



to her community makes a very significant difference. The reason that she believes it is important that PUNC Board members should be “Captains” of their respective Districts is that this would encourage formality and accountability that could be clearly presented in reports delivered by the District “Captains” at monthly Pico Union Board meetings.

- f) Discussion and possible action item: Tashanda Giles, from Food and Water Watch, request the Pico Union Board vote on a Motion to approve a “BDCP Oppose Letter” sent to the Los Angeles City Council, which opposes the building of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan / Water Tunnels. The Bay-Delta Conservation Plan to build twin tunnels or any such conveyance facility to divert the Sacramento River. The proposed project, estimated to cost between \$20 and \$50 billion, is unnecessary and would benefit corporate agriculture at the expense Los Angeles ratepayers and taxpayers. As such, we urge you to pass legislation prohibiting the use of Los Angeles ratepayer funds to finance the construction of this project and instead invest in local water infrastructure projects that would improve the reliability of our water supply, reduce our dependence on imported water and create local jobs. Los Angeles does not need to import more water. In fact, LADWP’s 2010 Urban Water Management Water Plan calls for purchasing less imported water as it is becoming more expensive, and prioritizes increasing local water sources such as storm water and cleaning and replenishing groundwater aquifers. Moreover, LADWP estimates that each year there are over 1,400 water main breaks in its 7,200-mile network that need to be repaired and/or replaced. Increasing our local supply and fixing local infrastructure are cost-effective measures that create local jobs. As these necessary investments will cost billions of dollars, ratepayer money should not be wasted on an unnecessary and harmful tunnel, especially in a bad economy. The tunnels would be a major gift from ratepayers to a few corporate agriculture interests in the Central Valley. The chief beneficiaries, the Kern County Water Agency and the Westlands Water District, already receive massive amounts of water subsidized by ratepayers and taxpayers. Some of these agribusinesses, in addition to exporting lucrative crops overseas, sell taxpayer-subsidized water for private profit. Los Angeles ratepayers should not be forced to pay ever-increasing water bills to subsidize the profits of a few powerful corporate interests. Contrary to proponents’ claims, new tunnels located 350 miles north of Los Angeles would not safeguard our water supply from a major earthquake. As the United States Geological Survey estimates that a major earthquake is more likely to occur in southern California than in northern California, LADWP must prioritize and accelerate the repairing of its aging and breaking local water delivery system. Given that an earthquake could also compromise pipelines that deliver imported water, diversifying our water sources by increasing our groundwater supply and capturing rainwater will protect the public’s access to water in an earthquake. Legislative action by the City Council is needed to ensure ratepayers are not harmed. Because the Metropolitan Water District, a partial source of LADWP’s water supply, would be a financial sponsor of the tunnel in its effort to control more water, ratepayers in Los Angeles could be made to pay over \$2 billion over the next thirty years. For all of the reasons outlined above, we strongly urge the Council to pass legislation prohibiting the use of any ratepayer funds towards financing or otherwise financially facilitating the construction of any new tunnels or water conveyance system to divert the Sacramento River. As LADWP’s water plan already states, Los Angeles needs to repair and augment its local water supply. Such allocation of ratepayer funds would improve water reliability, reduce our need for imported water and improve our local economy. And we should not waste money on a project that was defeated by California voters in 1982.
- g) Discussion item and possible action item: The PUNC President request that the PUNC Board vote to approve a motion to set up a phone-tree system to report issues to the police or city departments. The plan is to have each member of the system report the issue and then contact other members of the system in order to quickly generate many complaints.
- h) Discussion item and possible action item: The Outreach Committee requests that the PUNC Board vote to approve a motion to approve candidates for the award of “Outstanding Contribution to Pico-Union.” to be recognized for their service to the community during a PUNC Board meeting, sometime in the summer. According to an advisor from the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment Councils 4 Councils program, the PUNC should consider contacting their City Council representative’s office because they can have the certificates made and the City Council representative can hand them out at a PUNC meeting.
- i) Discussion item and possible action item: Jordan Jacobs, member of the PUNC Outreach Committee, requests

that the Board consider, and vote on, a motion to support the formation of a Coalition of Neighborhood Councils in Central Los Angeles. Such a Coalition would be comprised of: Westlake North NC, Westlake South NC, Macarthur Park NC, and Rampart Village NC, among others. Mr. Jacobs believes the primary purposes of this Coalition should be: to plan community projects and to improve communication. Randy Waller, member of the executive board of Westlake North and Westlake South NC, is the originator of the idea and firm supporter.

- j) Discussion and possible action Item: Jordan Jacobs, former editor of the PUNC Bulletin, would like to discuss the future of publishing efforts with the Neighborhood Council. He believes there are three options: OPTION 1: Create a Community Newspaper with key organizations and institutions in Pico-Union. The Neighborhood Council could subsidize, in part, the costs of this Newspaper (if it should so decide at a later date). OPTION 2: Transform the PUNC Bulletin from 8 pages to 2, print between 2000-4000 copies (full color) and limit content to i) an explanation of the Neighborhood Council ii) Contact Information, iii) Events/Meeting Dates. OPTION 3: Elect both options 1 and option 2.
- k) Discussion Item: August 15, town hall with Gilbert Cedillo from 530-730 p.m. at the Salvation Army Red Shield Center (more information to follow upon reading of item on August 5th, 2013).
- l) Discussion item and possible action item: The PUNC President requests that the PUNC Board on a Motion to approve a PUNC Board Member that will receive City Hall parking permit. A Board resolution must be signed and submitted to DONE in City Hall, 20th Floor, to receive the permits. An online survey also must be completed. There are only two permits for each Neighborhood Council.

**5. Board member comments – comments from board members on non-agenda items within the Board’s subject matter jurisdiction.**

**6. Meeting adjournment**

---

The public is requested to fill out a “**Speaker Card**” to address the Board on any agenda item before the Committee takes an action. Public comment is limited to 2 minutes per speaker, but the Board has the discretion to modify the amount of time for any speaker. The public may comment on a specific item listed on this agenda when the Board considers that item. When the Board considers the agenda item entitled “Public Comments,” the public has the right to comment on any matter that is within the Board’s jurisdiction. In addition, the members of the public may request and receive copies without undue delay of any documents that are distributed to the Board, unless there is a specific exemption under the Public Records Act that prevents the disclosure of the record (Govt. Code § 54957.5). In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the board in advance of a meeting may be viewed at *1225 S. Union Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90015*, at our website by clicking on the following link: [www.picounionnc.org](http://www.picounionnc.org) or at the scheduled meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact *the PUNC office at 213-738-0137*

The Executive Board may also call any additional special meetings in accordance with its Bylaws and the Brown Act. The agenda for the regular and special meetings is posted for public review at 1) **Normandie Recreation Center 1550 S. Normandie Bl.** 2) **Berendo Middle School 1157 S. Berendo St.** 3) **Leo Politi Elementary School 2481 W. 11<sup>th</sup> St.** 4) **Magnolia Ave. Elementary School 1626 S. Orchard Ave.** 5) **Tenth Street Elementary School 1000 Grattan** 6) **Pico Union Branch Public Library 1030 S. Alvarado St.** 7) **Toberman Recreational Center 1725 Toberman St.**

The Pico Union Neighborhood Council complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act and does not discriminate on the basis of any disability. Upon request, the Pico Union Neighborhood Council will provide reasonable accommodations to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure the availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting you wish to attend by contacting the Pico Union Neighborhood Council at (213) 738 - 0137 or please send an e-mail that states the accommodations that you are requesting to Picounion09@att.net.

**Process for Reconsideration** - An official vote or action of the Board may be reconsidered upon request as follow: a.) Reconsideration may take place immediately following the original action or at the next regular meeting. A member of the

Board, at either of the meetings shall make a motion to reconsider the action or decision. If approved by majority vote of the Board, the Board may immediately rehear the matter and take action. b.) A motion for reconsideration may only be made by a Board member who previously voted on the prevailing side of the original action or decision taken.

**PROCESS FOR FILING A GRIEVANCE:** Any grievance by a Stakeholder must be submitted in writing to the Board of Governors. The Board of Governors shall then refer the matter to an ad hoc grievance panel comprised of 3 Stakeholders who are randomly selected by the Council secretary from a list of Stakeholders who have previously expressed an interest in serving from time-to-time on such a grievance panel. The Secretary will coordinate a time and a place for the panel to meet with the person(s) submitting a grievance and to discuss ways in which the dispute may be resolved. Thereafter, a panel member shall prepare and submit a written report to the Board outlining the panel's collective recommendations for resolving the grievance, no later than two weeks after it has met with the person submitting the grievance. The Board of Governors may receive a copy of the panel's report and recommendations prior to any meeting by the Board, but the matter shall not be discussed among the Board members until the matter is heard at the next regular meeting of the Board pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act.

This formal grievance process is not intended to apply to Stakeholders who simply disagree with a position or action taken by the Board at one of its meetings. Those grievances can be aired at Board meetings. This grievance process is intended to address matters involving procedural disputes, e.g., the Board's failure to comply with Board Rules or these Bylaws, or its failure to comply with the City's Charter, the Plan, local ordinances, and/or state and federal law. In the event that a grievance cannot be resolved through this grievance process, then the matter may be referred to the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment for consideration or dispute resolution in accordance with the Plan.