

Why did yet another Lisa Sarkin recall fail? A look behind the curtain at the SCNC

There have been multiple attempts to remove Lisa Sarkin from her entrenched position on the Studio City Neighborhood Council. The latest in 2015 again successfully struck down. Only 75 signatures were needed and over 160 signatures collected in just 4 days, residents obviously are unhappy with her. Here is some of what went on behind closed doors to thwart the latest attempt.

Wednesday, September 22, 2010

Lana Shackelford questioned why, going forward, would the President of the Neighborhood Council need to appoint over and over the same person to represent the Board at each committee or other meeting.

Response by Stu Miller *"It is for transparency and to eliminate the question of whether the board member is authorized to speak on behalf of the SCNC."*

[LINK](#)

Tuesday, March 8, 2016

Statement from former Studio City Neighborhood Council Member:

These e-mails and the ensuing lies and cover-up at the Lisa Sarkin removal hearing were the reason I resigned from the SCNC. The e-mails speak for themselves. Lisa Sarkin lobbied for the developer and spoke for the neighborhood council without the president's permission. Violation of the by-laws of the SCNC. Several board members including myself wrote to John Walker and Lisa Sarkin about the emails Lisa sent on Sun Mar 22. John wrote back to Lisa clearly saying what she did is improper (see e-mail). John Walker did not give Lisa Sarkin permission to speak for the SCNC until Monday Mar. 23 (see e-mail).

Lisa Sarkin lied at the removal hearing that she had permission from the President (John Walker) (see transcript from hearing, see John Walker e-mail dated 3-23). At the end of the hearing several board members especially Lana Shackelford berated the neighbors who brought the petition which is a violation of Dept of Neighborhood Empowerments code of civility which all neighborhood council members must sign. All the while John Walker just sat there and said nothing. When the meeting broke up I went to John Walker and asked him why he did not say anything when he knew Lisa Sarkin lied about having his permission, his response to me was "nobody asked him." NOBODY ASKED HIM, I was flabbergasted. I did not know what to say in response to that. I don't think there could have been one other than are you serious? I resigned from the SCNC board after this incident.

Steven Quat - former member Studio City Neighborhood Council 5/2014 through 7/2015

Sunday, March 22, 2015 at 1:59PM

Lisa Sarkin sends email lobbying for the Sportsmen's Landing Project using her official position on the neighborhood Council:

"Lisa Sarkin <lsarkin@studiocitync.org> Sun, Mar 22, 2015 at 1:59 PM To: Studio City Neighborhood Council <board@studiocitync.org>

Dear Board Members, There are many rumors going around about the Sportsmen's Landing proposed project. The applicant submitted plans under the allowed square footage of the land with basically no exceptions or variances. We supported the application and so did the board. It would be appreciated by the applicant if you would send an email supporting the project personally..."

Sunday March 22, 2015 at 2:38PM

Board member Alex Izbicki receives the lobbying email from Lisa Sarkin and replies to Lisa and cc's President John Walker:

"Alex Izbicki <aizbicki@studiocitync.org> To: Lisa Sarkin <lsarkin@studiocitync.org> Cc: John Walker <jwalker@studiocitync.org>

Hi Lisa, I'm just wondering if the SCNC's scope should go beyond vetting community issues. Your request seems like we as board members are being asked to promote a project to city officials on an issue that the board has already spoken on but still is under city review. Am I missing something here? John? Alex "

Sunday March 22, 2015 at 2:44PM

President John Walker replies to Board Member Izbicki and Sarkin:

"John Walker <jwalker@studiocitync.org> To: Alex Izbicki <aizbicki@studiocitync.org> Cc: Lisa Sarkin <lsarkin@studiocitync.org>

Hi Alex:

That is ironic as I wrote to her with a similar question? We have already vetted and voted on this so I don't know why we would or should become so involved? I have not yet received a reply.

Great seeing you this morning - it was a fantastic event... "

Sunday March 22, 2015 at 3:05PM

Board Member Izbicki replies to President John Walker and Sarkin:

"Alex Izbicki <aizbicki@studiocitync.org> Draft To: John Walker <jwalker@studiocitync.org> Cc: Lisa Sarkin <lsarkin@studiocitync.org>

Sun, Mar 22, 2015 at 3:05 PM

Hi Lisa, Hi John, It was great seeing you as well. I agree, great event. I hope it becomes a regular occurrence.

Again, I could be missing something, but something is not sitting well with your email Lisa.

I can see if you Lisa want to approach individual board members and others on a personal level to tout or promote this or any project. (which I personally feel as Chair of LUC probably is not a great idea when we do so much to promote board impartiality) I just feel reaching out in an SCNC capacity to your fellow SCNC board members can possibly expose the board severally and collectively to questions or allegations of favoritism or collusion with the developer/property owner in question. I think our job at SCNC is to our constituents and to hear opinions and vet projects and speak on them but not to attempt to form them and/or "championing" a project when they are still under review and possible appeal from the city.

Clarification would be appreciated. Best wishes,

John, you just emailed all of us informing how the city attorney has asked the board to refrain from involvement in Harvard Westlake activities for that exact reason... "

Sunday March 22, 2015 at 5:37PM

Sarkin replies to Izbicki and the President John Walker:

"Lisa Sarkin <lsarkin@studiocitync.org> To: Alex Izbicki <aizbicki@studiocitync.org> Cc: "John T. Walker <jwalker@studiocitync.org>

Every input counts for any effort. Whether we are for or against. I know what could be built and the erroneous information that is going around. "

Sunday March 22, 2015 at 6:42PM

President John Walker replies to Sarkin and Izbicki:

"John Walker <jwalker@studiocitync.org> To: Lisa Sarkin <lsarkin@studiocitync.org> Cc: Alex Izbicki <aizbicki@studiocitync.org>

Hi Lisa:

We have already done our "input" and you can only know what has been applied for. We are a Political body of the City and we should not do more, for any project, than what was done publicly.

I am sorry to disagree but again, you cannot possibly know what has not yet been applied for and that too would need approval.

Regards, John "

Transcript of Lisa Sarkin testimony from July 15th, 2015 SCNC Recall Meeting

"...Two. John Walker received the telephonic request from me to provide the authorization to speak at the hearing on the Sportsmen's Landing on Friday March 20th, 2015. At which time he indicated that he would appoint me on...on number three...on Councilman March 23rd 2015 at 11:14AM John Walker issued the SCNC board with a copy to our Councilman and Karo Torossian an email providing a formal appointment of me Vice President...and Chair of the SCNC Land Use Committee to speak on behalf of the board on both quote the Sportsmen's Landing and quote the Boulevard Live Hotel project unquote. That's exhibit two. This authorization was a blanket authoriza...authorization with regard to these two projects but was not limited in anyway to one particular meeting or hearing."

But Lisa Sarkin sent out an email lobbying for the Sportsmen's Landing project on

Sunday March 22, 2015 at 1:59PM a full day before *"John Walker issued to the SCNC board with a copy to our Councilman and Karo Torossian an email providing a formal appointment of me Vice President...and Chair of the SCNC Land Use Committee to speak on behalf of the board on both quote the Sportsmen's Landing and quote the Boulevard Live Hotel project unquote."*

On Tuesday, March 24, 2015 at 10:58 AM, Denise Welvang Board Member replied to Lisa Sarkin

<> wrote:

Hi Lisa,

I received calls this weekend regarding your e-mails. Unfortunately I was unable to access my e-mail until this morning and was speechless when I did access them. I find it totally inappropriate that you used your SCNC e-mail to send these three e-mails to anyone, much less the entire board and a number of non-

Ventura/Cahuenga Blvd corridor specific plan review board) to promote a personal goal and ethically compromise the balance of the board baffles me. You not only sent a specific formal letter directing board members to copy and send, with all of the persons to receive said the letter, but you added an obvious marketing fluff piece by the Weintraub group, making all of the SCNC appear to be nothing more than a collection of lobbyists for your associates. The neighborhood is understandably upset, but the even the owner of the land is upset with the Weintraub project. Yet the SCNC Board has been directed to fill out this letter in the hopes of forcing this project through. I cannot in good conscience do this task, nor will I. We represent the stake holders in our community, homeowners, renters, business owners, business patrons and others. Not just the deep pocket developers.

To make matters worse I attended the PAB at Beeman Park last night and found the area residents believe the SCNC does not listen to their views nor is it willing to help with their issues. When residents were told, by the PAB Chair, to talk with the SCNC regarding the possible park project, the response was universal laughter and a number of comments specifically stating "talking with the SCNC was a waste of time". They prefer to go to the SCRA with their issues on the grounds that the SCRA listens, is responsive to their concerns and sends out updates on all the issues impacting Studio City. This attitude, while understandable, is not what I believe the SCNC strives for. We have a big problem and these e-mails and antagonistic attitude only further encourages and cements their views. It appears to have had an unfavorable effect on other board members too, which is particularly sad.

Thanks,
Denise

Why did the Lisa Sarkin recall fail?

Enough Said...