultimate goal should be that the Valley Village section of Chandler corridor look like the section from Ethel to Van Nuys.

Mr. Sanchez asked the Board to remember that this is a 15-year project and that the Board should be realistic about what can be accomplished, warning the Board not to "bite off more than it can chew."

Mr. Pechin stated that at the MTA meeting, NCVV was encouraged to join with corporate partners to impact the proposed changes. Ms. Hatfield recommended that a committee be formed to address this issue. Mr. Sanchez recommended this be done under Dr. Wiseman's direction. Dr. Wiseman then stated his advocacy for additional meetings, and a formalization of the position of the Board including attention to all aforementioned issues (pedestrian/bike path, Orthodox community, crossings, etc.). Dr. Wiseman concluded his comments by stating "this is our neighborhood, we have a right to ask these things".

Mr. Sanchez thanked all for their comments, but reminded the Board that we need specific goals related to the issues that achieve focused results. Ms. Reiner commented

that as a Board, we can't just take on issues "we think we can win." Mr. Sanchez appreciated the comment but reminded the Board that "there are bulldozers out there, and we must act quickly and realistically."

Ms. Hull stated that 3 years prior there was no system of Neighborhood Councils, and now we have an unprecedented opportunity to facilitate change. This issue will impact our neighborhood for the rest of our lives.

Mr. Sanchez asked that the Board explore what could actually "be done", and what specific issues could be changed or improved. Mr. Paterson reminded the Board that any changes in the plan would have to be taken from the "existing landscape", e.g. if a bike path is added, that "space" would be taken from currently planned green space, as the road dimensions and the Orange-Line dimensions could not be altered. Mr. Pechin suggested that cities with a successful record of change in this area be contacted. His example was Portland Oregon.

Mr. Paterson motioned that an ad-hoc committee be formed, to develop a pedestrian, jogging and bike pathway between Ethel and The Hollywood Freeway. Mr. Simen clarified that an ad-hoc committee is not subject to Brown Act restrictions. This was validated by Ms. Gomez. Mr. Katz asked that the motion be more specific, with a one year time limit and not more than ½ the full Board serve, and only Board members serve. The committee is advisory only and may not make formal decisions. Ms. Hidey asked if this motion should be restricted to just the Bike pathway? The committee should be open to any issues related to the neighborhood and the impact of The Orange Line.

The motion, then formally submitted by Mr. Katz, stated: *An Ad-Hoc Committee of NCVV be formed (of no more than ½ Board members, only Board members, one year time frame) to advise NCVV on ongoing issues related to the construction and implementation of The Orange Line.* The motion was seconded by Mr. Pechin. With no further comment, the motion was approved 14-0.

Mr. Sanchez asked for volunteers to serve on the ad-hoc committee. Ms. Hull, Mr. Pechin, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Paterson and Dr. Wiseman will serve. Dr. Wiseman will coordinate the committee. Mr. Sanchez asked the committee to coordinate their own meeting date and report back to the full Board as needed. Mr. Pool reminded Mr. Sanchez of the need to discuss signage, and he thanked Mr. Pool and remarked that we would address that further into the meeting.

Agenda Item 9 – Soundwall Discussion (deferred from January meeting). Mr. Sanchez introduced Mr. Jimmy Chen representing MTA for a presentation on soundwall construction in the Valley Village area. Mr. Sanchez prefaced the remarks by reminding the Board which areas of freeway are actually inside the boundaries of Valley Village.

Mr. Chen thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak to the issue. He stated that while the issue is very political, he has a personal interest in Valley Village as he has

family interests in our neighborhood. A history of soundwall projects was given. Before 1998 all soundwall construction was the responsibility of CALTRANS, after that time it became the project of MTA. 101 Freeway remains the responsibility of CALTRANS. Not all freeways are eligible, and must have above 67 decibels of noise impact and/or be a neighborhood that existed prior to the construction of the freeway.

The project is divided into two 'phases', I and II. Phase I projects are further divided into Phase I priority I and Phase I priority II. Phase I projects are all freeways with HOV lanes, Phase II are freeways without HOV lanes. A project can be Phase I priority I if a soundwall already exists on one side of the freeway but not the other. There is a \$1 billion backlog in the project. The status of the project remains very important to MTA, and has 100% support of the MTA Board.

Three stages constitute a successful project: planning, design and construction. For Valley Village, our planning is completed. Based on The Noise Barrier Scope Summary Report of 2002 and approved in 2003 by CALTRANS. Our project scope is 3.6 miles each way, 7.2 miles total (both sides). The total cost is \$41 million to complete. Of this amount \$32 million is capital expense. There is a current shortfall of \$36 million for our project, as part of \$168 million committed to Phase I priority II projects. The sound impact in many areas of our neighborhoods is up to 72 decibels, so this is certainly a priority for MTA. There is strong internal advocacy for us as well.

Ms. Sanchez asked Mr. Chen specifically what we could do to advocate for our portion of the project? Mr. Chen recommended that we continue to state our case strongly to Commissioner Yaroslavsky's office, and we should maintain pressure on City Council. The planning is complete, the project is only being stopped due to lack of funds. Ms. Hatfield asked how new available funds would be assigned (according to priority)? Mr. Chen did not know. Mr. Pool asked how the Project could be moved from priority II to priority I? If 33% of the funds required for the project can be secured, the project moves up in priority. Mr. Pechin asked that he be allowed to produce a plan and illustrate with a "story-board" to clarify the next steps. Mr. Braswell made a motion for the Board to approve this action. Second by Ms. Hatfield. Mr. Simen stated that a motion to this action was not necessary. Mr. Braswell withdrew the motion.

Mr. Pechin stated that he would combine the CALTRANS and MTA plans to present to the Board for consideration of a formal recommendation to the County Commissioners and City Council. Mr. Sanchez asked for public comment, and hearing none closed the discussion.

Agenda Item 14 – Other Items for Discussion per NCVV Board President. Mr. Sanchez asked that the Board entertain a presentation from Mr. Chick Ciccarelli, regarding a potential web-site for NCVV. Mr. Ciccarelli was introduced, and distributed a copy of his CV and company overview. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to present, and informed the Board that a web site (myvalleyvillage.com) already exists and was used to distribute information on public services immediately after the tragedy of September 11, 2001. His proposal to NCVV Board was to make myvalleyvillage.com the

official web-site of NCVV. He would design, host and maintain the site for free. He gave an overview of all the opportunities this site would make available to the public, including a calendar, classified advertising, open "forum" discussion, resource for community information on fire, police, healthcare, and other public services. There could also be a private section for residents to exchange information.

Mr. Sanchez thanked Mr. Ciccarelli for his presentation, and his hard work to date on the web-site. He stated there were two key parts to the presentation, it was "goal oriented" and "results focused". Mr. Ciccarelli's goal for the web-site design is to win award recognition for excellence. Mr. Sanchez also reminded the Board of the generosity of Mr. Ciccarelli in offering this service for free.

Mr. Braswell thanked Mr. Ciccarelli as well, and asked that the proposal serve as a business plan that could be approved by the Board. Ms. Hull commented this was a significant undertaking and a big responsibility. Mr. Katz stated that the Board should not be involved in public forum on the web-site, as it would fall into a very legal "grey" area. Mr. Pool asked for clarification on the proposal statement "local business only endorsed by residents". Mr. Ciccarelli stated by example that this could mean a resident recommending a handyman. Mr. Pool asked that the local Chamber of Commerce be consulted on this. Final comment from Mr. Ciccarelli was that there could be a mechanism for blast emails to get important information to residents in a timely manner.

Mr. Sanchez asked for public comment. There was none. *Mr. Sanchez motioned that NCVV allow Mr. Ciccarelli to present a plan for the web-site at the March meeting.* Mr. Pechin seconded. The motion carried 13-0. Mr. Ciccarelli thanked the Board, and committed that the NCVV web-site would be the best of all Neighborhood Council web-sites. Dr. Wiseman stated "policy should follow possibility", and the Board would be excited to see the potential of this web-site.

Agenda Item 14 – Other Items for Discussion per NCVV Board President. Mr. Sanchez asked for a brief presentation from Amy Lee Jones, Civil Engineering Associate from Department of Public Works Bureau of Sanitation, Wastewater Engineering Services Division. She thanked the Board for the opportunity to present The Integrated Resources Plan, which began in early 2000 and carries planning through 2020. The plan now requests input from business, neighborhoods and stakeholders. At the current state of the plan, there are four alternatives to consider, and these plans are being carried to communities. She requested the Board members who are interested provide their contact information and she would be certain they were informed of upcoming meetings. Mr. Pool asked if there already were a Board contact for this? Mr. Sanchez replied yes. Ms. Jones clarified that this would simply add any Board member who wanted to be placed onto the mailing list. Dr. Wiseman will attend the March meeting and report back to the NCVV Board.

Agenda Item 5 – Laurel Canyon Proposed Carwash Follow-up to January Discussion. Mr. Paterson distributed a packet of information related to the proposed carwash for Laurel Canyon. Mr. Sanchez reminded the Board of the packet of

information also provided prior to the Board meeting by Counsel for the owner of the property. The packet distributed by Mr. Paterson contained information on the appeal of the project filed by Valley Village Homeowners Association. Mr. Paterson reminded the Board this is not an issue of architecture, but an issue of appropriate use of land. The overarching issue of concern for the Board is traffic flow.

(Ms. Harner left the meeting at 8:18 pm).

According to Mr. Paterson while there was early support for this project (as stated in the packet distributed by Counsel for The Owner), more recent feedback has not been supportive, especially among residents who are impacted. There is also an existing carwash in Valley Village, negating need for a second business. The site plan for the project has a history of traffic problems that are intended to be improved (and not repeated) in any future use (of the property).

Mr. Paterson stated that the Valley Village Homeowners Association has taken a legal position that this is not an appropriate use of this property.

Ms. Hidey asked why the use was prohibited – only because of recycling requirement for the property? Yes. Ms. Hidey stated that the proposed use (as a car wash) does not address (improve or hurt) traffic flow.

Mr. Paterson stated there are two issues for consideration under “proper use” – motorization of the car wash, and traffic flow. Both are not properly addressed.

Mr. Sanchez asked for clarification of the purpose of the presentation. Mr. Paterson stated that the Board is reviewing two packets of information and two positions on proper use of the property under The Valley Village plan and current zoning.

Ms. Hull stated that residents in her area are very upset about the proposed car wash, based on traffic and potential noise.

Mr. Simen stated that some residents who signed support positions now state they did not fully understand what they were signing. He asked if the owner had now stated they would not fully mechanize the operation? Mr. Sanchez asked Mr. Reznik (legal counsel for The Owner) for clarification. He stated the current proposal is for mechanization. A “fallback” plan has been developed that does not include mechanization in the event that the current proposal does not receive full approval of the City.

Mr. Paterson stated there are 31 conditions on the approval for the current proposal, and that traffic questions have still not been adequately addressed.

Mr. Sanchez introduced Dale Thrush from the Planning Department of Councilwoman Wendy Greuel. He stated that Mr. Paterson has properly presented the issue, and that if there is to be an exception to the site plan for the neighborhood, a specific process must be undertaken. The site plan says that whatever is constructed on the site cannot be

“power driven”. The proposed mechanization certainly violates this requirement. But so does power use, vacuum, etc. A total handwash operation would not be violative, but the code could be construed that in fact any power use on the property would be in violation of “power driven” guideline. The ultimate determination will come from Zoning Administration.

Mr. Reznik was asked to take questions from the Board related to the information he distributed. Mr. Katz asked if there had been any review of the legislative history of the ordinance related to property use? No. Are we assuming commercial vacuums, industrial washing machines (for linens) will be used? Yes. Mr. Reznik added that all equipment would be indoors. Ms. Hatfield asked if the project were granted (as has been done) and changes were made, wouldn't it be easier to get a variance for approval? No.

Ms. Hidey asked for clarification on the traffic impact. If the egress is south only, wouldn't the traffic concern exist for any project? Yes. Dr. Wiseman asked if in the city's opinion the mechanization question has been resolved? This was a part of the original proposal and has been addressed.

Mr. Reznik added that the Board should only be dealing with the original proposed use of the property. It would require an exception from the city related to the specific plan for the property.

Mr. Hatfield asked if cars would “be pulled through on a chain”? Yes. Mr. Braswell asked for guidance on what the Board was being asked to do – Mr. Sanchez replied that the Board has been asked to approve the use of the property for a carwash. The Board has also been asked by Mr. Paterson to delay a decision. Mr. Katz asked what is the current status of the planning exception? It is filed. There are two driveways, can we assume that the south will be exit only? Yes. If in fact true, Mr. Katz replied, this violates page nine of the site plan which requires dual egress.

Mr. Reznik voiced concern that Mr. Paterson was not recusing himself from the discussion. Mr. Sanchez reminded Mr. Reznik that he was able to present at the January meeting, and Mr. Paterson was asked to present at the February meeting. The Board was asked to consider both presentations in any decision. Mr. Reznik asked for time to rebut comments from Mr. Paterson, and Mr. Sanchez reminded him he would have a full two minutes as part of the public comment.

Mr. Hatfield asked about volume indicators used in the presentation? Mr. Reznik replied that the maximum possible traffic was used in the proposed business model. Mr. Hatfield asked about financial viability? Mr. Reznik replied that a financial plan was presented to Wells Fargo prior to approval of financing, and this is a viable business.

Mr. Sanchez asked that discussion on the issue be closed.

The public was invited to comment. Mr. Scott Strong, contractor, commented that the tunnel length had been shortened and that would limit the flow, as well as slow the number of cars passing through, having a positive impact on the business' community presence. Mr. Reznik summarized his position, and stated that any other use of the property would have similar and potentially worse traffic impact, and while a plan for a hand wash has been developed, the owners are maintaining their request for the original plan to be approved. He also reiterated the owner's position that this use does not violate the site plan for the property.

Mr. David Compton, resident, stated that traffic would be "tremendously impacted" and that the noise issue "must be addressed". He also asked the Board to consider what would happen to trash, waste water and sewage generated by the business. Mr. Sanchez asked Mr. Compton to state his position related to the project. He is opposed.

Mr. Reznik stated that wastewater would be recycled. Noise was addressed by the placing of mechanization underground (verified by independent acoustical study in Exhibit E of his packet) and that ambient noise in the area is currently greater than noise that would be generated by the car wash.

Mr. Sanchez closed public comment. There are two issues before the Board. First Mr. Reznik has asked the Board to support the proposed car wash. Mr. Paterson has asked the Board to oppose the use. Mr. Katz asked for clarification on the time frame of the Board's decision and the project. Mr. Reznik stated that the proposal is currently before the City Planning Department and The City Council.

Mr. Katz motioned that the NCVV Board oppose the project, and join with The Homeowners Association in the appeal of approval of the project. Ms. Hull seconded. The motion was approved 9 in favor, 2 opposed, with two abstentions.

Agenda Item 10 – Treasurer's Report. Mr. Hatfield reminded the Board that a formal motion was made at the January meeting to adopt a budget. Mr. Hatfield asked the Board to approve the budget (attached) for \$25,000 for first quarter. Mr. Hatfield stated that officially the budget year began with the initiation of the Board. To better serve our financial interests, we should adopt a budget year beginning April 1. Mr. Braswell asked if this would establish the Board's fiscal year? Yes. ***A motion was made by Mr. Hatfield to adopt the budget as presented by Mr. Hatfield.*** The motion was seconded by Ms. Hidey. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Hatfield thanked the Board and heartily encouraged them to begin developing projects – both immediate and long term – that require financial resources available to NCVV.

Agenda Item 14 – Other Items for Discussion per NCVV Board President. Mr. Sanchez introduced Mr. Mark Lazar, member of the community. He gave a brief overview of a proposed use for property at Colfax and Hartsook, a nine-unit apartment building. He presented detailed architectural drawings and landscape plans. Mr.

Paterson asked if the proposed use of the property had been approved by the zoning department? Mr. Lazar replied that the owner was not going beyond the current approved zoning for the property.

Agenda Item 6 – Planning and Land Use – 11800 Riverside Condominiums (deferred from January meeting). Mr. Paterson directed the Board to his report distributed by email prior to the meeting. The ongoing issue for this property is the uncertainty of the project, and whether it adheres to the site plan for Valley Village.

Agenda Item 7 – Security Report arranged by Fortuna Ippolita. This item is deferred to a future meeting.

Agenda Item 8 – Presentation on Pay Facilities along Chandler Corridor. Ms. Gomez asked that this issue be deferred to March meeting. Mr. Sanchez thanked her for her assistance in coordinating the presentation.

Agenda Item 11 – Board Liaison and Committee Assignments. Reminder from Mr. Sanchez that these assignments are designed to help us accomplish our work. Liaisons are connections to city departments, committees are to assist in work on specific issues. Mr. Sanchez asked that Dr. Wiseman be the DWP liaison, and to MTA, and that Mr. Braswell be liaison to Ethics.

Agenda Item 12 – Update on Brown Act Training, Form 700 Compliance. There is no further information on this issue.

Agenda Item 13 – Office Space for NCVV. Mr. Sanchez continues to assess the opportunities for space needs/availability for NCVV Board.

Agenda Item 14 – Other Items for Discussion per NCVV Board President. Mr. Sanchez stated that Mr. Jasso could not serve as Board representative from the Education community due to conflicts in his teaching schedule. He asked that according to the bylaws, a special election be held at the March meeting to fill the seat. Mr. Simen and Mr. Braswell agreed to facilitate the effort. *A motion was made by Mr. Pechin to hold a special election as provided for in the governing bylaws.* The motion was seconded by Ms. Hatfield. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 16 – Public Comments. There were no further comments from the public.

Agenda Item 17 – Chairman’s Closing Comments. Mr. Sanchez thanked the Board and public for their attendance. He then distributed mail to the Board, and asked that specific Board members remain to discuss committee work briefly. He also asked that the Executive Committee meet after the meeting.

Agenda Item 18 – Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 pm.