

DRAFT

(not approved until after opportunity for public comment at next scheduled Parks and Open Space Meeting set for Monday, May 14, 2018)

Minutes: Parks and Open Space Committee Meeting, March 12, 2018

1) 6:07PM – Meeting called to order by Jeffery Masino, Committee Chair: Introduction of HHWNC board members Daniel Savage, Area 1 Chair, and Matt Shichtman, Infrastructure Chair, and the following guests:

Catherine Landers - CD4
Estevan Montemayor - CD4
Alice Roth – CD4
Joe Salices – LA Rec & Parks

2) Smith Park update and next steps:

Matt Shichtmann spoke: gave an update mentioning being passed around from dept to dept.

Joe Salices, RAP, spoke: says that he is able to help via Rec and Parks directly without need of LAPD and/or LADWP. Can dispatch engineers to assess.

Matt will join for walk around. Question: Who received \$2,5000 payment?

3 Area 1: Cahuenga Peak (“wisdom tree”) trail:

Daniel Savage spoke: gave a background and update.

Stakeholder spoke: Wants to narrow focus of Dixon study to gate off top of wonder view, and establish a new trailhead

Daniel Savage proposed Motion: The parks & open spaces committee requests the gate at the top of Wonder View, leading to the Wisdom Tree "Trail" should be permanently closed including access, concurrent with moving ahead with The Dixon Study's Option B, the establishment of a new trailhead further south along Lake Hollywood Drive near the Toyon Tanks. Additionally, expand the Dixon area of study to include the establishment of a new trailhead from Forest Lawn Drive. **Matt Shichtman seconded**

Vote: 20 yes / 0 no - motion carries

4) Runyon Cyn. Park: Disclosure>Status of a Rec & Parks amendment to a 2016-approved memorandum of understanding (MOU) with Friends of Runyon Cyn. (FOR) Foundation for a three-year extension of the current term and categorical exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) – issuance of permits to use an existing structure of the City CEQA Guidelines for FOR activities.

Committee Chair spoke: My understanding is that this is not about changing the current MOU, this is about transparency and clarifying the language that was used on the Commissioners report in include language that HHWNC was involved in the list of achievements.

Stakeholder spoke: This goes beyond just Rec and Parks Commissioners notification. Please understand that the new MOU was to create an opportunity so that we would be notified and to be able to weigh in. ...and the act of "weighing in" involves the opportunity to have stakeholders weigh in favor, or against, to provide public comment, and then allow the committee and the HHWNC board make comments back to RAP, possibly through adopting an additional resolution, so that RAP could consider this before it takes any particular matter before Rec and Park. This is the first opportunity that we've had under the corrected MOU to talk about an issue involving FOR and the community.

Committee Chair spoke: One thing to add is that even though the Dec. 2016 MOU was not actually signed/executed in Dec. 2017, this was not due to any fault of FOR or Rec and Parks, but due to backlog of documents to sign on city attorney's desk.

Stakeholder spoke: Lives on Vista which has its own issues to separately address. Doesn't understand actual authority MOU gives to organization a la Friends of Runyon Canyon and how it became this way. Feels excluded from events / lists of organizations. More curious than anything – not trying to oppose.

Stakeholder spoke [answering other stakeholder]: Citizens Preserving Runyon helped negotiate MOU with FOR. Tried to create transparency, so FOR could fundraise, but also that citizens be notified. But in the past year and a half, there have been at least 3 incidents where FOR has moved forward with events w/o stakeholder notification. Understands that the organization is not going away. FOR does follow the MOU, or that the MOU is currently not written strongly enough to create full transparency. Wants to make motion to NOT APPROVE, but negotiate new MOU with stronger language geared towards greater transparency and with no exemption of CEQA.

FOR representative spoke: We did not ask for any type of exemption of CEQA.

Stakeholder spoke: That's good. Then let's ask to take that out.

Estevan Montemayor - CD4 spoke: I think that the discussion is interesting, but would like to invite Joe Salices to explain the MOU process with the parks.

Joe Salaices, RAP spoke: FOR is non-profit and works / partners w/ RAP. They raise funds and bring to Dept. for improvements. MOU puts a binding agreement between FOR & RAP. MOU is still under RAP's oversight. The reference to CEQA exemption refers to drafting of actual MOU. It is "default" language in all board reports - not actions

taken under MOU. If you look at any board report you are going to see that statement in there. It is a requirement of the Dept. It is a default statement in every report.

Committee Chair spoke: The CEQA statement is needlessly confusing as it appears in this document.

Estevan Montemayor - CD4 spoke: This refers to the document itself. In a hypothetical, if this non-profit was supporting some new structure, etc., then that would have to go through CEQA, and you have our full support that we will follow those laws.

Stakeholder spoke: Would request that A) MOU not be renewed, or B) that language strengthened so that true transparency is created. Given the history, we get very nervous when we see this organization popping up doing things when we have seen in the past the plans that they wanted to do. Appreciated the explanation given, but would like to have better transparency so that we can be assured.

Stakeholder spoke: The community is paying attention, and this is a sensitive matter, given the circumstances and the history. This [language] needs to be tightened up so that community doesn't need to constantly run over here.

Stakeholder spoke: Wants to know what FOR has done up until now. Poop bags and trash cans are at one level that is of less concern, but if there are bigger and better plans, we need to know what they are doing. There is a severe distrust.

Stakeholder spoke: POS committee previously voted not to approve FOR MOU, and HHWNC board voted against MOU, but David Ryu, did not listen to the wishes of the stakeholders and HHWNC, and went ahead and still renegotiated MOU when stakeholders didn't want. Stakeholders want to vote on whether to approve MOU.

Committee Chair spoke: In truth there is a new MOU for FOR and Rec and Parks that your fellow stakeholders had a hand in creating. No one can speak on behalf of every stakeholder on this issue.

FOR representative spoke: We are born from the HHWNC (at a meeting at Bonham's and Butterfields) four years ago. One of our biggest accomplishments in the last two years is acquiring all of the extra land in Runyon on the west side of the park (two committee member comments clarifying this statement). There is zero reason to hide anything. We are in the park everyday. There was just a tree planting two weeks ago. Many people here were there. Many of people here have donated to the campaign, which is appreciated. Looking forward, most interested in acquiring the land around the East Cyn steps in the park.

Infrastructure Chair question: When you say "acquiring land" does this mean land owned by the organization?

FOR representative spoke: No, it means acquired for the city and turned over to Rec and Parks. Work with Rec and Parks on a daily basis.

Stakeholder spoke: Wants to hear from FOR, there is a list of accomplishments, but why don't we know anything about them? I don't believe you.

FOR representative spoke: FOR has a vast mailing list that one can sign up for.

Stakeholder spoke: Are FOR accomplishments posted on the FOR website, not tree plantings, but issues that involve the MOU with Rec and Parks?

FOR representative spoke: Yes, it is all there.

Committee Chair spoke: Can a report of FOR accomplishments be generated to present to community via HHWNC? This is coming out of a feeling from stakeholders that there is still not transparency.

FOR representative spoke: We have been extremely transparent.

Process question from Infrastructure Chair: When FOR commences a new project, do you send out an email to the community?

More than one stakeholders spoke at once: No

FOR representative: FOR gets calls from people all the time asking for help and FOR passes those on to Rec and Parks.

Is FOR still wanting to all of the things listed on website (café, etc.) ?

FOR representative: No, organization does not want to do that.

How many people listed on board of organization?

FOR representative: FOR 12, same as other organizations, such as Friends of Griffith Park and Tree People, etc.

Stakeholder spoke: Is there a way of signing up to receive FOR emails without joining or becoming a member of FOR?

FOR representative spoke: Yes

Stakeholder spoke: Can you just be part of HHWNC?

Stakeholder spoke (answering stakeholder question): No, because they are a tax deductible organization and HHWNC, as part of an advisory board of the LA City government, can't be controlling a separate entity.

Stakeholder spoke: Do you have meetings where the public can attend?

FOR representative spoke: We don't. We have board meetings.

Stakeholder spoke: It does not benefit FOR to not have transparency. FOR acquired land on the East Trail steps. East trail steps are not part of Runyon. The owner is going to donate new steps. FOR want the same improvements as the community. If anyone wants to be on the FOR mailing list, just go onto the FOR mailing list and sign up. There is a lot of misinformation. There was never a plan for a Starbucks.

Stakeholder spoke: During and after the "basketball fiasco," Documents between RAP & FOR were requested, but have not been made public available after

requesting/searching for them. If we want transparency, we must have response and compliance with document requests.

Stakeholder proposed MOTION: POS Committee recommend to HHWNC that the MOU between the city and the FOR be terminated and/or not renewed. **Seconded by a another Stakeholder**

Committee Chair spoke: My understanding that we are not here to make a new MOU. Is there any relevant point not previously made that will help to clarify this proposed motion.

Stakeholder spoke: We are all participating in a kind of charade, where stakeholders give input, but meet “poker faces” to our request. We want to make it very clear that we do not go along with “charade” that David Ryu and others have created.

Stakeholder spoke: Board Commissioner report needs to have input from neighborhood council that takes in full scope of detail of the monies needed during “basketball fiasco” coming from discretionary funds and other sources needed to resolve that issue.

Vote: 21 yes / 1 no - motion carries

Request by Estevan Montemayor - CD4 to do the following agenda items out of order: 11A, 8, 5.

11-A) City trying to acquire privately help portion of Runyon Cyn Park so they can work with BOE and RAP to generate feasibility report and have repaired.

8) Runyon Cyn. Park Traffic Study:

Working on traffic studio similar to Dixon Study at Griffith for Runyon. With respect to “Improve access to park” statement, it’s a public park, so Ryu committed to access for stakeholders. Working on retaining Julie Dixon. Alice Roth will be closely involved in process.

Stakeholder spoke (lives off “Mullholland parking lot”): Need solution outside the box because parking lot not sufficient. It’s a safety issue and quality of life issue for those who live in the area.

5) Park user input on safety issues at Runyon Cyn Park: Stakeholders have mentioned safety issues at Runyon Cyn Park that they would like to address. Looking for community input on the overall safety needs/ improvements.

Stakeholder spoke: Parking effecting east outpost neighborhood in addition to west of Park impacts

Stakeholder spoke: Trail and parking lot gates not locked and unlocked in timely manner, and not effectively locked. Unlocked at 4 AM. Want more trilogy locks for gates.

11-B) Update Runyon Cyn Opening/Closing Times:

Joe Salaises mentioned that this is a \$450/each gate upgrade that is within the RAP funds to address. Alice Roth asked for a timeline for implementation. It was decided that an implementation update would be provided at the currently scheduled Parks and Open Space committee meeting on Monday, May 14th.

Stakeholder spoke: People park cars at early hours of the morning and climb the gates. Wants a camera with ability to talk to trespassers.

It was suggested by Daniel that stakeholders send safety concerns via email to Alice Roth and/or Catherine Landers at CD4. Catherine and Alice provided their email contacts.

Stakeholder spoke: Vista is now a promenade wearing earbuds and not paying attention. Situation is dangerous. Dog fights.

Stakeholder spoke: Raised on-going fire concerns. Smoking. Need more no-smoking signs and much better enforcement.

6) Runyon Cyn. Park Graffiti and tagging removal: Joe Salices speaking to maintenance about removing graffiti. Griffith Park group hired an employee for full-time removal.

Stakeholder spoke: Runyon Cyn Park is an attraction and people are not going to come and be on their best behavior, so we need the support.

It was mentioned that many of these issues would be addressed / monitored by hiring of Park rangers, which is a process that Joe Salices was already in the planning stages.

9) Blue recycle bin installation:

Stakeholder spoke: This is due to a bigger issue of un-permitted stand at the Fuller Ave gate entrance.

Stakeholder spoke: Can't take garbage cans out any earlier than bed time or it will be filled w/ dog poop/expressed concerns that blue recycle bins would also be a magnet for dog poop.

Introduced by Jeff Masino proposed Motion: Request to LA Rec and Parks to install and maintain plastic bottle blue recycling bins for large amounts of water bottles at/near Fuller Ave gate and Mulholland entrances.

Daniel Savage seconded. **Vote: 16 yes / 0 no - motion carries**

Committee meeting agenda items tabled for May 14th meeting:

- 7) Runyon Cyn. Park tree planting projects**
 - 10) Correction needed: Hollywood Community Plan Update 2 Briar Summit boundaries**
 - 11-C) Runyon Cyn East Trail overlook bench donation**
 - 11D) Update: Porta-toilet installation and maintenance at Runyon Cyn.**
- 15) Meeting adjournment at 8:57PM**