



(Asian American Drug Abuse Program) www.aadapinc.org

2900 S. Crenshaw Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90016 Tel: (323) 293-6284

Fax: (323) 295-4075

October 5, 2010

Mr. Michael Logrande, Director LA City Planning Department Los Angeles City Hall 200 N. Spring Street Room 10Lo, LOth Floor Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE:

Case No. CPC 2009-800-CA CEOA ENV-2009-801.ND Council File 07-3427

F

Dear Mr. Logrande,

On behalf of AADAP, Inc., (Asian American Drug Abuse Program) we are writing you in opposition of the above-referenced ordinance. AADAP, Inc., is a drug treatment program that has been offering residential and outpatient drug treatment services to the community for over 30 years. AADAP's work helps addicts recover and reintegrate as productive members of society.

This proposed ordinance sweeps with too broad a brush and with no justification for doing so. The City has provided no supporting evidence that homes with more than one lease are greater threat to community health and safety than homes that don't have such rental agreements. This proposal also assumes the reverse, that homes in which financial burdens of housing are not shared under separate agreements pose no threat to communities, an equally unsound premise.

By redefining family, this ordinance ignores the case of City of Santa Barbara v. Adamson in which the California Supreme Court ruled, based on privacy laws, that local governments cannot define family differently for non-related persons than related persons. Furthermore, the City is apparently declaring war on its residents who choose to live together through shared rental agreements or who cannot afford to live any other way.

The City seeks to redefine family not on the functionality of how people relate to each other in the privacy of their households, but solely on how they pay for their housing. This puts an undue burden on those who cannot afford to live alone, particularly in these harsh economic times in which people are being forced to share housing who never have before.

The City has not specified how the potentially thousands of residences this ordinance will impact will be identified. Since it has provided no methodology, nor described how one will be developed to identify these homes, how can the City ensure that enforcement will be applied uniformly and not focused primarily on sober living, i.e. our population, of recovering individuals?

This ordinance is discriminatory against housing for persons with disabilities. The more than two and a half year history of this developing ordinance clearly demonstrates its discriminatory intent

to restrict group homes for persons with disabilities, eventually narrowing its focus specifically to sober living. In the trail of public documentation it is clear that the basis for wanting this restriction is based on neighbors' complaints about sober living. However, the City has offered no justification based on objective evidence that sober living homes overall are more of a threat to community health and safety than any other type of home. In fact, in a January 28, 2010, City Planning Staff Report, explanations were given why the City could not legally restrict sober homes. (see Jan.28,2010 staff report, p. 10)

Also, we oppose the use of "Correctional or Penal Institution" being defined as: "Any building including a prison, jail, or halfway house used for the housing or provision of services to persons under sentence from a federal, state or county court, or otherwise under the supervision of the State of California Department of Corrections or successor agency." As our population has an inordinate number of individuals who have crossed paths with the CDC, again, our population is being singled out and this should and this should not be the case. Also, those individuals who are served and aided by such residential housing are mostly non-violent drug offenders, not to be confused with half-way houses wherein sex offenders and other violent offenders have their housing. Just which homes would be impacted is not made clear/ Does the City's definition mean that any home in which a parolee lives, whether as a renter or not, would need to be classified and, therefore, need a CUP?

Broadening the scope of this ordinance to include all low density residential homes with shared lease agreements in the City is merely a pretext for the original intent to restrict sober living and other housing for persons with disabilities. Plus, the majority of public dialogue supporting this ordinance continues to focus primarily on sober living homes.

Even though the City has focused its current version of this ordinance on all low density residential homes with shared lease agreements in the City, it is a pretext for the original intent to restrict where sober living and other group housing for persons with disabilities can be located. Furthermore, the majority of the public dialogue on this subject continues to focus on sober living homes, not all homes with shared lease agreements.

Mayor Villaraigosa has his plan to eradicate homelessness in the City of Los Angeles in his 10-year plan. Adopting this ordinance will only raise the number of homeless who have the benefit of low-cost safe and supportive housing through sober living homes. Our population will be greatly and overly prejudiced by this ordinance.

Should you have any questions or comments before this time, please don't hesitate to contact us at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Mike Watanabe President & CEO

AADAP, Inc.