

Communication from Public

Name: Jared Meisler

Date Submitted: 05/23/2021 10:54 AM

Council File No: 17-0981

Comments for Public Posting: Hello Council, I've been a restaurant owner and operator in Los Angeles for 15 years. I am in strong support of the Restaurant Beverage Program. I think it is thoughtful and well crafted. It balances business and resident's needs. This program will help to support restaurants creation and survival and create jobs.
Sincerely, Jared Meisler

Communication from Public

Name: Eddie Navarrette
Date Submitted: 05/23/2021 11:34 AM
Council File No: 17-0981
Comments for Public Posting: See attached letter of support addressing amendments



INDEPENDENT

HOSPITALITY COALITION

Via Email

May 23rd, 2021

Economic Development and Jobs Committee

Councilmember Curren D. Price, Jr. Chair

Councilmember Bob Blumenfield

Councilmember Nithya Raman

Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Councilmember Marqueece Harris-Dawson

Re: Restaurant Beverage Program ([CF: 17-0981](#))

Dear Economic Development and Jobs Committee Chair Curren Price and Committee Members:

The Independent Hospitality Coalition (IHC) represents over 1200 members made up of local food service business operators and employees within the Los Angeles area. We were created to provide a voice and representation for our workforce and essential businesses that are engrained in Los Angeles' local economy.

We are writing in our continued support of Item 7 ([CF: 17-0981](#)) on the agenda for your meeting on Tuesday, May 25th, that would establish a Restaurant Beverage Program (RBP), an administrative process for the onsite consumption of alcohol incidental to a restaurant, subject to a set of eligibility criteria, performance standards, and enforcement procedures. The creation of RBP would help businesses who need it most – the small restaurant businesses that cannot afford a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) – both the extreme financial burden and lengthy time historically associated with the CUP process, typically requiring the hiring of an expeditor to navigate the cumbersome process (average \$27,000 and 12-18 months).

RBP is the remedy that small restaurant businesses have long needed.

A CUP for alcohol in conjunction with a restaurant should not cost \$15,000, plus extraordinary fees. It is simply unaffordable for most local small businesses – and most business owners give up on this opportunity to maximize their revenue deeming it impossible. IHC believes it is critical for the City to simplify the permitting process for restaurants. Not only is the process expensive, but also extremely lengthy – taking nearly two years to get planning authorization for an alcohol license. The proposed program is a great solution that will help restaurants obtain an alcohol license while still ensuring restaurants abide by the City's rules and help keep our communities safe. We believe the 7AM-11PM hours limitation will help mitigate the misuse of restaurants as nightclubs and help address community concerns. The RBP should also include full liquor that would enable existing restaurants that wish to expand their premise or remodel their interior floor plan a license without be subjected to the \$15,000+ fee and years' wait time.

Cities such as Santa Monica, Burbank, Pasadena and Beverly Hills **already allow** template approvals for restaurants who wish to serve alcohol. These template approvals that have not increased the detriment to quality of life by allowing these programs. Los Angeles needs to be part of their efforts to make the City a more business-friendly economy, especially for small businesses who are trying to survive the pandemic.

Additionally, post-Covid impacts on job loss are inclusive of city staff processing these types of applications. City budget cuts have forced several community development staff members into early retirement and work furloughs. We need to consider new ways to make our great city work better and more efficient. We must be the example in executing a more sustainable future. Based on city data, 90% of CUBs for restaurants are already approved with many of the template conditions proposed by this ordinance. Let's prioritize city staff for the rebuilding and bettering of Los Angeles rather than processing applications approved so often. Let's prioritize our small business community.

We ask that the Committee consider removing the amendments created by PLUM Committee disqualifying so many for the Restaurant Beverage Program. These amendments, specifically: *Additional Provisions for Alcohol Sensitive Use Zones* make the program unusable. This will disqualify many of those whom the program was intended for. It is our small independent small business owners in our denser urban area that need this most. Consider the additional city cost impacts as a result of the amendments prior to including into the RBP. Let's get this right rather than getting it just passed.

We further ask, to protect our patrons' health during the post COVID-19 pandemic, the RBP be more supportive of our new restaurant environments of outdoor dining. Restaurants have turned to outdoor dining to safely serve residents while also allowing restaurants to have a more flexible source of income. We recommend that Sec. 2, 34 (b) (1) that limits outdoor seating to 30% of the total seating area, be removed at this time. Especially during/post COVID-19, restaurants are reliant on outdoor dining and removing this will continue to support these efforts.

Based on information from the California of Tax and Fee Administration, restaurants generate \$5.7 billion per year in taxable sales within Los Angeles County, which is more than the auto industry. This is money that stays within our communities through jobs, local merchants, farmers, etc. Most restaurants throughout the City are locally owned and contribute to community platforms, like kids' sports programs, religious institutions, and other charitable causes. Not only do restaurants provide taxes and financial support to the City and community, each restaurant employs a minimum of 30-50 employees, from dishwashers, bartenders, to baristas, to line cooks, to chefs, to managers, etc., and a majority of these jobs are held by minorities. Having an alcohol license can create 30-40% more revenue which will be used to help sustain these local jobs.

The restaurant industry has been decimated by the COVID-19 virus. The number of jobs expected to evaporate from the independent restaurant industry is astronomical and will make a negative impact in the years ahead while the industry recovers from the devastating impacts on the virus. As independent small businesses, we don't have access to financing and funding

for support like other large restaurants have the ability to do. Implementing a RBP will help these businesses hit the hardest by the pandemic by increasing their revenue from alcohol sales, which will help keep our doors open, which many of our fellow restaurateurs have already been forced to close.

Thank you for the hard work that you and your staff have invested in this ordinance to consider a Restaurant Beverage Program. This ordinance provides small businesses the opportunity to increase revenue that will help keep our restaurants open and viable, which supports jobs and brings economic vitality to the City. We truly appreciate your efforts to ensure we can continue to safely serve Los Angeles residents. We hope you will continue to recognize that and support the thousands of restaurants struggling to make it through this pandemic.

If you have any questions or would like more information, please do not hesitate to reach out to me directly at Eddie Navarrette 213-687-6963, ext. 101.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eddie Navarrette', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Eddie Navarrette
IHC Advocacy Committee Chair
eddie@fedesignandconsulting.com

About IHC

The Independent Hospitality Coalition (IHC) is a coalition of California hospitality workers whose purpose is to provide representation for our growing workforce and essential businesses, creating awareness of our role in the economic fabric of society. Our mission is to have a seat at the table to help shape policy and legitimize our crucial impact on communities and cities throughout California. More information can be found here: <https://www.independenthospitality.org/>

Communication from Public

Name: Blair Besten

Date Submitted: 05/24/2021 09:30 AM

Council File No: 17-0981

Comments for Public Posting: Please know that the lockdowns were incredibly debilitating, most excruciatingly to the small businesses that were never allowed to open for the past year. Rents are still being demanded of them if not now then imminently. Local and State governments should be doing everything in their power to assist businesses with operations: from licensing and permits to building approvals. Rather than penalizing with stringent regulations, delays, and red tape of the old days, offer financial relief and incentives! COVID 19 offered an excellent opportunity for governments to recognize how to step out of the way and honor the countless benefits these businesses bring to our communities, and afford them the ability to survive. These are not just talking points, these are families and livelihoods.

Communication from Public

Name: Lien Ta
Date Submitted: 05/25/2021 08:39 AM
Council File No: 17-0981

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember, I operate an LA restaurant and am a member of the 1200-strong Independent Hospitality Coalition (IHC). I oppose the new direction of the Restaurant Beverage Ordinance, per the PLUM Committee recommendations for these reasons: -It applies standards that assure virtually no restaurants in LA will be able to use it. -It unduly singles out restaurants (as opposed to liquor stores, bars and nightclubs) for these tough new restrictions; despite the ample body of evidence that restaurants are the most responsible alcohol uses. -These restrictions ignore that there is improved alcohol oversight now in place, in the form of the two surprise visits to alcohol uses by Building and Safety Code Enforcement. -The PLUM restrictions send exactly the wrong message to the beleaguered restaurant industry, at the worst possible time. We urge you to return to the Ordinance's original intent—to streamline the extremely lengthy and costly CUB process. Now is the time to send a clear signal of support to our small businesses—that the City understands the difficulty of opening-operating a restaurant—and is prepared to help. IHC has provided ample testimony on provisions in the Ordinance over a two-year process. We remain committed to helping streamline the City's restaurant CUB process—while safeguarding neighboring residents' right to quiet enjoyment. We have other ideas to share as well. Regards, Lien Ta All Day Baby 3200 W Sunset Blvd Los Angeles, CA 90026

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/25/2021 08:41 AM

Council File No: 17-0981

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Economic Development & Jobs Committee, I work for a restaurant group in Los Angeles and we are in favor of the proposed Restaurant Business Program. The program will allow restaurants, one of the businesses hit hardest by the COVID-19 pandemic, to open their doors faster in order to serve the community as well as raise the employment rate in Los Angeles by hiring workers and putting them to work faster, rather than waiting on CUP approval when the restaurant is otherwise ready to open. This will, in turn, boost the local economy of each neighborhood in Los Angeles and help speed the recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic as well as raise billions of dollars in taxable sales for the City. This program streamlines the CUP process for a very specific, narrow range of restaurant types that represent the simplest of cases, reducing not only the costs and uncertainty that operators face, but also the burden placed on the city to review the high number of applications every year. This will then allow the city to focus on the more difficult and complex cases. Many other cities, including City of Santa Monica and Pasadena have alcoholic beverage programs without amendments our current iteration has. Neither have suffered increased community endangerment. Thank you

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/25/2021 08:43 AM

Council File No: 17-0981

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Economic Development & Jobs Committee, I own and operate several restaurants throughout Los Angeles and we are in favor of the proposed Restaurant Business Program. The program will allow restaurants, one of the businesses hit hardest by the COVID-19 pandemic, to open their doors faster in order to serve the community as well as raise the employment rate in Los Angeles by hiring workers and putting them to work faster, rather than waiting on CUP approval when the restaurant is otherwise ready to open. This will, in turn, boost the local economy of each neighborhood in Los Angeles and help speed the recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic as well as raise billions of dollars in taxable sales for the City. This program streamlines the CUP process for a very specific, narrow range of restaurant types that represent the simplest of cases, reducing not only the costs and uncertainty that operators face, but also the burden placed on the city to review the high number of applications every year. This will then allow the city to focus on the more difficult and complex cases. Many other cities, including City of Santa Monica and Pasadena have alcoholic beverage programs without amendments our current iteration has. Neither have suffered increased community endangerment. Thank you

Communication from Public

Name: Kate Bartolo

Date Submitted: 05/25/2021 11:40 AM

Council File No: 17-0981

Comments for Public Posting: The attached letter's suggestions is an earnest effort to bridge the apparent chasm between decisionmakers who distrust the RBP's direction; and those who support a thoughtfully applied streamlining of the presently arduous CUB review process. Here are my suggestions: -Require that applicants request-participate in a meeting with the Council office, neighborhood association-neighborhood council prior to or at the time plans are submitted to the City; with such the meetings to occur within the City review timeline. Reasoning: This approach goes further than the PLUM recommendations of an Outreach Plan. Such meetings encourage restaurant owners to forge early relationships with their neighbors and the Council office, to be educated as to hot button concerns; and to help calm the waters from residents concerned about the potential for undue neighborhood impacts. FYI, the City of West Hollywood requires a neighborhood meeting, as part of its CUB review. -Require a new owner to similarly notify the City and meet with the above community stakeholders, file a Covenant agreeing to the RBP's mode, character, and substantial conformity standards; and file new plans administratively to catalog changes. Reasoning: This achieves the PLUM objective, without requiring a new owner-operator to start the review process all over again. This would only apply to restaurants that increase seating 20% or less than the original plan. -Create a form that lists the comprehensive array of standards to which all RBP applicants must adhere and distribute widely citywide. Reasoning: This will educate community stakeholders and provide a template by which to judge a restaurant's conformity with the RBP standards. Include Ordinance language that allows the ZA to add or revise conditions, which review may result in a public hearing. (emphasis added). Reasoning: This is already codified, but not commonly enforced. With the improved enforcement standards in LADBS, it can be and should be. This is a more appropriate standard than the one-year provisional approvals, and its related limitations to beer and wine only service. -Apply the RBP citywide. Allow full alcohol service, 50% of space to be outdoor seating, minimum seating to 7 patrons, and a bottle of wine to be served tableside (as differentiated from bottle service for distilled spirits). Reasoning: It's important to offer flexibility to restaurants. It is also burdensome to require an applicant to go

through two separate ABC processes . -Consider creating Pilot Programs in certain areas of the City which seek to address community-specific needs. Reasoning: This would be in lieu of PLUM's proposed Alcohol Sensitive Zones and reliance on the ABC Guidelines on Alcohol Overconcentration. (emphasis added) The ABC standards apply more aptly to small towns or suburbs, without commercial districts, much less downtowns. If codified as mandatory, the ABC standards would literally eliminate most areas of the City from RBP access. The area pilot programs could be subject to review within three years, for possible modification, depending on the metric of success or ensuing problems. The Council office would be responsible for working with the relevant city departments/community stakeholders to establish individual standards. Examples of Pilot Programs: -In areas of higher unemployment and lower rates of entrepreneurship: Reference in the RBP a request that the Community Development Department (CDD) create a series of workshops that encourage residents to take advantage of the RBP; and provide insights in how to plan for, lease space, gain funding, improve space, hire staff, all critical to restaurant start-ups/operations. Then have the Council offices work with CDD to establish such programs. Reasoning: This will not only educate would-be entrepreneurs, but it will also tackle the major reason restaurants struggle and/or violate conditions—the overly long review process and pressing need for improved knowledge and skills. -In areas with a history of alcohol abuse, consideration can be given to further restricting RBP standards. It must be noted that the RBP Standards are already highly restrictive. To establish further restrictions may risk a restaurant's economic viability. -Consider allowing densely populated employment centers (e.g. Downtown LA and Hollywood) to enjoy less restrictive standards, These could include: longer evening operating hours, especially, weekends. It could allow patios not restricted to the ground floor. And it could address the stricture that restaurants adjacent to A or R zones be separated by a fully enclosed building by alternatively allowing restaurants to install noise mitigation measures affirmed by an experienced noise consultant. Finally, now is the time to send a clear signal of support to our small businesses—that the City understands the difficulty of opening-operating a restaurant—and is prepared to help.

KATE BARTOLO

May 24, 2021

LA City Economic Development Committee
Chairman Curren Price
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA. 90012

Re: Restaurant Beverage Program (RBP), Item 7, Economic Development Committee, May 25, 2021

Dear Chairman and Committee Members,

I am writing from the perspective of a largely retired CUB consultant, who is not a paid representative. I offer the below suggestions from the perspective of one who has lived all sides in alcohol use debates; I am a former Chair of my own neighborhood association and a former Planning Commissioner, in a neighboring city with high intensity alcohol uses. I have watched too long as small restaurants languish in the prolonged, costly review process. A thoughtfully applied, streamlined restaurant alcohol review process is needed now, more than ever.

However well intentioned, the PLUM recommendations assure virtually no restaurants in LA will be willing or able to utilize it; including the very local businesses-residents the PLUM Recommendations seeks to encourage. I believe there is a way to achieve the objectives of the PLUM Recommendations while maintaining the original Ordinance intent.

Respectfully, I submit that the RBP's already comprehensive, highly restrictive standards promise to prevent the very problems the PLUM recommendations seek to remedy. These include but are not limited to sharp restrictions on hours of operation, patio use and two surprise site visits by code enforcement. Of further concern, is that the PLUM Recommendations unduly singles out restaurants (as opposed to liquor stores, bars, and nightclubs) for (even) tougher new restrictions; despite the ample body of evidence that restaurants are, by far, the most responsible alcohol uses.

Here are my suggestions:

-Require that applicants request-participate in a meeting with the Council office, neighborhood association-neighborhood council prior to or at the time plans are submitted to the City; with such the meetings to occur within the City review timeline.

Reasoning: This approach goes further than the PLUM recommendations of an Outreach Plan. Such meetings encourage restaurant owners to forge early relationships with their neighbors and the Council office, to be educated as to hot button concerns; and to help calm the waters from residents concerned about the potential for undue neighborhood impacts. FYI, the City of West Hollywood requires a neighborhood meeting, as part of its CUB review.

-Require a new owner to similarly notify the City and meet with the above community stakeholders, file a Covenant agreeing to the RBP's mode, character, and substantial conformity standards; and file new plans administratively to catalog changes.

Reasoning: This achieves the PLUM objective, without requiring a new owner-operator to start the review process all over again. This would only apply to restaurants that increase seating 20% or less than the original plan.

-Create a form that lists the comprehensive array of standards to which all RBP applicants must adhere and distribute widely citywide.

Reasoning: This will educate community stakeholders and provide a template by which to judge a restaurant's conformity with the RBP standards.

Include Ordinance language that allows the ZA to add or revise conditions, which review *may* result in a public hearing. (emphasis added).

Reasoning: This is already codified, but not commonly enforced. With the improved enforcement standards in LADBS, it can be and should be. This is a more appropriate standard than the one-year provisional approvals, and its related limitations to beer and wine only service.

-Apply the RBP citywide. Allow full alcohol service, 50% of space to be outdoor seating, minimum seating to 7 patrons, and a bottle of wine to be served tableside (as differentiated from bottle service for distilled spirits).

Reasoning: It's important to offer flexibility to restaurants. It is also burdensome to require an applicant to go through two separate ABC processes .

-Consider creating Pilot Programs in certain areas of the City which seek to address community-specific needs.

Reasoning: This would be in lieu of PLUM's proposed Alcohol Sensitive Zones and reliance on the ABC *Guidelines* on Alcohol Overconcentration. (emphasis added) The ABC standards apply more aptly to small towns or suburbs, without commercial districts, much less downtowns. If codified as mandatory, the ABC standards would literally eliminate most areas of the City from RBP access.

The area pilot programs could be subject to review within three years, for possible modification, depending on the metric of success or ensuing problems. The Council office would be responsible for working with the relevant city departments/community stakeholders to establish individual standards.

Examples of Pilot Programs:

-In areas of higher unemployment and lower rates of entrepreneurship: Reference in the RBP a request that the Community Development Department (CDD) create a series of workshops that encourage residents to take advantage of the RBP; and provide insights in how to plan for, lease space, gain funding, improve space, hire staff, all critical to restaurant start-ups/operations. Then have the Council offices work with CDD to establish such programs.

Reasoning: This will not only educate would-be entrepreneurs, but it will also tackle the major reason restaurants struggle and/or violate conditions—the overly long review process and pressing need for improved knowledge and skills.

-In areas with a history of alcohol abuse, consideration can be given to further restricting RBP standards. It must be noted that the RBP Standards are already highly restrictive. To establish further restrictions may risk a restaurant's economic viability.

-Consider allowing densely populated employment centers (e.g. Downtown LA and Hollywood) to enjoy less restrictive standards, These could include: longer evening operating hours, especially, weekends. It could allow patios not restricted to the ground floor. And it could address the stricture that restaurants adjacent to A or R zones be separated by a fully enclosed building by alternatively allowing restaurants to install noise mitigation measures affirmed by an experienced noise consultant.

Conclusion: I urge the Council to return to the Ordinance’s original intent—to streamline the extremely lengthy and costly CUB process. My recommendations can help avoid the limitations of a “one-size fits all” approach, using proven methods to encourage restaurant success and avoid neighborhood impacts.

Now is the time to send a clear signal of support to our small businesses—that the City understands the difficulty of opening-operating a restaurant—and is prepared to help.

Regards,

Kate Bartolo
kate@katebartolo.com
(310) 497-4424

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/25/2021 04:09 PM

Council File No: 17-0981

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Cassandra Meraz and I work throughout Council Districts 6 and 7. I am writing as a member of the Los Angeles Drug and Alcohol Policy Alliance about the Restaurant Beverage Program (17-0891) . I support the amendments made at the PLUM committee and would like to see the suggestions that we submitted in a letter to make the added amendments stronger. Furthermore, we request that the complaint process is reviewed again and that the number of complaints is lowered to 3 and that one "criminal" complaint should be considered as a justifiable cause to require an immediate review of the restaurant. Additionally we request that the term "criminal" complaint be added to our suggested amendment. Throughout the City of LA, our communities are over-proliferated with alcohol outlets and with alcohol being deemed as an essential business in the midst of a pandemic, it further added to the dangerous ways that people can cope with the stresses experienced. Therefore, we encourage for there to be a strong reconsideration for the ordinance currently being proposed and ask that our amendments be considered.

Communication from Public

Name: Victor DeAlba

Date Submitted: 05/25/2021 04:11 PM

Council File No: 17-0981

Comments for Public Posting: Good afternoon honorable council members, My name is Victor DeAlba and I am with Social Model Recovery Systems, a non-profit human services organization. I am here on behalf of our members. Simply increasing alcohol availability is not a good public policy because it can threaten the community's overall public health. Surely, there are other ways to help restaurants in need that do not include increasing alcohol availability in communities that already struggle with overconcentration. There are people and organizations across Los Angeles that have worked tirelessly to ensure their voices are heard on issues that impact their neighborhoods. Still, now you're introducing a process that would eliminate a community members' right to provide input on a land-use matter in their neighborhood. These uses don't operate in a vacuum and buffers need to be in place to mitigate any problems that will inevitably result. The Restaurant Beverage Program at the very least needs to include solid enforcement process whereby residents can voice their concerns, especially in areas devastated by the harms caused by alcohol. Moreover, these uses should maintain a provisional status until a public hearing is held. Lastly, council districts should have the ability to opt-in/out based on the need of their jurisdictions. Thank you for your time.

Communication from Public

Name: Charles Porter

Date Submitted: 05/25/2021 04:16 PM

Council File No: 17-0981

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Charles Porter with United Coalition East, a program of Social Model Recovery Systems working in the Skid Row area of Los Angeles. On behalf of our coalition and in solidarity with advocates in South LA we have previously submitted our concerns and opposition this program. Despite amendments made to the language we fail to see the community benefit. This program does not advance equity in our neighborhoods, many of which are inundated with alcohol uses. In and adjacent to Skid Row we have 273 alcohol licenses while 27 are allowed by the State. The pandemic has changed the spirit of this program and exacerbated substance abuse and overdose deaths. Increasing alcohol access is not a public health priority. The community needs jobs, healthy food access, and social gathering spaces that do not revolve around drinking. Additionally, the capacity does not exist to monitor these proposed businesses, which are not merely sit-down restaurants, as they are currently allowed to sell alcohol to go. The large numbers of existing alcohol licenses downtown demonstrate the ease in acquiring them, and public hearings are an indispensable safety measure. We are also working alongside community members to prohibit new alcohol uses in Skid Row in the DTLA community plan. If we are to expedite any process, let it focus on increasing wellness for our most vulnerable.

Communication from Public

Name: Brianne

Date Submitted: 05/25/2021 05:02 PM

Council File No: 17-0981

Comments for Public Posting: I work for a restaurant group in Los Angeles and we are in favor of the proposed Restaurant Business Program. The program will allow restaurants, one of the businesses hit hardest by the COVID-19 pandemic, to open their doors faster in order to serve the community as well as raise the employment rate in Los Angeles by hiring workers and putting them to work faster, rather than waiting on CUP approval when the restaurant is otherwise ready to open. This will, in turn, boost the local economy of each neighborhood in Los Angeles and help speed the recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic as well as raise billions of dollars in taxable sales for the City. This program streamlines the CUP process for a very specific, narrow range of restaurant types that represent the simplest of cases, reducing not only the costs and uncertainty that operators face, but also the burden placed on the city to review the high number of applications every year. This will then allow the city to focus on the more difficult and complex cases. Many other cities, including City of Santa Monica and Pasadena have alcoholic beverage programs without amendments our current iteration has. Neither have suffered increased community endangerment. Thank you

Communication from Public

Name: Dina Cruz

Date Submitted: 05/25/2021 05:05 PM

Council File No: 17-0981

Comments for Public Posting: Good afternoon, my name is Dina Cruz, I live in Boyle Heights and request that you do not ignore our public health pleads. Too often liquor stores are painted as the problem, but on-site consumption also has negative effects, for example people who consume with the intent to get drunk. If alcohol is incidental; why rely on it to stimulate the economy. Creating jobs to improve parks, relieve homelessness and uplift our youth is a better priority. One size does not fit all, and not having restrictions on the number of alcohol uses allowed will inundate communities that have been historically targeted, such as Boyle Heights, a community also struggling with gentrification and displacement. Boyle Heights is extremely vulnerable and having uses get a pass without allowing our community to have a say is irresponsible. There is no equity in this program, it will support existing outside establishments to expand. This is not good public policy and neighborhoods should have the option to not accept this program. Additionally, the proposed monitoring and enforcement component is lackluster and we should not support a program that does not monitor its impact on the neighborhood or respond to community complaints.