

Communication from Public

Name: Scott Ehlert

Date Submitted: 04/06/2021 11:22 AM

Council File No: 19-0603

Comments for Public Posting: As a bone dry California gears up for another climate-fueled megafire season, I find it shocking and alarming that city officials are looking to limit the use of advanced wood construction materials under the guise of safety. All mass timber product on the market must meet PRG320 requirements which makes them just as, if not more safe, than concrete and steel. California needs to thin millions of acres of forest to restore natural and healthy wildfires and the best place for our climate and - as proven by 1,000s of prefab mass timber structures built in Europe and Asia - to help in our housing affordability. To ban or limit mass timber now would be grossly irresponsible for our climate, wildfire efforts, and affordability. Thank you, Scott Ehlert

Communication from Public

Name: Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA)

Date Submitted: 04/06/2021 12:05 PM

Council File No: 19-0603

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Kayla with the Valley Industry and Commerce Association - VICA. While we appreciate the efforts to address and prevent wildfires in our region, we do have concerns with the impacts this policy could potentially have on construction in Los Angeles. VICA has been a strong advocate and supporter of solutions that address our city and state's homelessness and housing crisis, supporting the construction of housing at all economic levels. This policy could counter these efforts and negatively impact housing production by limiting construction type in parts of Los Angeles. We understand the wildfires we have experienced over the last few last years have been devastating. However, current wood structural design uses state-of-the art engineering data, technology and standards for wood products to ensure they are safe and have a substantially greater fire resistance. Today, buildings are designed to withstand fires, whether they are built with wood or steel. Specifically, with regard to wood, it is required to be treated with fire retardant chemicals and wrapped into fire resistance drywalls when wood is used. We would urge you to not to limit construction type and to consider the costs and impacts this motion would have on construction throughout Los Angeles. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Jesse Silva

Date Submitted: 04/06/2021 07:05 AM

Council File No: 19-0603

Comments for Public Posting: Please do not put more limits on wood construction, especially in heavily urbanized areas. Wood is far more environmentally friendly than concrete and is cheaper to build with, banning wood would only increase LA's affordability crisis. Timber is more affordable and sustainable, and just as safe as concrete/steel in urban contexts. Mass timber (which is a not traditional two-by-fours and includes things like cross-laminated timber) is actually safer to build and performs better in earthquakes than concrete. Please allow mass timber (Type IVA, IVB, IVC) construction in existing Fire District 1 areas. Please don't cave to anti-competitive, anti-climate astroturfing by the concrete industry!

Communication from Public

Name: Sean Meredith

Date Submitted: 04/06/2021 09:53 AM

Council File No: 19-0603

Comments for Public Posting: Timber is more affordable and sustainable, and just as safe as concrete/steel in urban contexts. Mass timber (which is a newer product and includes things like cross-laminated timber) is actually safer to build and performs better in earthquakes than concrete. Please do not limit wood construction in urban areas.

Communication from Public

Name: Adam Buchbinder

Date Submitted: 04/06/2021 01:18 PM

Council File No: 19-0603

Comments for Public Posting: I'm writing in to oppose this item. This is an underhanded attempt by the concrete lobby to ban mass timber (aka "cross-laminated timber" or CLT) buildings in much of Los Angeles, without mentioning concrete or wood in the motion. Proper CLT construction is safe against fire, blast, and seismic hazards, while being lighter, faster to construct, and more sustainable than concrete and steel. These buildings should be allowed in Fire District 1 in the first place. If the City Council wants to consider the wisdom of the current International Building Code, it should do so openly. "Build With Strength" (@BuildStrength on Twitter), a self-described "coalition of housing advocates, architects, builders, engineers, union organizations, emergency services personnel, faith leaders, and community activists" which has been pushing this change, is actually "a coalition of the National Ready Mixed Concrete Association", according to their Twitter profile. The concrete industry shouldn't be able to ban its competition under a bad-faith figleaf of spurious safety concerns. I encourage the Council to reject this measure. Thank you.