

Communication from Public

Name: Rita Silverman

Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 02:09 PM

Council File No: 21-0829-S1

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Council Members: When I've approached major decisions in my life, I've made a pros and cons list and assigned weights to each of the pros and cons. I have tried to stick with only the facts. This has minimized the likelihood that critical factors may be missed. In addition, because major decisions are likely to evoke powerful emotions, analyzing the pros and cons based on facts reduce cognitive biases which are common patterns of thinking that lead to errors in judgment and poor decision making. My question to each of you is have you made a pros and cons list when considering approving the massive Reese-Davidson Community that would forever diminish Venice and place unfair burdens on people who live, work and engage in recreational activities here? If you vote yes on approving the massive project, I would challenge you to post your pros and cons list so the Venice Community can see exactly why you voted the way you did based on the overwhelming facts that clearly show the irreversible negative impact the project would have on Venice with little to no benefit to ANYONE except the developers. Chair Marqueece Harris-Dawson stated in a 2019 interview that "I am a bit of a data nerd, and I like to deal in the world of facts as opposed to opinion" and "I know that any government involvement on a project can feel like an intrusion. But some of that has to be done in order to make the city safe for the long term, and a place where everybody can live, grow, and prosper—not just an individual developer trying to create a profitable development." If Chair Harris-Dawson and each of you "deal in the world of facts as opposed to opinion" and want to "make the city safe for the long term, and a place where everybody can live, grow, and prosper—not just an individual developer trying to create a profitable development" then you will vote no on this monstrosity. The following are several of numerous items on the "cons" list: • Before the passage of AB 1197, the City was preparing an EIR for the Reese Davidson project. In a 12/18/2018 Notice of Preparation of Environmental Impact Report, the City did an initial environmental impact study. That study showed that the Project could have potentially significant environmental impact on many things including air quality, cultural resources, hydrology and water quality and land use. The study also showed that transportation, energy conservation, and Infrastructure would

also be impacted. • An Oct. 2021 LA County publication stated that by mid-century, sea levels of up to 2.5 feet will lead to more frequent and severe coastal flooding, especially in low-lying areas unprotected by natural bluffs, like the canals. The publication stated that low-income communities will find it particularly difficult to prepare for and recover from flooding events, and the events may have an outsized impact on the local economy because of the concentration of key industries along the coast, including tourism, shipping, and select energy assets. • Elimination of Precious Open Space: The 2.8-acre building site is the largest parcel of zoned open space in Venice. Venice desperately needs this parcel to address our chronic parking shortage (for residents, visitors and businesses alike). • Indefensible Expense: The average size of a unit of supportive or affordable housing in the Reese-Davidson Community is 449 square feet. Factoring in conservative estimates for land and parking results in building costs of more than \$600,000 per unit—or nearly \$1,400 / sq. ft — before overages. The sale cost of a condominium in Los Angeles in Q4 2019, by contrast, was \$377 / sq. ft. Spending nearly 4x market rate on homeless housing is simply impossible to justify. • Mass, Size & Character: The City’s RFQ/P states that the proposed site is unusually large and need not be developed in its entirety. Plans for the project, however, not only call for using every square inch of buildable space on the site but also seek numerous exemptions from height limitations and set back requirements applicable to market rate projects in Venice, further crowding existing residences as well as the substandard streets and sidewalks in the area. • Ms. Reese Greenland sent a cease and desist letter to the developers stating that her grandfather—Venice legend Arthur L. Reese—would want the project “stopped immediately” and demanded that the Reese name be removed from the project and also stated that the project is “the opposite of social justice” because it reduces beach access for communities of color by replacing existing surface lot parking with expensive, mechanical lift parking 500 feet further from the beach and freezing substandard streets and sidewalks in place forever. On the "pros" list is the benefit to certain developers trying to create a profitable development. In light of the foregoing, please reject the project. Thank you.