

## Communication from Public

**Name:** sandy berman

**Date Submitted:** 10/12/2021 03:17 PM

**Council File No:** 21-4118-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am requesting Council Member O'Farrells' 17 Site Resolution to continue his motion until council can demonstrate progress on the outreach program at thses sites, and to abstain from voting until the outreach protocol has been completed. Also I ask Council to request the CLA adjusts resolution protocol to be in line with outreach protocol and to develop standards for identifying if a site has met requirements for enforcement.  
Sincerely, Sandra Berman Woodland Hills, Ca

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Philip Meyer

**Date Submitted:** 10/12/2021 03:19 PM

**Council File No:** 21-4118-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a resident of Councilmember O'Farrell's district, in the East Hollywood neighborhood. Many of the locations listed in Councilmember O'Farrell's motion are near my home. And I stridently OPPOSE the motion. I am sad to call Councilmember O'Farrell my representative. The Councilmember continually prioritizes the financial objectives of corporations and wealthy landowners over the livelihood of CD 13's residents. His primary response to the housing crisis are to criminalize poverty and homelessness are shameful. This motion is yet another example in a campaign of force and violence. The Councilmember's standard argument is that there are "tiny homes" now, so it's okay make the city into a fenced-off, militarized space for the most vulnerable. This is unconscionable. Instead of punishing the victims of skyrocketing housing costs, O'Farrell should be focusing his attention on reversing the flows of financial capital into our communities, discouraging real estate speculation, and strengthening the enforcement of the rent control, habitability, and anti-harassment ordinances. I urge the City Council to vote NO on this motion.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nitzan Barlev

**Date Submitted:** 10/12/2021 03:57 PM

**Council File No:** 21-4118-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hi, I'm Nitzan Barlev, VBS community organizer writing in on behalf of the Homelessness Task Force at our temple. Council should continue this item. When the Council passed the amended LAMC 41.18 - they committed to a Street Engagement Strategy that would precede any enforcement. We have not seen evidence that each identified site has gone through the entire Street Engagement Strategy protocol and that all residents of the impacted encampments have been offered suitable housing and shelter. Also, there are still a number of report backs pending within the Energy, Climate Change, Environmental Justice, and Rivers Committee related to the Outreach Engagement Framework, including ones pertaining to outreach coordination and the ability for the City to create the necessary signage for posting 41.18 restrictions. Council members committed to a different pathway forward when it updated 41.18 - stating that a Street Engagement Strategy would minimize the role of law enforcement and avoid the criminalization of unsheltered residents. Voting on and approving this resolution today undermines that commitment. Each 41.18 resolution must be scheduled within 30 days, but each Council member can continue the item "if the item is not ready for action." To date council members have already introduced resolutions impacting over 100 sites citywide. Given that this is the first real test of the new 41.18 street engagement protocols, Council member O'Farrell should continue the item until we can be absolutely positive that the process was carried out as designed.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 10/12/2021 04:24 PM

**Council File No:** 21-4118-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a resident of the Hollywood studio district, I firmly oppose Councilmember O'Farrell's resolution 41.18. It's cruel, superficial, and unproductive. Rather than doing the long, difficult work of housing the homeless, this ordinance will simply shuffle our mentally ill and addicted to another location. Our houseless neighbors in this area are no more troublesome than our housed neighbors. I live in the immediate vicinity of the location listed as #14, Angelica's Daycare. While the people who live in tents on this block do cause some disturbance, it is FAR less than that of Angelica's Daycare and AT&T. I could lodge a noise complaint daily against the daycare for all the Baby Shark and shrieking I have to hear. Angelica frequently hosts drunken karaoke parties late into the night. Aside from being annoying, this is also a public health hazard while in the middle of a global pandemic. AT&T employees frequently honk horns as loud and long as possible. There's an immense light in their parking lot that illuminates the entire block at night, disturbing our rest. Actions to sweep away our less fortunate and ill residents seem to be performative - especially in light of the multitude of cold, hideous, new buildings popping up around all of us. This is motion proves the stereotype of hollywood true: that we are vapid, careless, selfish, and elite. Mitch, you make me ashamed I voted for you. I encourage all council members to deny this motion and vote NO.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dr. Va Lecia Adams Kellum

**Date Submitted:** 10/12/2021 04:26 PM

**Council File No:** 21-4118-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am Dr. Va Lecia Adams Kellum, President & CEO of St. Joseph Center writing today to urge the City to continue Item #22. When LAMC 41.18 was passed as amended, the City Council committed itself to a framework in which enforcement actions would be preceded by a consistent Street Engagement Strategy. We currently have insufficient evidence that the sites identified in this item have actually received the full range of services over the timeframe outlined in the Street Engagement Strategy. We also have no way of verifying that bona fide offers of suitable housing and/or shelter have been made to all residents of these encampments. Additionally, the Energy, Climate Change, Environmental Justice, and Rivers Committee has yet to make a number of reports connected with the Outreach Engagement Framework that deal with such critical issues as outreach coordination and the City's capacity to actually create and post signage outlining 41.18 restrictions. When the Council updated 41.18, it made a commitment to a uniform, service-provider-led Street Engagement Strategy that would de-emphasize law enforcement's role and avoid criminalizing people simply for being unsheltered. Taking action to approve this resolution now directly contradicts that commitment. While 41.18 resolutions must be scheduled within 30 days, it also true that Councilmembers may continue the item if it is "not ready for action." Members of this council have introduced resolutions that could impact more than 100 sites across eight council districts. Today you are setting the template for how these resolutions will be handled. I urge you to ensure that the new 41.18 Street Engagement Strategy is given a verifiable opportunity to succeed, and for that to happen, Councilmember O'Farrell must continue the item until we can be sure that the process has been completed in accordance with the framework that this Council approved.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lauren Natoli

**Date Submitted:** 10/12/2021 02:08 PM

**Council File No:** 21-4118-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am opposed to 21-4118-S1. I believe that criminalizing and punishing people for being homeless will only make the crisis of homelessness much worse in LA. Jailing or fining people is not a solution, the people being affected do not have that kind of disposable income or freedom to adhere. Better solutions to curbing homelessness would be requiring inclusionary zoning, building affordable housing, and incorporating Housing First models.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Rachel Kassenbrock

**Date Submitted:** 10/12/2021 09:01 PM

**Council File No:** 21-4118-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am submitting this comment on behalf of LA Family Housing on Council File 21-4118-S1 (item #22 during the 10/13 Council meeting). When the Council passed the amended LAMC 41.18 - they committed to a Street Engagement Strategy that would precede any enforcement. We have not seen evidence that each identified site has gone through the entire Street Engagement Strategy protocol and that all residents of the impacted encampments have been offered suitable housing and shelter. Additionally, there are still a number of report backs pending within the Energy, Climate Change, Environmental Justice, and Rivers Committee related to the Outreach Engagement Framework, including ones pertaining to outreach coordination and the ability for the City to create the necessary signage for posting 41.18 restrictions. Councilmembers committed to a different pathway forward when they updated 41.18, stating that a Street Engagement Strategy would minimize the role of law enforcement and avoid the criminalization of unsheltered residents. Voting on and approving this resolution today undermines that commitment. Each 41.18 resolution must be scheduled within 30 days, but each Councilmember can continue the item "if the item is not ready for action." To date councilmembers have already introduced resolutions impacting over 100 sites citywide. Given that this is the first real test of the new 41.18 street engagement protocols, Councilmember O'Farrell should continue the item until we can be absolutely positive that the process was carried out as designed. Thank you so much for your consideration.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 10/12/2021 09:46 PM

**Council File No:** 21-4118-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** I'm writing on behalf of item #22. Council should continue this item. When the Council passed the amended LAMC 41.18 - they committed to a Street Engagement Strategy that would precede any enforcement. We have not seen evidence that each identified site has gone through the entire Street Engagement Strategy protocol and that all residents of the impacted encampments have been offered suitable housing and shelter. Also, there are still a number of report backs pending within the Energy, Climate Change, Environmental Justice, and Rivers Committee related to the Outreach Engagement Framework, including ones pertaining to outreach coordination and the ability for the City to create the necessary signage for posting 41.18 restrictions. Councilmembers committed to a different pathway forward when it updated 41.18 - stating that a Street Engagement Strategy would minimize the role of law enforcement and avoid the criminalization of unsheltered residents. Voting on and approving this resolution today undermines that commitment. Each 41.18 resolution must be scheduled within 30 days, but each Councilmember can continue the item "if the item is not ready for action." To date councilmembers have already introduced resolutions impacting over 100 sites citywide. Given that this is the first real test of the new 41.18 street engagement protocols, Councilmember O'Farrell should continue the item until we can be absolutely positive that the process was carried out as designed.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Akio Katano

**Date Submitted:** 10/12/2021 11:39 PM

**Council File No:** 21-4118-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a twisted garbage resolution and must be rejected. Council claimed that they were created a street engagement strategy, not criminalization, and here we have a motion that is the exact opposite of what they claimed - only criminalization without the slightest trace of a street engagement strategy. Shame on Councilmember O'Farrell, a disastrous failure of a representative, and on any one who supports this foolishness.