

Your Community Impact Statement has been successfully submitted to City Council and Committees.

If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at NCsupport@lacity.org.

This is an automated response, please do not reply to this email.

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Reseda Neighborhood Council

Name: Jamie York

Phone Number:

Email: JamieY@resedacouncil.org

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(10) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 08/16/2021

Type of NC Board Action: Against

Impact Information

Date: 08/17/2021

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 21-0885

Agenda Date: 08/16/2021

Item Number: IX-J

Summary: We urge Mayor Garcetti to veto the resolution opposed to AB 339 and allow time for robust public comment and community impact statements from neighborhood councils. Please see attached document for full statement.

We urge Mayor Garcetti to veto the resolution opposed to AB 339 and allow time for robust public comment and community impact statements from neighborhood councils.

A vote on a resolution that affects the ability of the 3.9 million Angelenos to engage in public comment that did not seek any input from Angelenos about what they want for public comment is a farce. The City Council utilized rule 54 which put this resolution to a vote without any opportunity for it to be heard in committee, which would have allowed the necessary time for Neighborhood councils to author Community Impact Statements in support or opposition of AB 339. It is a matter of typical course for neighborhood councils to be afforded the opportunity to make Community Impact Statements on resolutions regarding state legislation, and, as AB 339 was still in committee itself at the state legislature, there was no urgent need to utilize Rule 54 and vote on a resolution within days of the August 5th Chief Legislative Analyst report.

At a minimum, the resolution should have been heard in both the Rules, Elections, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee and the Art Parks Health Education and Neighborhoods Committee as the continuation of zoom options is highly relevant to the function of Neighborhood Councils. It is notable that Rules, Elections, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee have cancelled their last three scheduled meetings, but still felt they could waive consideration of this resolution.

Choosing to not implement Rule 54 would have also allowed the public time to file written public comment and speak at the committee meetings. In darkly ironic fashion, the City Council then routinely spoke of potential disenfranchisement of in-person and resident commentary as a cited concern of the proposed legislation.

The City Council has shown the contempt they have for engaged citizens who wish to speak about the effects of proposed legislation on their communities. The original report from the Chief Legislative Analyst speaks only to the possible negatives of telephonic public comment. It additionally worries that those who show up to make in person public comments will be disenfranchised. However the analysis does not speak to the enfranchising qualities that have allowed a wider range of citizens to engage in the process. Those with disabilities, without access to transit, who provide childcare, who work during the day have all been extended greater access to make their voices heard via telephonic comment. In Reseda, we do not discount that a greater diversity of voices empowers our council and the decisions we make. In seeking to minimize the voices that the City Council views as disruptive, they have dismissed the voices of the thousands of citizens who have become more engaged at a local level.

We would remind our City Council that they are not only paid to legislate but also to listen to the voices of their constituents. Furthermore, it is inappropriate of the City Council to routinely cite concern for decorum and appropriate behavior in opposing this legislation, only to

freely engage in discriminatory, namely ageist, rhetoric to express their opinions of the merit of the bill and its author. Specifically, Councilmember Cedillo was guilty of such behavior, but no members save Councilmember Bonin rebuked him for such rhetoric.

We urge Mayor Garcetti to veto the resolution opposed to AB 339 and allow time for robust public comment and community impact statements from neighborhood councils.