



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
LINDSEY P. HORVATH  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
Public Comment		<b>Oppose</b>	Lora L York	RMP 2025-0017-R5 OPPOSE
		<b>Other</b>	Andrew P Van Vooren	County Budget
			Courtney E Guerrero	<p>I am submitting public comment regarding serious concerns about DCFS placement transparency and accountability. A 14-month-old child, My granddaughter "Tilly" Servin, lost her life after being placed in a home where prior child abuse convictions existed. Those convictions were internally known but sealed from biological family members, preventing meaningful advocacy and informed oversight.</p> <p>I am asking this Board to review DCFS placement disclosure policies and consider reforms requiring transparency when substantiated abuse history exists, independent review in high-risk placements, and documented risk assessments accessible to qualified relatives.</p> <p>This is not about retaliation. It is about preventing future harm and ensuring child safety through transparency and accountability.</p>
			Courtney E Guerrero	<p>I am submitting public comment regarding serious concerns about DCFS placement transparency and accountability. A 14-month-old child, Lilliam "Tilly" Servin, my granddaughter lost her life after being placed in a home where prior child abuse convictions existed. Those convictions were internally known but sealed from biological family members, preventing meaningful advocacy and informed oversight.</p> <p>I am asking this Board to review DCFS placement disclosure policies and consider reforms requiring transparency when substantiated abuse history exists, independent review in high-risk placements, and documented risk assessments accessible to qualified relatives.</p> <p>This is not about retaliation. It is about preventing future harm and ensuring child safety through transparency and accountability.</p>
		<b>Item Total</b>	<b>4</b>	
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>4</b>	

**Subject:** Public Comment on FY 2026-27 Budget – Micrographics and Modernization Funds

To the Honorable Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express serious concerns regarding the allocation of the \$4.4 million Micrographics Fund and the \$11.7 million Modernization Fund in the upcoming fiscal year budget.

Specifically, the proposed \$11 million contract with Kofile for third-party microfilm restoration represents a missed opportunity for the County to build long-term, sustainable infrastructure. Rather than "farming out" this critical work to a private vendor, these public funds should be reinvested internally to strengthen our own workforce.

The current strategy overlooks a more cost-effective and efficient solution: investing in the Assistant Microfilm Technician position. By prioritizing internal training and staff retention over high-priced external contracts, the County would:

- **Protect Public Funds:** Keep the \$11 million within the County economy rather than sending it to an outside corporation.
- **Modernize Properly:** Use the \$11.7 million Modernization Fund to upgrade internal equipment and software, ensuring the County owns the tools of production.
- **Leverage Existing Talent:** Our internal labor is ready and capable of performing this work immediately; we simply need the departmental support and resources to execute it.
- **Ensure Quality Control:** Maintain direct oversight of vital records restoration, which is often lost when specialized work is outsourced.

The specialized nature of microfilm preservation requires a dedicated team. Relying on temporary external contracts leads to a loss of institutional knowledge and leaves the County vulnerable to rising vendor costs in the future.

While I submit this as a concerned member of the public, my perspective is rooted in a deep understanding of the daily technical requirements and the specific operational challenges faced within this unit. I urge the Board to direct these funds toward internal staff development and equipment modernization rather than further outsourcing.

Respectfully,

Andrew Van Vooren

2/26/2026

**RE: Public Safety Crisis and Regulatory Failure – RMP 2025-0017-R5 & El Rancho Escondido (APN 7480-004-3020)**

I write to oppose the hurried and non-transparent deer eradication plan for Santa Catalina Island. While the ecological arguments are well-known, I am writing to provide critical evidence regarding a **major public safety hazard** and a **regulatory failure** that has been overlooked in the recently approved **Restoration Management Permit (RMP)**.

**1. The "Fire Trap" at El Rancho Escondido:**

The RMP fails to account for the role of **El Rancho Escondido (APN 7480-004-3020)** as a primary "irrigated attractant." The vineyard at this site serves as a year-round water and food source that concentrates deer density. If these grazers are removed without a concurrent, massive increase in funded brush clearing, the area will experience an immediate surge in **"flashy" invasive fuels** (wild oats and ripgut brome). This creates an unanalyzed wildfire "powder keg" along **Airport Road**, the only interior evacuation route as well as the island as a whole. LA County Fire Chief Marrone has stated that removal of all deer greatly increases the risk of island-wide fires.

**2. Failure of the 2006-2007 Conditional Use Permit (CUP):**

The vineyard was approved in 2006 (CUP R2005-02117) under the assumption that the surrounding landscape—including the deer population—was part of a stable baseline. By allowing the CDFW to eradicate the deer, the County is effectively changing the environmental conditions of that original permit. We believe this triggers a legal requirement for a **Subsequent EIR** under **CEQA Guidelines §15162**.

**3. Inconsistency with Naturalization Standards:**

The CDFW's argument that the deer are not "naturalized" after 100 years is a dangerous precedent. Under CEQA, the "baseline" is the environment as it exists today. Removing a century-old grazer without first mitigating the "attractant" (the vineyard) is a backwards approach that prioritizes a private commercial interest over public safety.

**Requested Action:**

We respectfully ask that your office:

- Demand an **immediate stay** of RMP 2025-0017-R5 pending a **Wildfire Risk Assessment** by LA County Fire.
- Request that Regional Planning review **CUP R2005-02117** for potential revocation and removal, as the "irrigated attractant" is now the primary driver of the ecological crisis they are trying to "hurriedly" solve.

**Sincerely,**  
Lora York