

OPNC Brown Act violations, corruption, and fraud

CPC-2020-516-DB-PSH-SIP
EXHIBIT 14B

From: Virginia J. (vcarville@ymail.com)

To: elise.ruden@lacity.org; mike.n.feuer@lacity.org

Cc: xavier.becerra@doj.ca.gov; jlacey@da.lacounty.gov; ayochelson@da.lacounty.gov

Bcc: info@whycantimove.com

Date: Tuesday, December 31, 2019, 11:09 PM PST

Dear Elise,

Please excuse the late response, I had a hard time trying to come up with a reply to what you, as the Managing Attorney of the Neighborhood Council System and a representative of the City Attorney's Office, provided to me as a response/non-response/refusal to Brown Act violations and allegations of corruption taking place in the Neighborhood Council System and Dept. of City Planning. Even when provided with proof, the City Attorney fails to perform their required job duties to investigate Brown Act violations, and protect the public from corruption.

The complaints brought to you and the Dept. of City Planning since November 2018 involve a trio of developments in Council District 10 – Olympic Park, between Country Club Dr. and Pico Blvd. on Crenshaw Blvd. Two of the buildings are *heavily* funded by the public (Prop HHH funds) and like the proposed luxury c3 subdivision (**Attachment K, Attachment M**), have no environmental or traffic accountability to the surrounding community.

The situations uncovered may point to possibly greater problems outside of Olympic Park, and demonstrate the enormous power developers have to work with city employees to override environmental accountability meant to protect the health and safety of local neighborhoods, so much so that since September 2019, have been relieved of all environmental accountability for HHH housing over the next seven years.

*It's surprising that the City of Los Angeles would need to have environmental law changed at the State Level (AB 1197 – **Attachment D**) when exemptions to CEQA in the City of Los Angeles are willingly granted by the Advisory Agency – as they did for Amani Apts. (Crenshaw/Pico PSH Housing).*

Planning city functionality according to the needs and wants of anonymous developers looking to find a way to get themselves paid compromises functionality, traffic flow, and public safety.

Your response/lack of response as the managing Deputy City Attorney over the Neighborhood Council System, surmounts to a refusal of the City Attorney to investigate Brown Act violations, fraud, and corruption involving City of Los Angeles public servants and the private developers they serve. The City Attorney's action (or lack of action) of ignoring Brown Act violations, fraud, corruption, and collusion demonstrates that fraud is tolerated and compromised employees are protected, rather than held accountable.

By failing to provide proper checks/balances, the City Attorney fails to maintain the integrity of the city public employee system, and allows crimes committed against the public trust to go unchecked. If the City Attorney fails or refuses to recognize Brown Act violations, corruption and fraud – do they then not exist? Should the violations of the Brown Act happen to be recognized, it may be found that the OPNC, like other neighborhood councils, may be too compromised to continue to represent the people without putting the people at risk.

How is it possible for the City Attorney to address issues of corruption if it is possible to see that there's a problem?

EXHIBIT 14B

I had originally forwarded to you the email I sent to City Attorney Mike Feuer on October 9, 2019, requesting that the City Attorney investigate and determine the applicability of the Brown Act to past/current actions/violations involving the OPNC (Olympic Park Neighborhood Council) and local developers. (**Attachment N, Attachment N2, Attachment Q**) I also had cc'd Mr. Feuer a complaint about the OPNC's previous involvement in the attempted construction of a private Luxury Commercial Subdivision known as C3, which included proof of a forged "mitigated negative declaration" (**Attachment H**) by the Dept. of City Planning in order to override federal flood code and environmental and traffic studies to get it constructed without the neighborhood knowing about it.

On November 22, 2019 your response to determining the merits of my Brown Act complaint, and allegations of corruption, fraud and collusion involving the Dept. of City Planning, private/anonymous developers, and the local neighborhood council consisted of the following:

"I believe that the President of the OPNC Board Mitch Edelson responded to you on October 24, 2019 regarding your Brown Act complaint. If you did not receive this correspondence, please contact Mr. Edelson for another copy of the response."
(Attachment R)

IS IT USUAL PRACTICE FOR THE CITY ATTORNEY TO DEFER TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL PRESIDENT TO ADJUDICATE THE LEGALITY OF THEIR OWN ACTIONS, WHEN ISSUES INVOLVING BROWN ACT VIOLATIONS, CORRUPTION, AND FRAUD ARE BROUGHT TO THE CITY ATTORNEY'S ATTENTION TO MAKE A DETERMINATION?

Why does the City Attorney refuse to perform their required job duties to protect the people of Los Angeles and investigate Brown Act violations and internal corruption? By ignoring complaints of fraud, the City Attorney condones fraud, and by doing nothing contributes to making it worse.

Just to clarify, you are a public employee; there is nothing confidential in our interchange. Your response, instead of deciding the merits of my claims, attempts to make our interchange (and attachments) confidential.

HOW IS YOUR RESPONSE THANKING AND DIRECTING ME BACK TO THE PERSON TO WHOM I WENT TO YOU TO COMPLAIN ABOUT PROTECTED BY CONFIDENTIALITY?

ALL DOCUMENTS I USE ARE/WERE PUBLIC AND WERE PUBLICLY SOURCED. Your interactions as a public employee with members of the public are of public record, and thus not applicable to confidentiality.

Does the City Attorney not want others to know that it ignores and tolerates graft and corruption, EVEN WITH PROOF?

Government code 822.2 states:

A public employee acting in the scope of his employment is not liable for an injury caused by his misrepresentation, whether or not misrepresentation be negligent or intentional, unless he is guilty of actual fraud, corruption, or actual malice.

How can an employee be found guilty of actual fraud or malice if the City Attorney looks the other way when presented with evidence?

As the managing attorney of the Neighborhood Council System CP02020596-DBP54-SIM simply told me to refer back to Mr. Edelson's response, without checking whether Mr. Edelson's response holds water. EXHIBIT 14B

Mr. Edelson's response to my complaint states the following:

"The OPNC cancelled the September 9, 2019 meeting due to a lack of quorum, as required by the OPNC Bylaws. The land use matter you referenced in your email was not agendized for that meeting. However, the OPNC board did hear the matter at its October 7, 2019 board meeting. That meeting was properly noticed as required by the Brown Act. You also attended the October 7 meeting and participated in the public comment. Based on the above, we have determined that no Brown Act violation occurred and no further action will be taken.
(Attachment O)

BREAKDOWN OF MR. EDELSON'S CLAIMS

Mr. Edelson claims that the Olympic Park Neighborhood Council (OPNC) cancelled the meeting due to a lack of quorum. This is incorrect.

Wouldn't a meeting of the OPNC first have to be called to order to determine quorum?

The OPNC meeting of September 9, 2019 was cancelled at approximately 3:12pm, but was noticed and scheduled to meet later that day at 7pm. Mr. Edelson notified me at 2:21pm on 9/9 that the meeting would be cancelled due to the lack of quorum.

WOULD YOU OR SOMEONE AT THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE PLEASE FIND WHERE LANGUAGE TO JUSTIFY CANCELLATION OF A PUBLIC MEETING SET TO START LATER THAT DAY IS JUSTIFIED BY DETERMINING QUORUM OUTSIDE OF PERMITTED MEETING HOURS?

How can the OPNC call a meeting to order approximately four hours outside of its permitted operating hours and take action to cancel its meeting scheduled to meet later that day? This would mean Mr. Edelson and other members of the OPNC: gathered early at their regular meeting location - the Catch One Nightclub - not to PAR-TAY, but to take action to per-emptively cancel its 9/9/19 meeting.

Who among the OLYMPIC PARK NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL WAS PRESENT at the at the Catch One Nightclub – owned by the President of the OPNC, FOR ROLL CALL outside of scheduled meeting hours to determine quorum for a meeting scheduled to meet later that day? Could deliberations to determine quorum four plus hours before the scheduled meeting time be conducted openly as required by the brown act, or were committee members exchanging private emails back and forth through opncla1999@gmail.com to say they couldn't make it? Since that is the email listed as the contact for the OPNC, is it subject to the public records act?

Outside of its regular meeting hours, the council determined there were not enough members present to reach quorum and used this as the reason to justify the cancellation of a public meeting scheduled to take place later that day. When I asked Mr. Edelson where in the bylaws I could find language to justify cancellation on the grounds of quorum, I was ignored
(Attachment P)

According to 54952.2b1 of the Government code, a body should not take action outside of meeting hours:

A majority of the members of a legislative body shall not, outside a meeting authorized by this chapter, use a series of communications of any kind, directly or through intermediaries to discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item of business that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body.

Cancelling a meeting outside of the authorized council meeting hours is taking action. Doing so 4+ hours before the meeting was scheduled to start would mean the OPNC is conducting business outside of scheduled meeting hours when it isn't permitted to do so or more likely, the president took it upon his own initiative (or was directed by others in higher positions) to cancel the meeting. This was done to pre-emptively suppress the voice of homeowners from airing their grievances and valid concerns including, but not limited to, two permanent Prop HHH high density PSH Housing complexes that would be placed in their neighborhood. These complexes would come with no residential parking, creating a burden to be absorbed by Victoria Ave and Windsor Blvd. to park possibly hundreds of additional cars.

Allowing a cancellation of a public meeting approximately four hours before its set to commence, sets a precedence that all legally recognized legislative bodies operating in the City of Los Angeles are justified by the City Attorney to pre-emptively cancel public meetings, determine a lack of quorum, and use this as an excuse to make that determination outside of designated meeting hours.

Mr. Edelson goes on to say that the OPNC observed the Brown Act when noticing their meeting of October 7. *What difference does that make?* How does meeting the requirements of the Brown Act 30 days later negate the illegal cancellation of the meeting one month prior?

The president states that because I attended the meeting in October and participated in public comment, no Brown Act violation occurred on September 9, 2019.

There were approximately 30-40 homeowners/residents who were gathered to attend the 9/9/19 meeting. The number dropped significantly in October, and may be due to the president of Oxford Square HPOZ, a former lawyer for Sony Studios, who at an unofficial meeting held on Victoria Ave. in September 2019, refused to let the topic of Solaris Apts. be discussed, even though that was the reason neighbors, who were asked at the meeting to provide their contact information, had gathered.

In October, I attended and spoke both during public comment and on the item involving Solaris Apts. I wanted to speak about the OPNC appointing themselves as qualified to submit community impact statements, but the President had threatened to have me thrown out/expelled.

The members of the OPNC at the October meeting parroted Mr. Edelson's excuse, stating that the September meeting was cancelled due to the lack of quorum.

Government code 54959 states:

Each member of a legislative body who attends a meeting of that legislative body where action is taken in violation of any provision of this chapter, and where the member intends to deprive the public of information to which the member knows or has reason to know the public is entitled under the chapter, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

What happens to the people of Los Angeles when the City Attorney's Office knows of corruption by public employees and chooses to do nothing? Is the City Attorney then themselves an accessory to corruption – allowing crimes against the public trust to be committed and standing idly by and looking the other way? Can the City Attorney be held negligent/liable for failing to enforce public ethics and hold public employees accountable for

fraud and corruption?

CPC-2020-516-DB-PSH-SIP
EXHIBIT 14B

By tolerating corruption, the City Attorney enables corruption.

By failing to hold politicians and employees accountable, the City Attorney fosters an environment where employees in high places know there are no checks/balances so they can operate above the law because the City Attorney when provided proof, looks the other way.

By failing to meet the requirements from the State of California to determine the applicability of the Brown Act to complaints related to the actions of the OPNC, the City Attorney allows the people of Olympic Park to be placed at the mercy of compromised public employees who believe that it is more important to accommodate the wants and desires of anonymous wealthy private developers, above the protection of the quality of life and health and safety of its current residents.

The situation in Olympic Park demonstrate succinctly the grave situation at LA City system of government – there is no one to hold anyone accountable to telling the truth or following law.

The City Attorney's lack of action regarding the disenfranchisement of homeowners in Olympic Park is deeply troubling, and may point to one of the reasons why the neighborhood council system and city government are prone to abuse, corruption, and fraud.

One may come to the determination that the City does not hold corrupt employees accountable, and has become too compromised and indebted to place the health and safety of the people ahead of the needs and wants of anonymous wealthy developers, who stack the system in their interest.

The OPNC suppresses the peoples' right to public comment/free expression, and to air their grievances regarding publicly financed large scale apartment buildings by anonymous developers, who use the destitute to justify outrageous financial costs of construction created and passed on to the taxpayer.

With little or no accountability or city oversight, anonymous developers construct HHH funded public housing for which they have no liability for, and with the enactment of AB 1197 in Sept. 2019, no environmental oversight or study needed. Most likely, the extreme costs of construction hide the real reason for never ending construction, the need to pay off outstanding accumulated debt from their previous projects.

It makes no sense to build new apartment buildings when vast amounts of empty property in Los Angeles can be retrofitted at a much more economical cost to qualified persons of need. If the City Attorney does nothing to check corruption, what are the people of the city left to do but wait for the coming of Blade Runner? Tolerating corruption, or being forced to tolerate corruption to keep one's job and not rock the boat is not worth losing one's soul or that of the city's.

The people of Los Angeles are suffering. Please help them.

Sincerely,

Virginia Jauregui

CPC-2020-516-DB-PSH-SIP
EXHIBIT 14B

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Elise Ruden <elise.ruden@lacity.org>
To: Virginia J. <vcarville@ymail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2019, 11:21:21 AM PST
Subject: Re: OPNC Brown Act violations, etc. - No response received

Hello Virginia,

Thank you for your email. I believe that the President of the OPNC Board, Mitch Edelson, responded to you on October 24, 2019 regarding your Brown Act complaint. If you did not receive this correspondence, please contact Mr. Edelson for another copy of the response. Thank you again for your inquiry.

Best,

Elise

On Thu, Nov 21, 2019 at 11:51 AM Virginia J. <vcarville@ymail.com> wrote:

Good Morning Elise,

This is a follow up to an email forwarded to you on October 19, which was originally sent to Mike Feuer on October 9, regarding the violation by the OPNC in regards to its bylaws and the Brown Act.

You stated in your October 21 response that a response to my complaint would be received in 30 days.

I am yet to receive any response.

Sincerely,
Virginia Jauregui

On Monday, October 21, 2019, 11:36:21 AM PDT, Elise Ruden <elise.ruden@lacity.org> wrote:

Dear Ms. Jauregui,

Thank you for your email. My office is in receipt of your Brown Act complaint. You can expect a response to your complaint within 30 days.

Best,

Elise Ruden

On Sat, Oct 19, 2019 at 11:14 AM Virginia J. <vcarville@ymail.com> wrote:

Good day,

I was advised by Alan Yochelson of County District Attorney's office to forward the below correspondence to you, as I am yet to receive a response to the issues addressed below.

CPC-2020-516-DB-PSH-SIP
EXHIBIT 14B

Thank you,
Virginia Jauregui

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Virginia J. <vcarville@ymail.com>

To: mike.n.feuer@lacity.org <mike.n.feuer@lacity.org>

Cc: jlacey@da.lacounty.gov <jlacey@da.lacounty.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, October 9, 2019, 5:22:53 PM PDT

Subject: Request action to cure and correct cancelled meeting sept 9, community impact statement

Good Afternoon,

I am writing you to request action by the District Attorney regarding the Operation of the Olympic Park Neighborhood Council. I have already sent an email to the OPNC earlier today, and hope I am completing the steps correctly. I am including a more in depth letter (attached), as to the problems which need your attention.

On September 9, 2019, the OPNC violated the Brown Act by cancelling its regularly scheduled meeting four hours before it was supposed to start. The cancellation was an attempt to prevent homeowners from airing their grievances regarding Solaris Apts. Members of the OPNC have been found to communicate city business through personal email accounts, and colluded together to deny the rights of Victoria Ave. homeowners to have their grievances addressed on September 9, 2019 as guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States.

54954.3c of CA Gov Code states: **The legislative body of a local agency shall not prohibit public criticism of the policies, procedures, programs, or services of the agency, or of the acts or omissions of the legislative body.**

Due to egregious violations of the Brown Act, the OPNC is not qualified to be **authorized filers or submit community impact statements. According to the City of Los Angeles document, *How to Create and Submit a Community Impact Statement*, "The City Clerk will accept statements only from Neighborhood Councils...in accordance with the Brown Act". (Attachment A)**

Why is the Olympic Park neighborhood council able to submit community impact statements when they communicate city business via non-city email and non-city phones? BROWN ACT 54950 states "It is the intent of the law that their actions [of the OPNC] be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly.

Isn't this considered a serious conflict of interest and a violation of public ethics when members of the council, considered city employees, communicate city business through private channels? How much city business has been communicated via private email and phone regarding tens of millions of dollars' worth of potential real estate projects in the Olympic Park area that only need support from the Neighborhood Council to get constructed?

I request the CITY ATTORNEY, in accordance with 54960 of the Brown Act, to commence an action to cure or correct by mandamus, injunction, or declaratory relief for the purpose of stopping or preventing violations or threatened violations of the Brown Act by members of the OPNC, who on September 9, 2019 illegally cancelled the meeting of the OPNC in order to avoid hearing and attending to the concerns voiced by homeowners of Victoria Ave. in relation to Domas LLC's Solaris Apts. Further, the OPNC utilizes private communication to conduct City Business in violation of Gov. Code 54950 and OPNC bylaws. (Attachment F.2)

I am requesting that the district attorney determine the applicability of the Brown Act to past actions of the legislative body, subject to Section 54960.2., and determine whether any rule of action the legislative body is punishable and described below:

I request that the City Attorney demand a cure or correct to the following actions of the OPNC:

1. The Cancellation of the regularly scheduled meeting of the OPNC on September 9 at 7pm in violation of Gov Code 54954.3c. The cure requested would be recognition by the City of the impromptu meeting held in the residents gathered in the Catch One nightclub parking lot, in lieu of the regularly scheduled meeting of the OPNC, and accept the adoption of paperwork passed out to residents at the meeting to be placed on the public record.
2. Withdraw/cancel the appointment of the five OPNC members as filers of Community Impact Statements which took place on October 7, 2019 at approximately 7:45pm. The OPNC is not qualified to provide community impact statements due to colluding to cancel a regularly scheduled meeting on Sept. 9, and utilizing private communication to conduct city business in violation of the Brown Act including Gov. Code 54954.3c and 54950 (Including Policy F of OPNC Bylaws). The City Clerk **only** accepts statements from Neighborhood Councils, "in accordance with the Brown Act".
3. Withdraw/cancel October 7, 2019 letter of Support for Domas LLC's Solaris Apts. The Board is not qualified to provide community impact statements, and thus the support letter for Solaris is invalid.

The OPNC is in violation of the Brown Act including Gov. Code 54954.3c and 54950 (Including Policy F of OPNC Bylaws).

The city would accept the following documents that were passed out to residents (10 copies) for public record:

- 1) 2015 Proposed Negative Declaration for C3 Subdivision (I only brought one copy). (Attachment H)
- 2) 2016 Letter of Support from Laura Rudison, obtained from the VTT-73424 Physical File for the C3 luxury subdivision. (Attachment I)

2) Mitch Edelson's response to my inquiry related to the C3 luxury subdivision dated 12/5/18. (Attachment J) OPNC 2020-516-DB-PSH-SIP
EXHIBIT 14B

3) 13-page email chain between myself and Mitch Edelson, President of the City of Los Angeles' Olympic Park Neighborhood Council (front page dated 12/31/2018). (Attachment K)

4) Six-page email chain between myself and Jordann Turner, City Planner for C3 luxury Subdivision, of City of Los Angeles. (front page dated 1/12/2019). (Attachment L)

PLEASE LET ME KNOW WHAT STEPS I NEED TO TAKE TO HAVE THE IMPROMPTU MEETING RECOGNIZED AND THE LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR SOLARIS WITHDRAWN.

According to the OPNC President Mitch Edelson, the meeting of the OPNC was cancelled due to a "lack of quorum". Lacking quorum is not a valid excuse to preemptively cancel a federally and state protected, regularly scheduled public meeting of the people four hours before it was supposed to start. The meeting was cancelled because the OPNC didn't want to hear the complaints of 30 - 40 angry property owners gathered, who had no idea that the OPNC planned to donate the land in front of their houses as a spacious garden-side parking lot for Domas LLC's Solaris Apts and Amani Apts. LP at 4200 Pico Blvd.

cancelling a meeting of the people in order to prevent complaints is a violation of the brown act.

The OPNC is not in accordance with the Brown Act and thus not qualified to submit community impact statements, or allow members to be authorized filers on behalf of the Council.

The owner of the Catch One Nightclub, President Mitch Edelson communicates city business listing OPNCLA1999@gmail.com as the contact for the OPNC, and utilizing mitchedelson@gmail.com for email. Using private phones and email addresses to communicate city business is against Council bylaws, is highly questionable, particularly with the issues involving the C3 luxury subdivision and the OPNC's 2016 letter of support, minus City record of any related discussion or action. (Attachment G)

According to the bylaws of the OPNC, the policy of the council is: "To have fair, open, and transparent procedures of the conduct of all Council business". The OPNC is currently in violation of this policy; additionally, the OPNC record of minute taking, particularly for their standing committees and previous sessions is lacking, and possibly missing.

The OPNC continues to remain in operation, even when Herb Wesson, the President of the City Council, was CC'd of meeting's illegal cancellation and did nothing (Attachment E)? Why do members of the OPNC continue to conduct city business via private email, when both the DA of the City and County of Los Angeles were contacted on 9/27 regarding this issue? (Attachment F).

Attached is the complete letter to the DA, including **CPA-2020-516-DB-PS-ASIP**

EXHIBIT 14B

Thank you,

Virginia Jauregui

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Virginia J. <vcarville@ymail.com>

To: board@opnc.org <board@opnc.org>; hwilliams@opnc.org <hwilliams@opnc.org>

Sent: Wednesday, October 9, 2019, 4:59:10 PM PDT

Subject: cure and correct requested, meeting sept 9, community impact statement

Good Afternoon,

I am writing you to request cure and correct for actions taken by the OPNC in violation of the Brown Act. I am including a copy of my October public comment which I presented partially to the Board, to which I only read up to "Members of the OPNC have been found to communicate city business through personal email accounts."

54954.3c of CA Gov Code states: **The legislative body of a local agency shall not prohibit public criticism of the policies, procedures, programs, or services of the agency, or of the acts or omissions of the legislative body.**

cancelling a meeting of the people in order to prevent complaints is a violation of the brown act.

According to the bylaws of the OPNC, the policy of the council is: "To have fair, open, and transparent procedures of the conduct of all Council business". The OPNC is currently in violation of this policy.

On September 9, 2019, the OPNC violated the Brown Act by cancelling its regularly scheduled meeting four hours before it was supposed to start. The meeting cancellation was an attempt to prevent homeowners from airing their grievances regarding Solaris Apts., which less than a month later, the Council voted to support. Members of the OPNC denied the rights of Victoria Ave. homeowners on September 9, 2019 at 7pm to have their grievances addressed and heard, as guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States. **According to the OPNC President and its members, the meeting was cancelled due to a "lack of quorum"**. Lacking quorum is not a valid excuse to preemptively cancel a federally and state protected, regularly scheduled public meeting of the people four hours before it was supposed to start. The meeting was cancelled because the OPNC didn't want to hear the complaints of 30 – 40 angry property owners gathered, who had no idea that the OPNC planned to donate the land in front of their houses as a spacious garden-side parking lot for Domas LLC's Solaris Apts and Amani Apts. LP at 4200 Pico Blvd.

Due to violations of the Brown Act, the OPNC is not qualified to be authorized filers or submit community impact statements. **According to the City of Los Angeles document, *How to Create and Submit a Community Impact***

Statement, "The City Clerk will accept statements only from Neighborhood Councils...in accordance with the Brown Act" (Attachment A)

Why is the Olympic Park neighborhood council able to submit community impact statements when they communicate city business via non-city email and non-city phones? BROWN ACT 54950 states "It is the intent of the law that their actions [of the OPNC] be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly.

I request the OPNC, in accordance with 54960 of the Brown Act, to commence an action to cure or correct by mandamus, injunction, or declaratory relief for the purpose of stopping or preventing violations or threatened violations of the Brown Act by members of the OPNC, who on September 9, 2019 at 7pm illegally cancelled the meeting of the OPNC in order to avoid hearing and attending to the concerns voiced by homeowners of Victoria Ave. in relation to Domas LLC's Solaris Apts. Additionally, the OPNC utilizes private communication to conduct City Business in violation of Gov. Code 54950 and OPNC bylaws. (Attachment F.2)

I request that the OPNC cure or correct its following actions:

1. The Cancellation of the regularly scheduled meeting of the OPNC on September 9 in violation of Gov Code 54954.3c. The cure requested would be recognition by the OPNC of the impromptu meeting held by residents gathered in the Catch One nightclub parking lot, in lieu of the regularly scheduled meeting of the OPNC. The OPNC would accept the adoption of paperwork passed out to residents, to be placed on the public record.
2. Withdraw the appointment of the five OPNC members which took place on October 7, 2019 at approximately 7:45pm. The OPNC is not qualified to adopt community impact statements due to cancelling a regularly scheduled meeting on Sept. 9, 2019 and utilizing private communication to conduct city business in violation of the Brown Act including Gov. Code 54954.3c and 54950 (As well as Policy F of OPNC Bylaws). The City Clerk only accepts statements from Neighborhood Councils, "in accordance with the Brown Act".
3. Withdraw of October 7, 2019 letter of Support for Domas LLC's Solaris Apts. The Board is not qualified to provide community impact statements, and thus the support letter for Solaris is invalid.

The OPNC is not in accordance with the Brown Act and thus not qualified to submit community impact statements, or allow members of the OPNC to be authorized filers on behalf of the Council.

The city would accept the following documents that were passed out to residents (10 copies) for public record:

- 1) 2015 Proposed Negative Declaration for C3 Subdivision (I only brought

one copy). (Attachment H)

CPC-2020-516-DB-PSH-SIP

2) 2016 Letter of Support from Laura Rudison, obtained from the
VTT-73424 Physical File for the C3 luxury subdivision. (Attachment I)

EXHIBIT 14B

2) Mitch Edelson's response to my inquiry related to the C3 luxury
subdivision dated 12/5/18. (Attachment J)

3) 13-page email chain between myself and Mitch Edelson, President of
the City of Los Angeles' Olympic Park Neighborhood Council (front page
dated 12/31/2018). (Attachment K)

4) Six-page email chain between myself and Jordann Turner, City Planner
for C3 luxury Subdivision, of City of Los Angeles. (front page dated
1/12/2019). (Attachment L)

On outgoing correspondences, the OPNC lists a private email and phone
number. (Attachment G) Using private phones and email addresses to
communicate city business is against Council bylaws, and is highly
questionable, particularly with the issues involving the C3 luxury subdivision
and the OPNC's 2016 letter of support, minus City record of any related
discussion, action, or vote.

Please let me know if the OPNC can cure or correct the issues addressed above.

Sincerely,

Virginia Jauregui

--

Elise A. Ruden
Elise.Ruden@lacity.org
Managing Deputy City Attorney
Neighborhood Council Advice Division
General Counsel Division
Office of the City Attorney
200 N. Main Street
700 City Hall East
Los Angeles, CA 90012
PH: 213 978-8132

CPC-2020-516-DB-PSH-SIP
EXHIBIT 14B

***** Confidentiality Notice *****






This electronic message transmission contains information from the Office of the Los Angeles City Attorney, which may be confidential or protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message and any attachments without reading or saving in any manner.

--

Elise A. Ruden
Elise.Ruden@lacity.org
Managing Deputy City Attorney
Neighborhood Council Advice Division
General Counsel Division
Office of the City Attorney
200 N. Main Street
700 City Hall East
Los Angeles, CA 90012
PH: 213 978-8132

***** Confidentiality Notice *****

This electronic message transmission contains information from the Office of the Los Angeles City Attorney, which may be confidential or protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message and any attachments without reading or saving in any manner.

-  Attachment P - no response.pdf
830.6kB
-  Attachment N 2 - email to elise.pdf
780.4kB
-  Attachment N - Email to Elise.pdf
875.1kB
-  Attachment D- AB 1197.pdf
1.2MB
-  Attachment H - ENV-2015-1229.pdf
2.6MB

CPC-2020-516-DB-PSH-SIP
EXHIBIT 14B



Attachment K - email chain.pdf
5.1MB



Attachment M - C3.pdf
866.9kB



Attachment O - opnc brown act.pdf
1.5MB



Attachment Q - Letter to DA.docx
38.8kB



Attachment R - Response of DA to Brown Act, Corruption.pdf
528.3kB



12 31 email to DA.docx
30.4kB