

Communication from Public

Name: Elisa Visick

Date Submitted: 06/01/2021 02:50 PM

Council File No: 19-0603

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose the expansion of Fire District 1 and support the use of wood-frame construction in more of Los Angeles. Wood-frame construction is more cost-effective and better for the climate than alternatives such as concrete and should be legal throughout the city.

Communication from Public

Name: Brooks Dunn

Date Submitted: 06/01/2021 12:50 PM

Council File No: 19-0603

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to oppose the expansion of Fire District 1. I do not believe this expansion is necessary for public safety. I believe the only result of this expansion will be an increase in the cost of multifamily structures and thus a decrease in the number of units built. Both are contrary to solving Los Angeles's housing crisis

Communication from Public

Name: Will Wright

Date Submitted: 06/01/2021 05:46 PM

Council File No: 19-0603

Comments for Public Posting: As the Director of Government and Public Affairs for the Los Angeles chapter of The American Institute of Architects (and our 4500+ members), I am writing to encourage the Honorable Members of the Public Safety Committee to work more closely with architects and engineers to identify the best methods for achieving your goal to make the built environment safer. We have resources, expertise, and insight to share on how to ensure "top-quality, skilled and responsible construction practices" are utilized for new multifamily and commercial structures within high risk areas. We truly appreciate the leadership of the Office of Bob Blumenfeld and all of the work they've done to make sure that all housing is safer from wildfires, etc. We think there are smart strategies to advance those goals, especially within wilderness urban interfaces. However, from the input we've received from architects and engineers, expanding Fire District #1 is NOT the correct tool to address those safety concerns. From the input we've received from architects concerned with both environmental performance and delivering much-needed housing to our communities, expanding Fire District #1 will do more harm than good and is not necessary or warranted as a best-practice. Therefore, we will not be supporting the potential expansion of Fire District 1. In fact, there is now substantial interest asking for changes to be made to modernize Fire District 1 at the State level to include Mass Timber and CLT, or to eliminate it as a district in City of Los Angeles in effort to bring us into greater consistency with statewide best practices with building codes, in general. Points to emphasize from the 'report back' = On page 30: LADBS contends that existing Los Angeles Building Code provisions provide adequate safeguards to ensure that responsible construction practices are utilized for new multifamily and commercial structures in Fire District 1 and has no further recommendations. On page 33: -"expanding Fire District 1 to more areas of the City would result in an overall increase in construction and materials cost." -"an expansion of Fire District 1 would likely reduce the financial feasibility of affordable housing projects and may result in fewer affordable housing units in the City" Also, this paragraph helps to support the idea that FD1 should be eliminated all together, especially as it relates to strengthening City of Los Angeles' pro-housing policies: "Survey

of Other Jurisdictions: Ten local jurisdictions were surveyed whether they have adopted Fire Districts or any similar requirements which impose regulations beyond what is required by the State. Seven of the jurisdictions are within Los Angeles County (Los Angeles County, Burbank, Glendale, Pasadena, Santa Monica, Beverly Hills, Long Beach). One of the jurisdictions is within Orange County (Fullerton). The remaining jurisdictions are the City of San Diego and City of San Francisco. Out of the ten jurisdictions surveyed, none of the jurisdictions have adopted Fire Districts. Although all of the jurisdictions have adopted local amendments to the California Building Code, they are relatively minor in impact (i.e. imposing more restrictive fire sprinkler requirements, requiring more stringent roofing material classifications, prohibiting wood shingles, etc.). None of the jurisdictions surveyed limit type of construction and maintain consistency with the minimum standards set forth in the California Building Code.” We do welcome the opportunity to further connect and identify workable strategies to make homes within wilderness urban interfaces safer from wildfires. We can convene a working group of architects and engineers to share best-practices, etc. Please let us know if that will be helpful. Very truly yours, Will Wright Director, Government & Public Affairs
AIA Los Angeles

Communication from Public

Name: Rabbi Jonathan Klein
Date Submitted: 06/01/2021 07:57 PM
Council File No: 19-0603

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Chairwoman Rodriguez, and Councilmembers O’Farrell, Buscaino, De Leon, and Harris-Dawson: Regarding Item 19-0603: My name is Rabbi Jonathan Klein. As Executive Director of Hope for All: Helping Others Prosper Economically (HOPE), I work with others to improve the lives of those who are struggling to obtain affordable housing and meet all of their economic needs. These community members are almost always housed in multi-family structures, the very same kind of low- to mid-rise housing which the proposed ordinance on fire-life-safety seeks to improve. This issue is very important to my organization and personally to me, as my parents survived a fire that destroyed my childhood home. I have testified on this issue on multiple occasions since 2019. Although I almost certainly cannot be there to testify today due to a funeral I am officiating, I nevertheless am sending this letter to reiterate my support for this amended ordinance, brought forward today by Councilmembers Rodriguez and Blumenfield, which is all the more critical as we enter into what could be the worst fire season yet. Our communities deserve safe, resilient, and affordable housing which is something this ordinance promises. For those fighting the tide of a challenging economy, there is little to no choice with housing; “you get what you get and you don’t get upset,” even if the one or two at most options are fire hazards. My parents’ fire destroyed their home. Their survival as they were dozing off to sleep watching David Letterman was pure luck; our dog Mickey was not so lucky. We cannot leave it up to luck for people to be safe. We must ensure buildings meet basic safety thresholds. Protecting those who cannot afford to live in lower density areas—disproportionately People of Color—is critical to myself and my organization. Councilman Bob Blumenfield’s and Councilwoman Monica Rodriguez’s fire-life-safety ordinance Building a Safer Los Angeles proposes to make multifamily low-to mid-rise buildings in communities across the City of Los Angeles safer when constructed with fire resistant materials like concrete or steel, and fire-treated wood. We thank them for their vision to elevate fire safety standards, and I thank you for hearing this ordinance again. On December 3, 2019 and on March 3rd, 2021-- I testified before the PLUM Committee and Public Safety Committee to ask that this motion be promptly turned into law to address the growing

inequalities around fire life safety in our communities. I encourage this committee to quickly pass this draft motion, and look forward to spirited discussion about this ordinance with all councilmembers in the coming months. The proposed ordinance, Building A Safer Los Angeles, will save precious lives and property. I appeal to you to move this forward today and follow Councilmember Blumenfield's wise motion and move this forward, for all. Thank You. Blessings, Rabbi Jonathan Klein

Communication from Public

Name: Toby Muresianu

Date Submitted: 06/01/2021 11:13 PM

Council File No: 19-0603

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose this motion. We have a housing crisis and need all the housing we can get, as inexpensively as possible. Wood is cheap, sustainable, and not especially dangerous; if it had been banned in construction much of this city could not have been built. This is a thinly veiled attempt by the concrete industry to mandate its product for use, which will increase the cost of housing and increase our fossil fuel emissions; if the concrete industry were a country, it would have the third most emissions of any country in the world.
<https://www.ecori.org/climate-change/2019/10/4/global-warming-has-a-co2ncrete-problem>
Please oppose this motion. We can not afford to take a step backwards on housing and the environment.