



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

Tue, May 16, 2023 at 5:58 PM

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: Reseda

Name: Jamie York

Email: jamiey@resedacouncil.org

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(9) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 05/15/2023

Type of NC Board Action: For if Amended

Impact Information

Date: 05/17/2023

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 22-1196-s1

Agenda Date: 05/15/2023

Item Number: V. D.

Summary: The Reseda Neighborhood Council supports Council File 22-1196-S1 if amended to ensure a truly independent redistricting commission and an expansion of LA City Council that is both sufficient in size and timely in implementation. The Reseda Neighborhood Council has repeatedly taken stands in support of independent redistricting and council expansion and appreciates the effort the committee has put into this conversation. However, we are concerned to hear some members, including one of our own councilmembers, entertain ideas that would favor incumbents and undermine fair representation of both the valley and the city as a whole. Our Neighborhood Council cannot support this item unless the following issues are properly addressed: 1. Sufficient Expansion of Council 2. 2026 Implementation 3. Complete Ban on any Ex Parte Communications 4. No Favored Access for Politicians 5. Remote

Comment Options Please see attached pdf for our full statement.

Ref:MSG8346747



Reseda CIS - Charter 22-1196-S1.pdf

131K



DJ FRANK
PRESIDENT
KARLA ESCOBAR
VICE-PRESIDENT
JAMIE YORK
SECRETARY
ANGELA SABORIO
TREASURER
MICHELLE GALLAGHER
PARLIAMENTARIAN
VICTOR SABORIO
SERGEANT-AT ARMS

SHARON BREWER
KARLA ESCOBAR
JENNIFER HUNT GUDERNATCH
GUILLERMO MORALES-
VITOLA
ANDRES PERKINS
JOE PHILLIPS
JIMMY REYES
GOLZAR SEPHRI
MARIA SKELTON
SOPHIA ZAMBRANO

[Council File 22-1196-S1](#)

Independent Redistricting Commission / City Chapter (sic)¹ Amendment / Ballot
Measure / November 2022

Position: Support if Amended

The Reseda Neighborhood Council supports Council File 22-1196-S1 if amended to ensure a truly independent redistricting commission and an expansion of LA City Council that is both sufficient in size and timely in implementation.

The Reseda Neighborhood Council has repeatedly taken stands in support of independent redistricting² and council expansion³ and appreciates the effort the committee has put into this conversation. However, we are concerned to hear some members, including one of our own councilmembers, entertain ideas that would favor incumbents and undermine fair representation of both the valley and the city as a whole.

¹ City **Charter** Amendment

² 10/27/2021 CIS to LA City Council Redistricting Commission:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1V-1axAUMCwyvGM5gKbV5UKxyOH5M3bJE/view?usp=share_link

³ 12/22/2021 CIS to LA City Council:
https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2021/21-1472_CIS_12222021103714_12-22-2021.pdf

Our Neighborhood Council cannot support this item unless the following issues are properly addressed:

1. Sufficient Expansion of Council

We are disappointed to see that in spite of everything we saw in the 2021 redistricting process at the time and the scandal that unfolded in the following year, some of our elected officials learned little to nothing from the experience. This applies to our representative, councilmember Blumenfield, who appears unsure if he actually supports council expansion, and suggested that he *might* be open to adding 2-4 members. He expressed that adding 6 members was the most ambitious option he'd *potentially* entertain. It may take a lot of thought and deliberation to figure out the best number for this city, but the half measures suggested by the councilmember are clearly insufficient.

We do not have a particular preference for council size at this moment, but we believe 25 districts should be the floor for consideration. A council smaller than that will not be capable of representing the diversity of this city. A council smaller than that leaves underserved communities of color, both in and surrounding Watts, in a district where they are neglected. A council smaller than that fails to deliver proper and equitable representation of the valley, and will result in more Neighborhood Councils being divided amongst multiple council districts.

Many Neighborhood Councils became deeply engaged in the 2021 redistricting cycle, but the strong armed tactics of Councilmember Blumenfield's Commissioner Richard Katz in his quest to remake the valley was in many ways *the* catalyst for the Neighborhood Council revolt.

The valley is challenging to redistrict, given the unique geography & topography of the mountainous divide between it and the rest of the city. We are presented with just two natural ways (the 405 or 5 fwy) of bridging the valley and the rest of the city. In the last cycle we were able to limit the number of bridge districts to just one, but this required drawing a badly gerrymandered district 4 which stretches from Reseda to Los Feliz. The 2021 process demonstrated, quite clearly, how having too few puzzle pieces to work with guaranteed an inherently messy process would become a brutally divisive one. Redistricting will not get any easier if we are still working with an undersized council.

2. 2026 Implementation

We thank Councilmember Raman for her amending motion which ensured the council would hear options for 2026 implementation.⁴ Some councilmembers, including our own, seem to presume we will wait to redraw the lines with an expanded council in the 2032 cycle. This is unacceptable. The public wants change *now*. We cannot truly move past the Fed tapes until we have new district lines. To say our current council map is tainted is an understatement. Communities across this city were intentionally disenfranchised. *Amending the charter means little if we have to wait nearly a decade to see the actual implementation of that change.* Approval of this measure must be followed by an immediate redistricting process with implementation of new lines in time for the 2026 elections.

3. Complete Ban on any Ex Parte Communications

The Council has discussed a very limited Ex Parte Communications ban that would only apply to elected officials and their staff. We cannot accept anything less than a complete ban on Ex Parte Communications like the state of California's redistricting commission has.⁵ Otherwise, elected officials can *and will* circumvent the ban. They all have campaign staff, consultants, supporters, and proxies that they can work through. They all have pet organizations, who they steer contracts to, who can be leaned on for a favor.

4. No Favored Access for Politicians

We are troubled to hear Councilmember Blumenfield suggest elected officials should be given preferred access, and extended time, to deliver public comment at commission meetings. To be clear we believe all people, including elected officials and their staff, should be able to speak at comment during commission meetings, but offering them preferred access to speak on their preferred lines undermines the basic notion of an independent citizens redistricting commission and should not be considered any further.

5. Remote Comment Options

The CLA's report makes mention of a number of issues regarding public access to commission meetings, but does not address remote public comment. While the 2021

⁴ https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2022/22-1196_misc_amd_ram_of_10-18-22.pdf

⁵ CA Constitution Chapter 3.2 - Section 8253(a)(3): Commission members and staff may not communicate with or receive communications about redistricting matters from anyone outside of a public hearing. This paragraph does not prohibit communication between commission members, staff, legal counsel, and consultants retained by the commission that is otherwise permitted by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act or its successor outside of a public hearing.

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV§ionNum=8253

commission had its issues, it did a remarkable job of engaging diverse public comment with over 6,300 attending public hearings and more than 1,450 providing testimony. All of that via zoom.⁶ We cannot take a step back on public access. Remote public comment options should be provided for all commission meetings.

Lastly, it is worth noting this committee, and in fact all committees, under the stewardship of Council President Krekorian abandoned remote comment months ago. We believe this should be immediately reversed. Failure to ensure full public input in the formation of this ballot measure will ultimately undermine public trust, undermine your ability to come up with the right measure, and will ultimately undermine the success of any measure sent to the ballot.

This motion passed in a meeting held in accordance with the Brown Act on May 15, 2023 with a vote of 9 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, and 0 ineligible.

⁶ Pg 5 of the 2021 LA City Council Redistricting Commission Report:
https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2020/20-0668-S7_misc_10-29-21.pdf