

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Laurie Kelson

**Date Submitted:** 08/06/2024 12:24 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0140-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please pass this ASAP. There have been 14 fires in the past week in the Sepulveda Basin in CD 6. The expensive LAFD resources are needed for so many areas and are exhausted. There was a 75 acre fire.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Penelope Deihl

**Date Submitted:** 08/06/2024 10:03 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0140-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** If we do not follow the Supreme Court ruling in the Grant Pass case and enforce the existing laws relative to encampments, Los Angeles will become a bigger magnet for the unhoused. Our city will be over run with people from other states and jurisdictions who are enforcing the encampment laws and will become the dumping ground of those states and jurisdictions' issues. The number of unhoused in Los Angeles will only increase. We must enforce these laws to better serve those currently in need and our city in general. Thanks, Penelope.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Katherine King

**Date Submitted:** 08/06/2024 04:52 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0140-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** CF 24-0140-S1 Comment: Vote No Although knowledge is always a good thing, the purpose for which one seeks it may be highly questionable. In the case of motion 24-0140-S1, knowledge about how the recent SCOTUS ruling on Grants Pass affects the City's existing rules, litigation, and established agreements appears to be sought for only one reason: a desire to change those rules to make it easier to arrest unhoused people without having to create housing for them. Compare this motion to the Board of Supervisors' reaffirmation that their Care First approach to encampment resolution will continue despite the SCOTUS ruling (Agenda item 13, July 23, 2024). Motion 24-0140-S1 does not mention of Care First. The BOS wants to coordinate with all the cities in the County to make sure the impact is equitable everywhere. Motion 24-0140-S1 is concerned only with how other cities' policies will impact the City of Los Angeles. If this motion were a person, I would label it narcissistic and fearful. Since it is not, I will use only "mean-spirited." The second part of the motion, which wants to know "how this ruling impacts the LA Alliance Settlement" invites intense speculation. It is clear from the Los Angeles Times report on the 2022 agreement between the City Council and the Alliance that many on the Council agreed to open "enough beds over the next five years to accommodate 60% of the city's unsheltered population in each City Council district" only because it meant they could thereby evict unhoused people from parks and other public spaces. [see <https://www.latimes.com/homeless-housing/story/2022-04-01/los-angeles-homeless-lawsuit-settlement-judge-carter>] And now what? Are the six makers of this motion perhaps hopeful that the City Attorney will find a way to release them from the obligation to create those beds? Are the Councillors representing wealthier districts hoping that the pressure to build low-income and affordable housing will dissipate? That they can continue to oppose projects like the Venice Dell Community with impunity because they can simply sweep the unhoused off their streets into jails and unincorporated areas? Out of sight out of mind. Please get down to work on building city-wide affordable and low-income housing, on incorporating rather than "disappearing" the unhoused through criminalization. Please vote no on this mean-spirited motion.

CF 24-0140-S1 Comment: Vote No

Although knowledge is always a good thing, the purpose for which one seeks it may be highly questionable. In the case of motion 24-0140-S1, knowledge about how the recent SCOTUS ruling on Grants Pass affects the City's existing rules, litigation, and established agreements appears to be sought for only one reason: a desire to change those rules to make it easier to arrest unhoused people without having to create housing for them.

Compare this motion to the Board of Supervisors' reaffirmation that their Care First approach to encampment resolution will continue despite the SCOTUS ruling (Agenda item 13, July 23, 2024). Motion 24-0140-S1 does not mention of Care First. The BOS wants to coordinate with all the cities in the County to make sure the impact is equitable everywhere. Motion 24-0140-S1 is concerned only with how other cities' policies will impact the City of Los Angeles. If this motion were a person, I would label it narcissistic and fearful. Since it is not, I will use only "mean-spirited."

The second part of the motion, which wants to know "how this ruling impacts the LA Alliance Settlement" invites intense speculation. It is clear from the Los Angeles Times report on the 2022 agreement between the City Council and the Alliance that many on the Council agreed to open "enough beds over the next five years to accommodate 60% of the city's unsheltered population in each City Council district" only because it meant they could thereby evict unhoused people from parks and other public spaces. [see <https://www.latimes.com/homeless-housing/story/2022-04-01/los-angeles-homeless-lawsuit-settlement-judge-carter>] And now what? Are the six makers of this motion perhaps hopeful that the City Attorney will find a way to release them from the obligation to create those beds?

Are the Councillors representing wealthier districts hoping that the pressure to build low-income and affordable housing will dissipate? That they can continue to oppose projects like the Venice Dell Community with impunity because they can simply sweep the unhoused off their streets into jails and unincorporated areas? Out of sight out of mind.

Please get down to work on building city-wide affordable and low-income housing, on incorporating rather than "disappearing" the unhoused through criminalization. Please **vote no** on this mean-spirited motion.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** P. Salmon

**Date Submitted:** 08/06/2024 09:04 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0140-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a CD11 resident that has had enough. The city of Los Angeles is an open landfill because the homeless are allowed to do whatever they want in this city. Public transportation is treated like a dumpster. Why should the homeless be allowed (ignored) to do whatever they want? Follow in San Francisco's lead and find the will to make Los Angeles a better city.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 08/06/2024 09:36 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0140-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please consider the rights of other people who use public spaces such as children, the elderly and the disabled. Forcing these vulnerable groups to walk in the street amongst traffic when sidewalks are blocked, or to live in fear while in their home or in the park due to suspicious activity or screaming from nearby encampments or to have to wade through trash and human feces, this is a violation of their rights to have safe access to public spaces and to be secure in their homes and communities.