

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Vladimir Strinski

**Date Submitted:** 09/28/2022 09:30 PM

**Council File No:** 12-1549-S23

**Comments for Public Posting:** I object to this motion, and urge all councilmen to vote No on this proposal. The proposal is in violation of city law and rules, and targets a study that was rightly rejected in the first place as invalid and biased. Should a new contract (even with same or similar terms) be needed it should follow the correct procedures, and allow for public hearing(s), and include a Neighborhood Council review and approval. The original contract C-134581 was already extended once till November 30, 2021. There were no further extensions. The contract expired on that date. Attempts, almost a year later, to revive a long expired contract through sneaking a motion like that are illegal and in violation of city contracting rules. Second, the contract sought a study of businesses and business use of public property exactly during hard times for businesses. This will guarantee a biased study. Third, even the expired contract was attempted to be executed in a bad way, where none of the businesses or anyone in the community actually knew such a study would be done or how it was going to be done. Such attempts to sneak an invalid and expired contract under the table should be a shame for all honest work otherwise done by city employees and leaders. For the reasons above I urge all councilmen to vote NO on this motion. Respectfully, V.Strinski  
Reseda resident, businessman, and real property owner.