

Communication from Public

Name: Barbara Broide

Date Submitted: 02/21/2025 06:16 AM

Council File No: 15-0989-S47

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose this measure as written and request that it be held for further refinement. The motion as presented is too broad and creates a blank check for projects that may carry with them significant negative impacts. It also opens the door for projects not truly related to the Olympic or Paralympics to proceed without required compliance. The specific projects and their locations should be specified. There is a very significant difference between temporary and permanent structures and it is inappropriate to allow facilities that will remain after the Olympics to skirt compliance with all land use review practices. Public participation should not be removed from the process and specific plans and other land use policies that were the product of robust public participation cannot be ignored. If and/or when this motion is adopted, please exclude the McCourt / LAART Gondola project from those that fall under this motion. Rather than proceed with this measure, it would be wise to create an expedited review process and schedule for specific projects. The taxpayers of Los Angeles were told that our Olympics would be a no-build event taking advantage of existing venues. If event demands now require venues to be constructed, the communities and neighborhoods that will host them should not be burdened with inappropriate projects that outlive the events. It is appropriate to ask what role the Olympics Committee can and should play in contributing to the cost of staffing needed to provide proper project review. By removing some events from the City, the Olympics Organizing Committee has removed future event-related benefit and revenues from our City. They should do their fair share. (I note that the public does not know and cannot understand the relationship between the City and the Organizing Committee and whether the City is fairly represented in any contractual agreements because of the private nature of the Committee and the lack of public transparency.) The motion under consideration should not be adopted as written for being too broad and too easily abused with potential significant long-lasting negative impacts on the City's neighborhoods.