

THE LEGISLATURE SHOULD DELAY OR DEFEAT AB 832

Date: May 26, 2021

To: California Legislature Members
Los Angeles Community Activists
Members of The Los Angeles Press

From: Members of CPSP [Citizens Protecting San Pedro], RESPCT [Residents for an Equitable San Pedro Community Today], and concerned residents in San Pedro/City of Los Angeles

We Represent the Voices of People Left Out of This Debate.

Please ensure that this bill receives a much closer review of the impacts on us. The following critical points describe the irreparable harm AB 832 will cause to communities in redevelopment plan areas:

The Sneaky Exemption in AB 832 Lets Los Angeles Out of ALL Obligations Other Cities and Counties in California Have Under the Community Redevelopment Law.

AB 832 Exempts Only the City of Los Angeles From Having to Require an Average of 15% Affordable Units in Public and Private Projects it Approves Within Redevelopment Plan Areas.

The Bill Takes Away Our Constitutional Right to Mailed Notice of Proposals to Amend or Repeal Los Angeles Redevelopment Plans and Participation in Blight Studies.

There is No Rational Basis to Allow Los Angeles to "Administer" Our Redevelopment Plans as a Zoning Provision When Redevelopment Fundamentally is Not Zoning.

Many of the Legislative Findings, Written by Los Angeles Officials, Are Demonstrably False, Further Undermining the Constitutionality of AB 832 When Challenged in Court.

AB 832's Blanket Exemption from CEQA Review Imperils Decades of Environmental Protections Enacted in Former Agency EIRs and Plans.

The Context of Corruption at Los Angeles City Hall is a Reason for Closer Scrutiny.

Why is Assemblymember Richard Bloom Sponsoring AB 832?

Richard Bloom introduced AB 832 into the Legislature at the request of Los Angeles City Mayor Eric Garcetti and one Councilmember, Mitch O'Farrell. See attached email circulating among activists. Garcetti and O'Farrell have received significant campaign contributions from real estate developers, particularly those seeking to build projects in Hollywood. These projects are bigger than the protective limits of the redevelopment plan, and without anything near the amount of affordable housing units required by state law (Health and Safety Code Section 33413) and the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan that incorporates the state minimum requirements.

Is Mr. Bloom's sponsorship of this bill linked to his desire to receive endorsements of Los Angeles officials and campaign contributions from real estate development interests as he runs to leave the Legislature for a Los Angeles County Supervisor seat? We cannot answer that question yet, but we wonder who in the Legislature is serving the public interest by granting special legislation, only to the City of Los Angeles, to be exempt from constitutional notice, study of blight impacts, and affordable housing protections of this Legislature's Community Redevelopment Law? It isn't Mr. Bloom.

We think the late introduction of the bill was calculated to avoid letting the Legislators representing low-income residents of the other affected redevelopment plan areas of Los Angeles from knowing the devastating impacts to their constituents. For this reason alone, the Assembly should pause attempts to immediately pass AB 832 out of the Assembly until it at least understands the sneaky exemptions that remain in the bill after Monday's amendments by Mr. Bloom.

Our research shows that Mr. Bloom represents some of the wealthiest white areas of Southern California (Malibu, Agoura Hills, Pacific Palisades, Beverly Hills, Hollywood Hills) and one wildly gentrifying Los Angeles redevelopment area: Hollywood. Did Mr. Bloom or Mr. Garcetti or Mr. O'Farrell consult with any other Legislators representing portions of the City where the other 17 redevelopment plans protect the most economically vulnerable residents? These areas are listed on the City's website at <https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/overlays> (Redevelopment Plans). (See below why redevelopment plans are not zoning overlays.) In addition to Hollywood, the affected redevelopment plan areas include: [Adelante Eastside](#), [Broadway/Manchester](#), [Central Industrial](#), [Chinatown](#), [City Center](#), [Council District 9 Corridors](#), [Crenshaw](#), [Crenshaw/Slauson](#), [Exposition/University Park](#), [Laurel](#)

[Canyon](#), [Mid City Corridors](#), [Pacific Corridor](#) (San Pedro), [Vermont/Manchester](#), [Watts Corridor](#), [Western/Slauson](#), [Westlake](#), [Wilshire/Koreatown](#).

If you are a Legislator that represents any of these parts of Los Angeles, you should be asking yourself how will this impact my constituents? The bill would make the City of Los Angeles, the largest city in the state, exempt from the Community Redevelopment Law's mandate to develop at least 15% affordable units among all public and private projects approved in each redevelopment plan area.

We Represent the Voices of People Left Out of This Debate.

CPSP and RESPCT include residents living in San Pedro's Pacific Corridor Redevelopment Area, right next to the Port of Los Angeles. Mr. Bloom does not represent us, Assemblymember Patrick O'Donnell does.

We are only beginning to understand the nature of the special legislation written by Los Angeles politicians themselves and introduced by Mr. Bloom. See attached email. However, **we are ringing the alarm to all Legislators, activists in other redevelopment plan areas, and members of the press** because it appears to us that our own City officials are seeking to deny us constitutional rights of due process notice of proposed changes to redevelopment plans, proper study of blight impacts of removing environmental measures and affordable housing requirements of the plans, and incredibly, removing the current state law that requires our City elected politicians to obtain 15% affordable units in each plan area.

The City asks this Legislature to remove its obligation to assure 15% affordable units are built while submitting a draft bill that falsely claims the bill would help "increase" affordable units. The stench of hypocrisy is overwhelming. Our City Hall has lost its way by pursuing this corrupt legislation.

The Sneaky Exemption Still in AB 832 Lets Los Angeles Out of ALL Obligations Other Cities and Counties Have Under the Community Redevelopment Law.

The City of Los Angeles knows that redevelopment law, especially after the dissolution of redevelopment agencies in 2011, is not as well understood by Legislators – especially those who came to the Legislature in recent years. The City has been claiming that because the Legislature withdrew tax increment from redevelopment, that successor agencies to the former redevelopment agencies have no obligation to continue to comply with the Legislature's constitutional due process

notification requirements or conduct a study of the impacts on blight in the redevelopment plan area if a plan amendment or repeal is proposed. This claim is false.

We live in a continuing redevelopment plan area and we are entitled to the benefits of notice, participation, and critique of conclusions about the impacts of a plan amendment or repeal. The rights the Legislature enacted into the Community Redevelopment Law to protect our federal and state constitutional rights were not repealed by the dissolution of redevelopment agencies. The Legislature expressly continued the plans intending them to be implemented by the successors to the former agencies.

Today, in all other cities and counties, hundreds of redevelopment plans are being carried out without other cities asking for special legislation. Only Eric Garcetti, Mitch O'Farrell, and Assemblymember Bloom are trying to take away our constitutional rights by granting a massive exemption from ALL Community Redevelopment Laws of the state. **If you did not know that, you should be asking for the bill to receive a much closer review of the impacts on us – the people who cannot afford lobbyists to tell you what AB 832 will or will not do.**

AB 832 Exempts Only the City of Los Angeles From Having to Require an Average of 15% Affordable Units in Public and Private Projects it Approves Within Redevelopment Plan Areas.

At Committee hearings, Mr. Bloom said he would remove the exemption of the City from having to comply with all affordable housing requirements. He has not done that because he has not removed the sneaky exemption for the Community Redevelopment Law. This will enrich a few real estate development interests and guarantees even more homelessness in Los Angeles. In a previous amendment, Mr. Bloom removed a provision that expressly exempted the City of Los Angeles from Section 33413 affordable housing requirements of the Community Redevelopment Law. We saw that amendment as we tracked the bill's progress.

But Mr. Bloom failed to remove the massive exemption from all of the requirements of "this division" of the state's laws. Here is the language still in the bill which all by itself treats the low-income residents of our redevelopment plan area differently from the residents in all other cities and counties in the state with operating redevelopment plans:

“Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, including, but not limited to, subdivision (i) of Section 34173, both of the following are effective November 11, 2019:

(1) All land use related plans and functions of the former Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles are transferred to the City of Los Angeles.

(2) The **amendment or repeal of a land use related plan or function transferred pursuant to paragraph (1) is exempt from this division.**” (Text of proposed new section 34173.5 in AB 832)

What does “this division” encompass? “This division” is Division 24 of the Community Development Law which includes Section 33413 and Section 33333.8 and other critical affordable housing provisions currently applicable to the City of Los Angeles. In section 33333.8 this Legislature made it illegal for any city or county to terminate (amend or repeal) a redevelopment plan if it has not yet obtained an average of 15% affordable units in all public and private real estate projects approved during the plan period. This requirement is expressly acknowledged in our City’s redevelopment plans, such as Pacific Corridor Section 900 governing the area where we live:

“. . .this Plan may be effective for the period ending 30 years from the date of adoption of this Plan. After the time limit on the effectiveness of the Redevelopment Plan, the Agency shall have no authority to act pursuant to the Redevelopment Plan except to pay previously incurred indebtedness and to enforce existing covenants and contracts, **unless the Agency has not completed its housing obligations pursuant to subdivision (a) of section 33333.8 of the Redevelopment Law, in which case the Agency shall retain its authority to implement requirements under subdivision (a) of section 33333.8 of the Redevelopment Law, including its ability to incur and pay indebtedness for this purpose, and shall use this authority to complete these housing obligations as soon as is reasonably possible.**”

So section 33333.8 extends the life of a redevelopment plan until a city in fact achieves its 15% affordable housing unit obligation under the Community Redevelopment Law – the City expressly acknowledged this obligation in the text of the Pacific Corridor redevelopment plan, and now it asks the Legislature to amend all our plans to delete all requirements of “this division” including the affordable housing obligations contained therein.

This sneaky exemption from “this division” lets Los Angeles off the hook from existing state law including sections 33413 and 33333.8. Why? Our vulnerable communities will be deprived of this vital affordable unit requirement while other communities in the state will still be protected by the Legislature’s Community Redevelopment Law.

The City says it has no power or resources to achieve the 15% goal. This is incorrect based upon our understanding of resources available. While the Legislature withdrew tax increment, the City has access to federal and state housing funds, \$1.3 billion of COVID-19 budget relief, the City’s portion of tax increment distributed back to it under the redevelopment dissolution, and most importantly, the power to condition approval of private projects in redevelopment areas on a developer providing 15% or more affordable units in exchange for the right to build a housing project. Our Los Angeles politicians have spent years claiming they will not require such affordable housing from developers, and it is no coincidence that Los Angeles suffers international condemnation for its failures to address the homelessness crisis.

The request to allow Los Angeles off the hook is about to make the situation worse in our redevelopment area and others like it across the City because no one at the Legislature has taken the time to understand the unconstitutional nature of Los Angeles’ ask of Mr. Bloom, and now the Legislature.

There is no rational basis for the Legislature to grant this massive gift to Los Angeles politicians, including Mr. Bloom, so that real estate developers will not have to provide minimum inclusionary affordable housing in their projects. We desperately need more affordable housing, not less. AB 832 would deny our communities equal protection.

The Exemption From “This Division” Also Takes Away Our Constitutional Right to Mailed Notice of Proposals to Amend or Repeal Los Angeles Redevelopment Plans and Participation in Blight Studies.

Land use experts we talked to point out that a proposed amendment of a redevelopment plan is required to comply with Health and Safety Code Sections 33450 to 33458. These provisions are consistent with the Legislature’s recognition that a redevelopment plan is not a form of zoning or “overlay” like the Los Angeles City Planning Department claims on its website. (See City link above calling redevelopment plans a form of zoning “overlay”.) A redevelopment plan is not within the power of the City to enact under its zoning; it required the Legislature to enact

the Community Redevelopment Law to authorize creation of redevelopment plans, and is why it remains operational today.

These plans are intensive in due process notification to property owners and residents, in guaranteeing a right of participation in amendments proposed to the redevelopment plans, and mandate careful studies of how any proposed amendment or early repeal of a plan will affect environmental protections and the ability to address blight.

Apparently, the City of Los Angeles and its successor agency do not want to do this work anymore, and they unilaterally have FAILED to do it for years with impunity. They have claimed they were not obligated to extract affordable housing units from private developers. Having fallen so far behind that people are now dying homeless on the streets in Skid Row and other areas of our City, they ask the Legislature to simply relieve them of all duties under the Community Redevelopment Law. They don't want to mail notice to us of proposed plan amendments. They don't want to have to study and do some real planning to avoid negative impacts on the environment and housing stock. And influenced by campaign money and other considerations, **they really do not want to enforce the Legislature's inclusionary housing requirement** of a minimum of 15% affordable housing units over the life of the plan on private real estate developers.

For the Legislature to approve AB 832 is to unconstitutionally declare that the people living in City of Los Angeles redevelopment areas, are not entitled to equal protection of the state's Community Redevelopment Law. This invites the Legislature to be sued for federal and state constitutional violations in the enactment of this law.

There Is No Rational Basis to Allow Los Angeles to "Administer" Our Redevelopment Plans as a Zoning Provision When Redevelopment Fundamentally is Not Zoning.

Legislators should also notice that AB 832 purports to reach back in time to November 11, 2019 to declare that all land-use related plans and functions of the City are deemed transferred to the City on that date. The Legislature is asked to reach backwards because the City in fall 2019 adopted a transfer resolution and Companion Ordinance No. 186325 that was so blatantly unlawful the City got sued for violation of the Community Redevelopment Law and the state's environmental law, CEQA.

Knowing the City has been sued, as AB 832 states in its findings, it becomes clear that another purpose of the bill is to retroactively legalize the City's 2019 actions that

are challenged in the lawsuit. Is it the function of the Legislature to intervene to legalize that which was illegal – for one City but not others? Does this special legalization of that which the City essentially admits was illegal constitute a lawful action of the Legislature?

One need only look at the transfer resolution from 2019 and the companion ordinance to see how crazily the City acted. The transfer resolution purports to list **selected sections** of each redevelopment plan and leave the remainder of redevelopment plan provisions, such as the affordable housing requirements, behind in the winding down successor agency CRA/LA. Then, directly contrary to the Legislature's requirement that redevelopment plans are governed not by a zoning code, but rather the Community Redevelopment Law, the City purported to govern the selected sections of each redevelopment plan it transferred, under its municipal code going forward.

In this deceitful sleight of hand, the City hoped no one would notice that it was trying to take our redevelopment plans (or portions of them anyway) out of the hands of the successor agency and going forward turn them into zoning – without all the due process protections and blight studies required under Section 33450-33458 before a plan can be amended or repealed. As we said before, Los Angeles officials really do not want to do the work of redevelopment, and this was the first try without assistance from the Legislature.

Just describing what happened in 2019 is to describe how lunatic the entire action was. No wonder the City was sued, and no wonder Mr. Garcetti and Mr. O'Farrell are asking the Legislature to provide a legislative "fix" to their blunder. It was a move, unauthorized by any law, to evade any further work required under the Community Redevelopment Law. And once again, it would treat the residents and property owners in Los Angeles' redevelopment plan areas as if they had no constitutional rights enjoyed by residents in the redevelopment plan areas of other cities and counties. This is another reason AB 832 violates equal protection of the law without rational basis.

The sneaky exemption would also seek to legalize future actions of the City of Los Angeles to administer a redevelopment plan, under the zoning code, even though a redevelopment plan is not zoning, or a zoning "overlay" as the City Planning Department likes to incorrectly say. The entire concept is unfair, illogical, and confers special rights on the City of Los Angeles that no other city or county administering a redevelopment plan possesses.

Many of the Legislative Findings, Written by Los Angeles Officials, Are Demonstrably False, Further Undermining the Constitutionality of AB 832 When Challenged in Court.

We understand that while the Legislature has discretion in addressing perceived ills, that discretion cannot violate California's prohibition against special legislation. The findings why the Legislature may approve this special legislation are irrational on their face. AB 832 claims that Los Angeles is "unique" because it was one of seven cities that declined to become the successor agency after dissolution of the redevelopment agencies. But by definition, the City is hardly "one of a kind" unique when it is one of seven. That finding is not a legitimate basis for special legislation.

The fact that Los Angeles has several redevelopment areas within its boundaries also does not make it unique. Multiple cities or counties in the state have multiple redevelopment plan areas within their boundaries. The only thing that makes Los Angeles "unique" is that it thinks it can come to the Legislature to fix and excuse decades of affordable housing neglect that is literally killing people on its streets. There is no rational basis to conclude that AB 832 is justified special legislation for Los Angeles.

Additionally, certain findings are inconsistent with the provisions of the legislation. One finding states that in 2019 the City of Los Angeles adopted a resolution transferring all land-use related plans and functions to itself. As outlined above, that factually did not happen. The City adopted a resolution purporting to transfer selected portions of redevelopment plans. Then in the legislation AB 832 states that all land-use related plans and functions are transferred effective November 11, 2019. If the Legislature's finding that all plans and functions were transferred in 2019, why does the Legislature purport to transfer it all again? The finding supports a rational conclusion that the legislation is not needed if the finding is true, which it is not. The Legislature may not validly enact special legislation based upon demonstrably false factual findings.

Accordingly, the Legislature and the City impair their credibility with voters when demonstrably false findings are set forth to approve an unconstitutional special legislation for the City of Los Angeles.

AB 832's Blanket Exemption from CEQA Review Imperils Decades of Environmental Protections Enacted in Former Agency EIRs and Plans.

It is our understanding that over the decades the CRA/LA existed, it mitigated environmental impacts by enacting them into law, redevelopment plans themselves, and enforceable project conditions. We understand all of these environmental protections to be part of land use plans and authority that should have transferred to the City in 2019. Now, the City has asked for a bill that does transfer these obligations to it, but gives the City a free pass from any environmental review if it then immediately follows up with a proposed repeal or effective repeal of these redevelopment plans and land use functions.

In tracking the progress of AB 832 we noted that Mr. Bloom amended it to allow total exemption from CEQA environmental review for any action the City takes on its transferred plans and land use functions until January 1, 2023. This is a wildly reckless provision because it incentivizes the City to take the transferred redevelopment plans, that protect the City's most vulnerable residents, and immediately repeal them.

This is not even a theoretical concern, we are informed by Hollywood activists that the City Planning Department in February 2021 released a proposed "amendment" to the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan as part of the City's revision of its General Plan. We understand the City has claimed it is "infeasible" to continue to enforce the environmental protections in Hollywood and therefore all of the prior environmental protections can be removed by effectively repealing the entire Hollywood Redevelopment Plan. Thus, at this moment, the City's evil plan to repeal all the substantive provisions of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan awaits legalization by this extraordinary CEQA exemption.

And by allowing the City this massive exemption from CEQA for all operating redevelopment plans in the City, Mr. Bloom just signed the death warrant on our redevelopment plan (and every other one in the City) before December 31, 2022. If AB 832 passes with such an expansive CEQA exemption, the City will have every incentive to move to repeal in mass all of the remaining redevelopment plans of the City. And it will do so also with the exemption from "this division," meaning the City also evades complying with the 15% affordable housing unit requirement before a redevelopment plan can be repealed.

The Context of Corruption at Los Angeles City Hall is More Reason for Closer Scrutiny.

The Legislature's own digest concedes that AB 832 is "sponsored" by the City of Los Angeles. Coming from a city where numerous elected officials, Mayoral staff, and

real estate players have pled guilty or are under indictment for bribery and corruption in connection with real estate development, caution by our Legislature is more than warranted.

The mere fact that AB 832 is sponsored by the City as “special legislation” only affecting itself ought to alert Legislators representing all of the districts affected by Los Angeles’ 18 remaining redevelopment plans (about 20% of the land mass of the City) that they better take a close look at what City officials cooked up in a back room, without inviting anyone else’s input. Close examination of the City’s bill, only a little bit we could do in this letter, reveals the “dream legislation” that the City is seeking inflicts harm on its own most vulnerable residents and property owners and elevates the financial riches of real estate developers.

The City itself has admitted it drafted this legislation among a handful of people in the Mayor’s and Councilmember O’Farrell’s office, assisted by City Planning and City Attorney staff anxious to get out of the real work required to administer a redevelopment plan. See attached email. It reveals that this bill was written under the supervision of Mayor Eric Garcetti and his political appointees, the office of Councilmember Mitch O’Farrell and his staff, the office of Mike Feuer and his deputy City attorneys, and City Planning Department staff of Vince Bertoni. Mayor Garcetti’s office itself submitted the “ask” to Assembly member Bloom to carry the legislation.

Even cursory analysis of the bill reveals it is unconstitutional and simply a terrible policy proposal. It would mark the Legislature undermining its own professed commitment to assuring that affordable housing gets built in California.

This bill should not even be considered by Legislators because its only purpose is to evade the Legislature’s high priority policy that each redevelopment plan in the state shall achieve an overall goal of 15% affordable units of housing among all agency and private development projects approved within each plan area. This is the Legislature’s well known “inclusionary housing” requirement in Health and Safety Code section 33413, and it does not require the tax increment removed in 2011 for Los Angeles to achieve this requirement. Los Angeles officials arrogantly think they are above this law, and they have wasted years ignoring the Legislature’s command to even try to achieve 15% affordable units in their redevelopment plan areas.

It is no coincidence that Los Angeles currently suffers a massive homelessness crisis – City officials for decades have shirked the City’s commitments in its redevelopment plan areas and now, it simply asks to be relieved of its legal duties. Meanwhile, in

every other redevelopment plan area located in all other cities and counties of the state, the City of Los Angeles asks that the Legislature continue to require achievement of the 15% affordable housing goal. We demand continued enforcement of all affordable housing requirements in redevelopment plans areas across this state, including within the boundaries of the largest city, Los Angeles. We also demand our constitutionally protected due process rights and participation rights in redevelopment blight studies be protected by rejecting the crazy theory that only the City of Los Angeles can take a redevelopment plan and administer it in the future under its own municipal code. The entire concept was lunacy from the start.

AB 832 ought to be voluntarily withdrawn by Mr. Bloom. The entire bill, drafted by a group of grifters at Los Angeles City Hall, has no merit. It is designed to make homelessness worse in Los Angeles, not better. The bill must be defeated, or at a bare minimum, the Assembly needs to investigate the serious matters raised in this letter before impairing the constitutional interests of those voiceless people we try to represent in this warning letter to the Legislature.

Most sincerely,

Members of CPSP [Citizens Protecting San Pedro], RESPCT [Residents for an Equitable San Pedro Community Today], and concerned San Pedro/LA residents:

Dr. Mary Ellen Barnes	Penelope McKenzie	Dusty Salinas
Greg Ellis	Danial Nord	Mary Salinas
Claudio Feehan-Liste	Cathy Ragland	Fran Siegel
Manuel Feehan-Liste	Kenneth Ragland	John J. Smith
Mary Lou Fentis	Mona D. Reddick	June Burlingame Smith
Allen Franz	Robert H. Reddick	Marianne C. Snell
Noel Gould	Graham Robertson	Laurie Steelink
Chris Havener	Robin Rudisill	Cindy Wallace
Andrea Herman	Mark Severino	

Addresses and signatures available on request
Additional community signature pages will follow

*See Attached Exhibit



Oscar Ixco <oscar.ixco@lacity.org>

Fwd: AB 832

5 messages

John Wickham <john.wickham@lacity.org>

Fri, Feb 19, 2021 at 8:35 AM

To: Oscar Ixco <oscar.ixco@lacity.org>, Ivania Sobalvarro <ivania.sobalvarro@lacity.org>

CD 13 had the Mayor put this in.

John Wickham
Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst
phone: (213) 473-5738
fax: (213) 620-9869

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Arthur Mandel** <arthur.mandel@lacity.org>

Date: Fri, Feb 19, 2021 at 8:24 AM

Subject: Re: AB 832

To: John Wickham <john.wickham@lacity.org>, David Giron <david.giron@lacity.org>, Craig Bullock <craig.bullock@lacity.org>

Yes this is the one we've been working on with CD13 and City Attorney. +David Giron +Craig Bullock have the details.

-Artie

On Fri, Feb 19, 2021 at 8:18 AM John Wickham <john.wickham@lacity.org> wrote:

Is this your bill? What's the story?

John Wickham
Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst
phone: (213) 473-5738
fax: (213) 620-9869



Arthur Mandel

Director of State and County Affairs
Office of Mayor Eric Garcetti
Office: (213) 978-1583 Cell: (213) 610-1031
arthur.mandel@lacity.org

Ivania Sobalvarro <ivania.sobalvarro@lacity.org>

Fri, Feb 19, 2021 at 9:22 AM

To: John Wickham <john.wickham@lacity.org>

Cc: Oscar Ixco <oscar.ixco@lacity.org>

Let's reach out to David so he can explain it to us..

[Quoted text hidden]

Ivania Sobalvarro
Assistant Chief Legislative Analyst
Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst
(213) 473-5745

John Wickham <john.wickham@lacity.org>

Fri, Feb 19, 2021 at 9:42 AM

To: Ivania Sobalvarro <ivania.sobalvarro@lacity.org>

Cc: Oscar Ixco <oscar.ixco@lacity.org>

Its a little messed up that it went this way.

John Wickham
Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst
phone: (213) 473-5738
fax: (213) 620-9869

[Quoted text hidden]

Ivania Sobalvarro <ivania.sobalvarro@lacity.org>
To: John Wickham <john.wickham@lacity.org>
Cc: Oscar Ixco <oscar.ixco@lacity.org>

Fri, Feb 19, 2021 at 9:48 AM

I'm not sure I understand it... maybe one of you can explain it to me...

[Quoted text hidden]

Oscar Ixco <oscar.ixco@lacity.org>
To: Ivania Sobalvarro <ivania.sobalvarro@lacity.org>
Cc: John Wickham <john.wickham@lacity.org>

Fri, Feb 19, 2021 at 4:31 PM

I spoke to CD13 regarding this matter so let me know when you have a moment to discuss.

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Oscar O. Ixco
Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
200 N. Spring Street, Room 255
Los Angeles, CA 90012

T: 213.473.5705
F: 213.620.9869
E: oscar.ixco@lacity.org