



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

Community Impact Statement - Submission Details

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org

Thu, Mar 7, 2024 at 8:23 AM

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or resolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at empowerla@lacity.org.

***** This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. *****

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: North Westwood

Name: Jacob Wasserman

Email: jacobnwwnc@gmail.com

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(17) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 03/06/2024

Type of NC Board Action: For

Impact Information

Date: 03/07/2024

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 24-0173

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary: The North Westwood Neighborhood Council (NWWNC) supports a fair and accurate assessment of the implementation of the Mobility Plan 2035. NWWNC backs Council File 24-0173, a truer accounting of the costs of traffic violence, and opposes Council File 24-0131, a politicized, misfocused effort based on inaccurate cost estimates. The motion in Council File 24-0173 recognizes that traffic violence has horrific costs, both human and monetary. One person is injured on city streets every five hours. This results in expensive use of emergency responders. The City also pays out large judgments and settlements to victims of negligently dangerous streets. The proposed report would account for these costs. On the other hand, Council File 24-0131 recklessly politicizes a proper accounting. It never mentions traffic violence. It all but explicitly ties Mobility Plan implementation to budget deficits—ignoring the Council's own hand in other

areas of spending. It suggests relitigating mobility decisions through likely slanted “community outreach” efforts, for a plan that was thoroughly reviewed and refined with stakeholders across the City for years. It valorizes congestion-fueling vehicle travel and parking above all other concerns. And it was introduced close to the election, coming close to the legal line against advocacy on pending ballot measures. The motion in Council File 24-0131 also relies on highly misleading financial data from Council File 23-0600-S54. Dedicated activists have debunked those figures. For instance, those reports contend that repaving expenses should be counted as part of the new costs of executing the Mobility Plan. However, the City routinely repaves hundreds of miles of streets each year, and this regular maintenance is already allocated in the budget. Also, the reports include the cost of sidewalk repair and widening not mandated by the Mobility Plan. We reiterate our support for automatic implementation of the Mobility Plan when repaving.

Ref:MSG9951944



CIS_Mobility Plan Implementation.pdf

141K



- COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT -

Council File: [24-0173](#)

Title: Mobility Plan 2035 / Mobility Corridors / Pavement Preservation Program / Street Resurfacing / Vehicle Crashes / Traffic Fatalities / Claim Payments / Measure HLA

Position: For

Council File: [24-0131](#)

Title: Tier I and II Protected Bicycle Lanes / Parking Space Removal / Vehicle Travel Lane Removal / Bicycle Enhanced Network / Transit Lane Enhanced Network / Neighborhood Enhanced Network / Measure HLA

Position: Against

Summary:

The North Westwood Neighborhood Council (NWWNC) supports a fair and accurate assessment of the implementation of the Mobility Plan 2035. NWWNC backs Council File 24-0173, a truer accounting of the costs of traffic violence, and opposes Council File 24-0131, a politicized, misfocused effort based on inaccurate cost estimates.

The motion in Council File 24-0173 recognizes that traffic violence has horrific costs, both human and monetary. One person is injured on city streets every five hours. This results in expensive use of emergency responders. The City also routinely pays out large judgments and settlements to victims of negligently dangerous streets. The proposed report would account for these costs.

On the other hand, the motion in Council File 24-0131 recklessly politicizes a proper accounting. It never mentions traffic violence. It all but explicitly ties Mobility Plan 2035 implementation to budget deficits—ignoring the Council's own hand in other areas of spending. It suggests relitigating mobility decisions through likely slanted "community outreach" efforts, for a plan that was thoroughly reviewed and refined with stakeholders across the City for years. It valorizes congestion-fueling

vehicle travel and parking above all other concerns—all during a climate crisis. And it was introduced close to the election, coming close to the legal line against advocacy on pending ballot measures.

The motion in Council File 24-0131 also relies on highly misleading financial data from Council File 23-0600-S54 (See [NWWNC's Community Impact Statement against Council File 23-0600-S54 unless amended](#)). [Dedicated activists have debunked those figures](#). For instance, those reports contend that repaving expenses should be counted as part of the new costs of executing the Mobility Plan 2035. However, the City routinely repaves hundreds of miles of streets each year, and this regular maintenance is already allocated in the budget. Also, the reports include the cost of sidewalk repair and widening not mandated by the Mobility Plan 2035.

We reiterate our support for automatic implementation of the Mobility Plan 2035 when repaving.