

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Uncle Phil LLC  
**Date Submitted:** 05/20/2021 06:34 PM  
**Council File No:** 12-0931

**Comments for Public Posting:** Uncle Phil has voted NO on this matter and respectfully requests that all members of the City Council please review our comments, below and copied in the attached pdf file. Uncle Phil LLC is the owner of one of the largest wholesale produce and dry goods markets in Los Angeles. The property has been under local, Los Angeles-based family ownership for over 70 years. Over fifty tenants occupy space within the market, many of whom are also family-owned, local businesses. In recent years the proliferation of vandalism, vagrancy, and homeless tent encampments has had a dramatic impact on the appearance and desirability of the property. A tent fire in June 2020 which was started by a fight between homeless persons on the sidewalk adjacent to the property resulted in destruction of one of the largest buildings within the market, and devastation to the businesses of numerous tenants. For the reasons set forth below, Uncle Phil has voted NO to the establishment of the expanded BID area that is proposed to include some of the property within Central Wholesale Market. Please note, we have no personal animosity to the managers, employees, and consultants of the BID, whom we believe to be well-intentioned and personally courteous. We do, however, feel strongly about our NO vote and respectfully request that the members of the City Council not approve the expansion that affects our property. We have participated in public opportunities to make these views known to Councilmember DeLeon, as well. • Because our properties do not face the street, our single biggest issue is homeless encampments that surround our property, rather than the types of services that this BID provides. As noted in the introduction, due to an altercation between homeless tent dwellers, one set the other's tent on fire and the fire spread to and destroyed an entire building on our property, affecting numerous small business owners and driving up fire insurance premiums to an astronomical amount. We understand that the BID is not legally empowered to do anything about this problem. • In our case, the BID initially informed us in writing that our property would be assessed within a certain class. After we told the BID that we did not want to have our property included, the BID changed the categorization of our property into a higher cost category, and included a portion of our property in the expansion area anyway, all without any notice to us, or any opportunity to

meaningfully object or opt out. If this passes, our property taxes will be increased over \$16,200 per year, and will include only a single building that does not face the street and contains less than 10,000 square feet. • The expansion of the BID is being done in a way that none of the property owners in the expanded area have any effective way of opting out. This is because of the way the City is counting the votes, namely, based on whether a majority of the property owners in the proposed newly expanded district vote yes, and on a weighted method. There is no separate vote of only owners in the expansion area. • Because of this flawed process, an owner who does not wish to participate in the BID could nevertheless see a material and substantial assessment amount added to that owner's property tax bill – a true case of taxation without representation. • A careful review of the ballot materials shows that nowhere does it state why the BID area is being expanded, other than to say that the appended properties are of a similar type as those within the existing district. The ballot package refers the reader to pages within a "Management District Plan and Engineer's Report" which is not included in the materials, nor are the relevant pages summarized in the ballot materials. • In order to find the "Management District Plan and Engineer's Report", an interested property owner must be an expert at navigating the City websites. The ballot materials when originally mailed contained an incorrect Council File number. A correction letter was sent separately. Who knows whether property owners received the correction? When a property owner eventually gets to the actual web page that contains the correct Council File, and then figures out how and where to find the "Management District Plan", he or she will still find no explanation of why the BID should be allowed to add all these new properties. Uncle Phil LLC appreciates your consideration of these comments. Should you wish to discuss this further please contact representatives of Uncle Phil LLC: Zach Zalben or Michelle Rojas, c/o Black Equities, (310) 278-5333, mrojas@begroup.us Lisa Quateman, c/o Belldale LLC, (310) 994-5459, lquateman@quateman.com

UNCLE PHIL LLC  
Owners of Central Wholesale Market  
Main address: 1211 E. Olympic Blvd., Los Angeles, CA

PUBLIC COMMENT  
REGARDING  
DOWNTOWN INDUSTRIAL BID ASSESSMENT BALLOT

LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL FILE NO. 12-0931

Introductory Comment

Uncle Phil LLC is the owner of one of the largest wholesale produce and dry goods markets in Los Angeles. The property has been under local, Los Angeles-based family ownership for over 70 years. Over fifty tenants occupy space within the market, many of whom are also family-owned, local businesses. In recent years the proliferation of vandalism, vagrancy, and homeless tent encampments has had a dramatic impact on the appearance and desirability of the property. A tent fire in June 2020 which was started by a fight between homeless persons on the sidewalk adjacent to the property resulted in destruction of one of the largest buildings within the market, and devastation to the businesses of numerous tenants. For the reasons set forth below, Uncle Phil has voted NO to the establishment of the expanded BID area that is proposed to include some of the property within Central Wholesale Market. Please note, we have no personal animosity to the managers, employees, and consultants of the BID, whom we believe to be well-intentioned and personally courteous. We do, however, feel strongly about our NO vote and respectfully request that the members of the City Council not approve the expansion that affects our property. We have participated in public opportunities to make these views known to Councilmember DeLeon, as well.

- Because our properties do not face the street, our single biggest issue is homeless encampments that surround our property, rather than the types of services that this BID provides. As noted in the introduction, due to an altercation between homeless tent dwellers, one set the other's tent on fire and the fire spread to and destroyed an entire building on our property, affecting numerous small business owners and driving up fire insurance premiums to an astronomical amount. We understand that the BID is not legally empowered to do anything about this problem.
- In our case, the BID initially informed us in writing that our property would be assessed within a certain class. After we told the BID that we did not want to have our property included, the BID *changed* the categorization of our property into a higher cost category, and *included* a portion of our property in the expansion area anyway, all without any notice to us, or any opportunity to meaningfully object or opt out. If this passes, our property taxes will be increased over \$16,200 *per year*, and will include only a single building that does not face the street and contains less than 10,000 square feet.

- The expansion of the BID is being done in a way that none of the property owners in the expanded area have any effective way of opting out. This is because of the way the City is counting the votes, namely, based on whether a majority of the property owners in the proposed newly expanded district vote yes, and on a weighted method. There is no separate vote of only owners in the expansion area.
- Because of this flawed process, an owner who does not wish to participate in the BID could nevertheless see a material and substantial assessment amount added to that owner's property tax bill – a true case of taxation without representation.
- A careful review of the ballot materials shows that nowhere does it state *why* the BID area is being expanded, other than to say that the appended properties are of a similar type as those within the existing district. The ballot package refers the reader to pages within a "Management District Plan and Engineer's Report" which is not included in the materials, nor are the relevant pages summarized in the ballot materials.
- In order to find the "Management District Plan and Engineer's Report", an interested property owner must be an expert at navigating the City websites. The ballot materials when originally mailed contained an incorrect Council File number. A correction letter was sent separately. Who knows whether property owners received the correction? When a property owner eventually gets to the actual web page that contains the correct Council File, and then figures out how and where to find the "Management District Plan", he or she will still find no explanation of why the BID should be allowed to add all these new properties.

Uncle Phil LLC appreciates your consideration of these comments. Should you wish to discuss this further please contact representatives of Uncle Phil LLC:

Zach Zalben or Michelle Rojas, c/o Black Equities, (310) 278-5333, [mrojas@begroup.us](mailto:mrojas@begroup.us)  
 Lisa Quateman, c/o Belldale LLC, (310) 994-5459, [lquateman@quateman.com](mailto:lquateman@quateman.com)