

Communication from Public

Name: Doug Ross

Date Submitted: 10/02/2024 01:48 PM

Council File No: 24-1168

Comments for Public Posting: the incompetence level in authoring factual motions is amazing. oceans 11 rv park llc vs the city of los angeles has nothing to do with motion 24-0787. as i state once again. OCEANS 11 RV PARK LLC DOES NOT OWN EITHER OF THE PROPERTIES IN QUESTION ON THIS MOTION AND IT HAS BEEN REQUESTED MULTIPLE TIMES TO REMOVE THE LLC NAME FROM THAT MOTION. the motion that does apply to that case is 24-0711. that motion is the cause of the unlawful discretionary interference in a by-right project by a biased councilman that is unethically representing one group of his constituents over another. could some one competent PLEASE remove oceans 11 rv park llc from 24-0787. proof of who actually owns the parks in question in 24-0787 has been provided multiple times to multiple people. it is obvious district 15 needs leadership that cares about conveying accurate information to council and constituents. 24-0711 also contains this falsehood about ownership as well as failing to mention the CALGEM report mentioned as being needed in that other motion had already been provided. these two statements by me are verifiable to be true. since in the june 14th meeting between the councilman and myself, stewart and donyea was made just to hand deliver not only the required cswr report but much more, such as engineer reports, soil reports, well capping reports and certifications for all 9 wells, and should have satisfied the motion that was brought to a vote over a week later. in that meeting the two properties in question in 24-0787 were brought up, at which time stewart said he did not own those properties as one had been sold over 4 years earlier and the other over a year earlier. the councilmans response to that was "well that is even more concerning. how do we know you wont just flip this property too?" which altho a totally inappropriate question as this is a private business that operates for profit , it was an acknowledgement that the councilman understood the ownership issue. it is easy to remember the details if that meeting as the condecending and judgemental way we were talked to was quite memorable. That was well before motion 24-0787 was brought to council. making these claims of ownership in the motion a knowingly false statement. same as in 24-0711 and the multiple false statements in it. it is mind boggling that this willful act continues after asking for this change for months. is

misleading the public the goal or is it just the inability to research facts before making these statements on a motion? these false and misleading statements should actually make both motions mentioned above invalid. while i do apologize for my tone in this message, it should be quite understandable after having asked so many times for its correction