



PRESIDENT
Ron Ostrow

VICE PRESIDENTS
Tor Hyams - Administration
Luisa Nubaravacharyan - Outreach

TREASURER
Christina Khanjian

SECRETARY
Jessica Kornberg

GREATER GRIFFITH PARK NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
"Your Neighborhood. Your Voice. Your Council"
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING

AGENDA

December 21, 2010 – 7:00 p.m.
Los Feliz Community Police Center
1965 n. Hillhurst Ave. (2nd floor of Citibank)
Los Angeles, CA 90027



CERTIFIED COUNCIL #36

PO Box 27003
Los Angeles, CA 90027-
0003

(213) 973-9758

www.ggpnc.org

GGPNC@ggpnc.org

1. Call to Order.

7:09 pm

Present: Ostrow, Mauceri, Bae, Masi, O'Grady, Gardner, Mims, Wilson, Arslanian, DeMonte, Nubaravacharyan, Kornberg

Excused: Malhi, Hyams, Vukovic, Napier, Campbell, Khanjian

Late: DeOcampo

2. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items.

None.

3. Reports from Public Officials and Community Organizations.

a. Councilman Tom LaBonge re: Haunted Hayride

Ostrow: Explaining miscommunication and expectation that this issue will be addressed at a future meeting.

b. California High Speed Rail Authority Presentation

Ben Gutierrez, presenting on behalf of the Authority: Sharing background of the project and current progress including planned construction and environmental review. For more information contact: palmdale_los.angeles@hsr.ca.gov or call 916-324-1541.

Mims: Asking about power source (electric), wild animal migration (breaks for migration patterns), and how private public partnerships work (private investment repayment yet to be finalized).

O'Grady: Asking about commute times from Palmdale and asking at what point the train will be a replacement for air travel (Los Angeles to San Francisco will be 2.5 hours).

Bae: Asking about proposed route through Los Angeles. (Three lines will run through Union Station. Five route options under consideration and still in flux.)

Mauceri: Clarifying transferred funds from Ohio and Wisconsin came from Federal government through ARRA. Asking about sales tax for public transit.

Kornberg: Asking about security measures.

Gardner: Noting efficiency of rail system and the possibility of leveraging this activity to further expand metro lines, particularly in the silver and gold lines by Griffith Park.

DeMonte: Asking if existing rail or new rail will be used. (Current rights of way may be utilized, but all new rail will be laid. Many Metrolink rights of way will be used through the valley, coming out of Union Station still in discussion.)

Wilson: Commenting that \$46 billion is a lot of money for a project where they will predominantly use existing right-of-ways that will generate huge revenues for those corporations involved in the construction. It would be helpful to know which companies are getting these contracts. (All sections in EIR process.)

Mims: Commenting about security, and suggesting that it will be governed by state and not federal authority. Explaining that contractors have not yet been identified.

Gardner: Noting new CRA zone has been proposed for most of the track routes.

DeMonte: Clarifying timeline for Merced line. Asking why the central valley is moving so quickly. (The central valley areas have a lower impact and are a better place to start because this is new technology.)

Ostrow: Sharing concern that it's being built in the central valley before funds are secured to build it in urban areas like Los Angeles and San Francisco. (The line they are building will be tied in to other lines if the full routes aren't completed.)

Public Comment:

David Swartz: Inquiring about Burbank and Glendale stations (Five station options under consideration: Buena Vista, downtown Burbank, Metrolink in Burbank, San Fernando, Pacoyma Wash).

4. Executive Committee

a. President

Ostrow: Sharing certificate from CD4 for participation in Big Blue M project and recap of completion celebration.

Mims: GGPNC also recognized on brass plaque at the mural.

Ostrow: Reviewing Dec. 8th transportation committee meeting of the City Council where Los Feliz used car issue was discussed.

John F. John: City Attorney will draft an ordinance on this matter.

Ostrow: Reviewing December 1st meeting of LFIA and CD4 on Park issues along with other PROS committee members.

Sharing response on NBC Universal Evolution Draft Comment Period extension request – it has been extended until February. Meeting earlier this month covered impact on Forest Lawn. Suggesting that an additional response may be required, but noting that no committee has stepped forward to work on this matter.

Updating information on opening council files with the city. Thanks to the GGPNC's efforts, Form 54 is available and working, however difficult.

O'Grady: Clarifying that other NCs had tried to open a file with DONE and had been rejected. An additional letter clarifying this will be forthcoming from the City Clerk. Suggesting the pilot program may need to be restarted.

Ostrow: Hoping that in the future the council can avoid putting further statement out on this issue that may then have to be retracted due to miscommunication. One person at the City Clerk is contradicting another. Before additional action is taken definitive information needs to be attained from the City Clerk.

Mims: Explaining that all board members must complete Form 54 in order to open a council file unless they are recused.

Masi: Inquiring if there are council files the GGPNC wishes to open? (Not at this time.)

Ostrow: Sharing response from Councilman Garcetti to Library letter. Passing Code of Civility for signature. Commenting that the Code of Civility are a set of guidelines without enforcement mechanisms. Complaints about the lack of civility are regularly raised. Requesting compliance with the Code of Civility.

b. Treasurer's Report

Ostrow: In Khanjian's absence, Ostrow visited DONE today to resolve outstanding issues. New challenges continue to arise. For example, David Farmer, a stakeholder who cannot be reimbursed, wrote a check to a business that lacks the proper business tax certificate and will be extremely difficult to repay. Non-profits must have Neighborhood Purposes Grant. For-profit businesses must have w-9 and benefit letters.

O'Grady: Suggesting the position of Treasurer is a losing proposition because the rules are constantly changing.

Gardner: Agreeing with O'Grady.

DeMonte: Asking which accounts have been paid.

DeOcampo arrives.

MOTION:

Nyla moves to adopt the budget. Kornberg seconds. No objection. Adopted by consensus.

- i. MOTION: To Reallocate \$10,800 previously authorized for the Fire Recovery Sign Program to King Middle School Garden Project (\$2,250), Independent Shakespeare Company (\$4,500), Green Committee Outreach Materials (\$750), TSRA Neighborhood Watch Signs (\$600), Miss Aimee After School Program (\$1,500), and L.A. Animal Services RACO Program (\$1,200).

MOTION:

Mims moves to reallocate. Nubaravacharyan seconds.

Wilson: Clarifying that the listed spending items have been approved by the board.

No objection. Passed by consensus.

- c. Formation of Sports & Recreation and Religious and Faith Based Interests Committees. Discussion and Action as Appropriate.

Ostrow: Recapping recommendation by the executive committee to create a Sports & Recreation Committee and to discuss the possible creation of a Religious and Faith Based Interests Committee. Distributing stakeholder interest materials.

MOTION:

Mims moves to create Sports & Recreation Committee. Nubaravacharyan seconds.

Mauceri: Presenting proposal for committee creation.

Question Period:

Wilson: Asking about the genesis of this issue.

Mauceri: Explaining his process for generating emails for the council to see stakeholder interest.

Gardner: Sharing his perspective as Recreation representative. 32 acres of flat land identified in Griffith Park for ball fields. PROS committee has discussed many of these issues in the past. Efforts should be focused on Chevy Chase service portion of the park that could easily be redesigned for this use.

Mims: Agreeing that this has been a topic in the past and deserves continued attention. Suggesting Griffith Park is too far for kids to walk and the best solution would be to create recreation areas in walkable locations.

Public Comment:

Richard Spicer: Sharing involvement in these efforts in decades past. Availability of school facilities should be easily leveraged.

Gardner: Neighbors, insurance, and funding for security have been the stumbling blocks in the past with these facilities.

Arslanian: Suggesting the committee should have a mission statement of some kind. Inquiring about whether the Recreation representative will be the chair.

Ostrow: Clarifying chair appointment process.

Wilson: People in the community have asked for ballparks in the park and they have traditionally been sent to the PROS committee. Majority of stakeholders don't want ballparks in the park. This shouldn't be an end-run around the PROS committee opposing that movement.

O'Grady: Sharing his impression that this committee is about existing assets like King and Marshall.

Ostrow: Responding to Wilson and noting that all committee action comes through the board so that no committee can serve as an end run around another.

Gardner: Disagreeing that this is not an end run around PROS. PROS represents a balance of interests in the park. This new committee represents a single interest outweighing the others.

Mims: Recognizing potential conflict.

MOTION TO AMEND:

Mims moves to form a Sports and Recreation Committee that focuses on active sports and recreation outside Griffith Park and the Los Angeles River. Wilson seconds.

Mims: Explaining how this resolves the conflict Wilson and Gardner have voiced.

Mauceri: Clarifying the focus of the committee to spearhead these issues. PROS has never raised a recreation issue with respect to the organizing of leagues or a facilities push for active recreation. Proposing mission statement: To promote and foster organized sports in the Greater Griffith Park area.

Gardner: Supporting the amendment.

Ostrow: Not in favor of the amendment, because it reinforces paranoia about development in the park. This amendment undercuts full confidence in this committee.

Masi: Agreeing with Ostrow that the amendment is unnecessary. There are issues of over overlap between Transportation and Planning committees, but those committees are allowed to coexist.

DeMonte: There are other active sports like dirt biking that could come up to this committee.

O'Grady: The same objection was raised with the formation of the Green Committee. There is overlap there too with PROS, and when issues arise that implicate Griffith Park the Green Committee reaches out and works with PROS quite effectively.

Gardner: Noting the Griffith Park Master Plan work that's been done on this issue and commenting that the continued utilization of the Park will come up inevitably.

Wilson: There's no harm in adding this amendment. The new committee could still approach PROS with issues related to the Park.

VOTE on AMENDMENT:

In Favor: Gardner, Mims, Wilson, Arslanian, DeMonte

Opposed: Mauceri, Bae, Masi, O'Grady, DeOcampo, Nubaravacharyan, Kornberg

Amendment fails by majority vote.

VOTE on ORIGINAL MOTION:

In Favor: Kornberg, Mauceri, Bae, Masi, O'Grady, DeOcampo, Mims, Arslanian, Nubaravacharyan

Opposed: DeMonte, Gardner, Wilson

Motion passes by majority vote.

MOTION:

Mauceri moves to establish committee. Nubaravacharyan seconds.

Mauceri: Explaining the goal of enfranchising the various religious communities.

Bae: Suggesting that this be tabled until after outreach has been made to these organizations to get feedback on the goals of the proposed committee.

MOTION to TABLE:

Bae moves. Mims seconds. No objection. Tabled by consensus.

5. Committee Reports

a. Arts & Culture: CRA Support Letter

MOTION:

Arslanian moves to adopt the following position of support for the Western/Hollywood CRA application. Masi seconds.

Ms. Neelura Bell
Project Manager
CRA/LA – Hollywood Office
6255 Sunset Boulevard, #2206
Los Angeles, CA 90028

RE: Proposed Hollywood/Western Streetscape Public Improvements

Dear Ms. Bell:

We are pleased to support the proposed Hollywood/Western Streetscape Public Improvements Project. The proposed public improvements will reduce automobile congestion, increase transit usage and encourage walking and transit uses as an alternative to driving all issues of concern to our neighborhood council and the stakeholders we serve. While the GGPNC's area of jurisdiction is the eastern boundary of the proposed project ending at Hollywood Blvd., the Western Avenue corridor is one of our community's

three major north/south access routes directly connecting to Los Feliz Boulevard our area's prime east/west artery.

We endorse the proposed improvements which will also bridge the gap through traffic calming measures and provide new pedestrians amenities such as bus benches, trash cans, safer crossing points at selected locations, landscaping, new sidewalks, ADA access ramp pavers, and bicycle racks that will benefit the Hollywood/East Hollywood/Los Feliz communities.

Encouragement of public involvement in initiatives such as this important and two of our board members participated in the process, the chair of Neighborhood Improvement and Culture and Events Committees. We were pleased that the proposed improvements were fully vetted through a comprehensive series of community meetings that provided maximum input from community stakeholders.

Sincerely,

Ron Ostrow, President

Arslanian: Explaining how the issue came to her and the history of this proposal.

Question Period:

Mims: Noting typos.

DeMonte: Asking if this is related to the repaving of the sidewalks along Hollywood Blvd.

Discussion Period:

Masi: Noting this was discussed at the last Planning meeting. Additional materials available on the committee website.

O'Grady: Criticizing the Vermont Triangle as a model.

O'Grady objects.

VOTE:

Abstaining: DeOcampo, Nubaravacharyan, Mauceri

In Favor: JKornberg, Bae, Masi, Gardner, Mims, Wilson, Arslanian

Opposed: O'Grady, DeMonte

Motion passes by majority vote.

b. Planning, Zoning & Historical Preservation Recommendations on Proposed Urban Design Guidelines, including MOTION to approve letter to Planning and CRA/LA Commissioners.

MOTION:

Masi moves to make the following recommendations as written in the Agenda as Supplement I. DeMonte seconds.

William Roschen, FAIA, President
City Planning Commission
City Hall
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Kenneth H. Fearn, Chairman
CRA/LA Board of Commissioners
Hollywood Regional Office

6255 Sunset Blvd. Suite 2206
Los Angeles, CA 90028

SUBJECTS: GGPNC preliminary comments and recommendations on (1) Draft Hollywood Community Plan (DHCP), Chapter 7, Urban Design Guidelines, available in two publications: Revised Text, dated July 15, 2010, pages 164-212 (48) and Text, dated June 24, 2009, pages 172-220 (48). Page references in this communication are to the Revised Text July 15, 2010. (2) CRA Hollywood Blvd. and Franklin Ave. Urban Design Plan and Guidelines--10/25/10 redline version. (3) Sunset Blvd./Civic Center Urban Design Plan and Guidelines--9/15/10 redline version.

Dear Mr. Roschen and Mr. Fearn,

The GGPNC Board requests that the Los Angeles City Planning Department (PD) and Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) continue to notify neighborhood councils in the Hollywood Community Plan area, including the GGPNC, of proposed changes and adoption of urban design guidelines, standards, and plans, as well as their application to proposed developments and signs. Make documents available in multiple formats—on line, compact disk, power point, and print. Confer with neighborhood councils.

The Board recommends that the City Planning Commission and CRA Board and staffs continue to work together, as during the joint meeting of the two boards on December 2, 2010, on the development, comparison, coordination, checklists, sustainability, implementation, and enforcement of urban design guidelines, standards, and plans. All three documents should include schedules for adoption and explanations of how the design guidelines, standards, and plans will be implemented, monitored, enforced, and funded.

Regarding the Planning Department's Urban Design Guidelines in Chapter 7 of the DHCP Revised Text, dated July 15, 2010, the GGPNC Board supports the purpose, in general, (page 165), the nine goals (page 166), and ten "citywide urban design principles" (page 167).

The Board also supports all the checklist topics, the use of checklists by land use types, and the use of images (photos and drawings) with explanations to illustrate the numbered design concepts in each checklist.

The Board recommends adding a check list on historic architecture, a section on implementation (retain emphasis on early consultation with staff), a section on funding, and a list of authors and the process for developing the chapter. All images should include word descriptions to clarify the intent of the image. Add images to convey diversity of architecture.

See the enclosed attachment for more detail and suggested changes in language.

Thank you for your consideration of these preliminary comments and recommendations.

Sincerely,

Ron Ostrow, GGPNC President and Gary Khanjian, Chairman Planning, Zoning, and Historic Preservation Committee

Copies: Councilmen: Eric Garcetti and Tom LaBonge
PD--Michael J. LoGrande, Director; Kevin Keller, Mary Richardson, Blake Lamb
CRA--Christine Essel, Chief Executive Officer, Kip Rudd, and Alison Becker

Enclosure: Preliminary Comments and Recommendations

GREATER GRIFFITH PARK NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
PRELIMINARY COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON DRAFT URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES
FOR THE HOLLYWOOD COMMUNITY PLAN AREA AND CENTRAL HOLLYWOOD

General Comments:

1. Notification and Involvement of Neighborhood Councils. The Planning Department and Community Redevelopment Agency notify neighborhood councils, including the Greater Griffith Park Neighborhood Council, of meetings and proposals on urban design guidelines; post the documents on web sites and CDs as well provide some print versions; and confer with the neighborhood councils on their comments and recommendations. GGPNC is wholly in the HCP area and CRA has two project areas that collectively cover a significant part of the GGPNC area.

2. PD and CRA Continue Coordination. PD and CRA staffs and boards should continue to work together in the development of and implementation of urban design plans, guidelines, and standards. To that end, build on the power point comparison on December 2, 2010, Joint Board meeting of the PD and CRA guidelines. For example, do a check list comparing at general level what is included or not included: goals, principles, standards, check list of guidelines included in a proposed projects, topics (signs, implementation process, protection of views, conservation and respect for Hollywood's historic buildings and architecture, open/space and plazas, street scape, sidewalks, density, height, etc.). As in the power point presentation, compare specific topics for being the same, similar, or in conflict.

3. Processes and Schedules. PD and CRA explain in their urban design reports the processes and schedules for using and applying the guidelines to proposed projects and signs in decisions by staffs, CRA and CPC boards, zoning administrators, city council committees, city council, public hearings, and mayor.

4. Checklists. PD and CRA retain checklists as part of the guidelines and require that the checklists be completed by persons and organizations in their proposed developments and signs so that stakeholders have a uniform basis for evaluating proposals.

5. Monitor and Enforced Guidelines. PD and CRA explain in their guideline reports how the guidelines and standards agreed to for specific developments and signs will monitored and enforced during the construction and use of the projects.

6. Environmental and Sustainable Design. PD and CRA ensure that the urban design guidelines and standards include provisions on sustainability, green construction (including references to different levels such as gold and platinum), as well as state clean air and clean water requirements and recommendations, and environmental impact reports

Preliminary Recommendations and Comments on Proposed Urban Design Guidelines, Chapter 7 in the PD's DHCP Revised Text, dated July 15, 2010

1. Support Purpose with Qualifications. Support, in general, the purpose of the Urban Design Guidelines as stated in the first two paragraphs of chapter 7 on page 165 with strong emphasis on "further the Hollywood legacy by guiding future development with a consistent standards applied throughout the Plan Area".

This general support is subject to some qualifications as indicated below and above in the general recommendations and comments, such as notifying and conferring with neighborhood councils on the PD and CRA application of the design guidelines to particular proposed projects and signs.

2. Recognize Whole and Effective Transit System. Add to the second paragraph, second sentence after "between fixed rail" and its effective connections to an on-time bus and shuttle system, as well as bicycles "and land use."

3. Identify Intent of All Images and Add Images on Range of Architecture. Put words under each photo and drawing to convey the intent of the image, for example, on pages 164-167 Add pictures to provide a sense of the diversity of residential and cultural architecture (e.g., Barnsdall Park) in neighborhoods in Central Hollywood, but especially in other neighborhoods.

4. Recognize Design Relationships. Recognize the design relationship of this chapter to other city plans, as described in the two paragraphs under the section "Relationship to Other Plans in Hollywood"; and support "baseline design standards are needed for the whole of the plan area, based on land uses by utilizing special districts as key examples that will illustrate proposed design principles." [Page 165]

5. Add a Checklist on Historic Architecture. Cross reference historic architecture section in the land use chapter pages 55-68, which includes the Hillhurst Avenue Design District and the Oaks Hillside Study Area. Also cross reference the Appendix: Table 1 Designated Historic-Cultural Monuments and Table 2 List of Protected Buildings in Mixed Use Incentive Areas: Hollywood Community Plan. [Was in 2009 Text, but not in the 2010 Revised Text.]

6. Support the Nine Hollywood Community Urban Design Goals on page 166.

7. Support in general the ten "Citywide Urban Design Principles" on page 167, and "Early consultation with Planning staff, including consideration of long term maintenance, is one essential way of assuring implementation of these Principles through the urban design guidelines for Hollywood. Consultation with staff should be mandatory.

8. Substitute Smart for Compact Growth. In the first sentence on page 167, just after the title, delete "compact" before "growth" and replace "compact" with "smart". "Compact" here is oversimplified and does not apply to many residential neighborhoods and commercial areas in the Hollywood Community Plan area.

9. Support all Seven of the Checklist Topics, the use of checklists by land use types, and the use of images with explanations, photos and drawings, to illustrate the numbered design concepts in each checklist. See above for recommendation to add a checklist category on Historic Design.

10. Add Credits on Authors and Process. In the public meetings and the final draft of the HCP Text, include the process for developing the content of Chapter 7 and cite the authors and organizations responsible text, tables, drawings, and photographs.

11. Add Funding Options. To fund the completion and implementation of the urban design guidelines and plans at PD, consider all the funding sources described on page 161 of the DHCP Revised Text and other effective and imaginative sources, including general revenue and public/private combinations.

Richard Spicer: Providing additional explanation of the letter and recommendations.

Masi: Emphasizing the importance of the request for a checklist of historic architecture.

No Objection. Passed by consensus.

c. Rules & Elections

- i. MOTION: to Adopt a Standing Rule that the President and Secretary, working in concert with committee chairs and committee members, may augment official correspondence by the Governing Board to update and/or correct factual references, spelling, and grammatical syntax, provided the nature and sentiment of the Board's intent is not changed. All official correspondence shall be disseminated (cc'd) to the entire Governing Board on or around the same time as it is sent to the specified recipient(s).

MOTION:

Mauceri (in Hyams absence) moves to Adopt a Standing Rule that the President and Secretary, working in concert with committee chairs and committee members, may augment official correspondence by the Governing Board to update and/or correct factual references, spelling, and grammatical syntax, provided the nature and sentiment of the Board's intent is not changed. All official correspondence shall be disseminated (cc'd) to the entire Governing Board on or around the same time as it is sent to the specified recipient(s). Nubaravacharyan seconds.

Mauceri: Explaining intent and using the letter to the CRA as an example of how this would operate.

Question Period:

Mims: Asking how this is different from previous practice.

Mauceri: Explaining inconsistent practices in the past.

Kornberg: Explaining her view that this codifies an existing convention.

Mims: Explaining that letters should not be brought as motions. Issues should be brought to the board for support or opposition and the letter should convey that sentiment. Agreeing that President and Committee Chairs should have this authority, but that motions shouldn't come in the form of a letter but as a position.

O'Grady: Remembering that a previous gas blower letter was subject to multiple revisions by amendment. Suggesting that this rule will save time in the future.

Mauceri: Noting that the motion requires the intent to remain intact through any authorized revisions.

Wilson: Suggesting elimination of "factual references" and "nature and sentiment of the."

Mauceri: Noting unanimous committee approval.

MOTION to AMEND:

Wilson moves to eliminate "nature and sentiment of the" from the rule. Masi seconds.

Mims: Reiterating view that board takes an action and conveying it is a separate matter.

Gardner: Sometimes letters need amendment or correction. That can be part of the discussion and the vote. Opining that letter can be submitted over email for board approval.

Ostrow: Clarifying that such comment and approval constitutes a serial meeting.

Bae: Noting the care with which this was crafted in committee.

Kornberg: Explaining why whether motions are brought as positions or motions, they are subject to nit-picking over grammar.

Ostrow: Explaining his approach to this issue.

Masi: Asking about nature and sentiment language and why it was used.

Mims: Agreeing that we can debate this now and save time in the future. The most efficient practice is to bring a motion to adopt a position or take an action.

POINT of INFORMATION:

Masi: These comments don't speak to the amendment.

Wilson: Reiterating that this is designed to minimize latitude.

Mauceri moves to end debate. Nubaravacharyan seconds. Unopposed.

VOTE on AMENDMENT:

In Favor: Kornberg, Masi, Mims, Wilson, Arslanian, DeMonte

Opposed: Mauceri, Bae, O'Grady, DeOcampo, Gardner, Nubaravacharyan

Amendment dies due to a tie vote.

Gardner: Agreeing with Mims and Wilson on the latitude allowed by this rule.

O'Grady: Noting that a Motion could also come to the board requiring a verbatim recitation.

VOTE on MOTION:

In Favor: Kornberg, Mauceri, Bae, Masi, DeOcampo, O'Grady, DeMonte, Nubaravacharyan, Arslanian

Opposed: Gardner, Mims, Wilson

Motion passes by Majority Vote.

Point of Order:

Mauceri: Suggesting that when a Standing Rule is passed – there should be a note to role this in to the Standing Rules document.

d. Parks, River, and Open Space Committee Report

Ostrow: Sharing copy of the Rare Plants Study, which was paid for in part by GGPNC funds.

MOTION:

Gardner moves to take the following position. O'Grady seconds.

On November 3, 2010, the Recreation & Parks Department and Council District 4 called a meeting of the Griffith Park Draft Master Plan Working Group to discuss the Draft Master Plan that was submitted by the Working Group to the City in October 2008. The meeting was held from 4:10 to 5:25 p.m. at the Los Feliz Branch Library.

Due to the brief duration of the meeting, the Department was unable to present and answer questions on its numerous and, in some cases, controversial redline changes to the October 2008 Draft, including the proposed downgrade of the document from a "Master Plan" to a "Vision Plan." Given the shortness of the meeting and its lack of public notification, it was also impossible for the Department to take public comment.

The Greater Griffith Park Neighborhood Council supports the request that has been made the Working Group that the Department hold a finite series of publicly-noticed meeting of at least two hours in duration at which a meaningful presentation and discussion of the redline changes in the Griffith Park Draft Master Plan and the issues they represent can be reviewed and discussed by the Working Group and commented on by the public. It is proposed that these meetings begin in February 2011 to allow both the Working Group and the public the month of January to review the redlined document that will be discussed.

Gardner: Explaining the motion.

Question Period:

Masi: Asking how this fits in with the meeting with Tom LaBonge on the park.

Ostrow: Explaining that this fits in with what happened at the LFIA parks meeting.

O'Grady: Clarifying that the Working Group meetings are run by the parks department.

Gardner: Providing additional background on meetings, plans, and history dating back to the 60's and 70's.

Mims: Clarifying that Working Group had the decision power about the content of the Master Plan.

Discussion Period:

O'Grady: Supporting this motion.

Ostrow: Sharing concern about the notification process for the meeting.

Mims: Voicing support.

Gardner: Voicing support and sharing his experience in this project.

DeMonte: Clarifying the timing of the issue

Ostrow: Explaining it is LaBonge's view that this is the time to act without losing the work that's been done. This was also reflected in the discussion at LFIA and PROS.

Public Comment:

Richard Spicer: Sharing his support for this position based on his experience with the working group. Suggesting additional statement of support for the Working Group as an essential step towards adoption of the Master Plan/Vision in 2011.

No Objections. Motion passes by consensus.

6. Approval of Past Meeting Minutes

MOTION:

Kornberg moves to adopt September 2010. Bae seconds. No objection. Minutes Adopted by Consensus.

MOTION:

Kornberg moves to adopt November 2010 Minutes. Nubaravacharyan seconds. Minutes Adopted by Consensus.

7. Other Comments and Announcements

Arslanian: On January 6th at noon, there will be a groundbreaking for the Barnsdall Park sign.

Mauceri: Commending Rare Plants Study

O'Grady: Sharing role of Green Committee members on Low Impact Development ordinance passed by the City Council, requiring rainwater collection for new construction.

8. Adjourn

Arslanian moves to adjourn. DeMonte seconds. Meeting adjourned at 10:28pm.