

Communication from Public

Name: Ondrea Tye

Date Submitted: 05/17/2021 04:49 PM

Council File No: 20-1359

Comments for Public Posting: I am a retired Urban Planner who worked 20 years for the City of Los Angeles. I worked the East Los Angeles Area for 10 years and on similar projects in this area. Therefore, my comments are coming from an area of expertise and intimate knowledge of this area, of Planning and CEQA in general, and Los Angeles planning protocols. Based on the scope of the project and the changes and that a [Q] condition refers to the fact this area requires review and letter from the CA Department of Toxic Substances Control. The MND reconsideration was defective and should never have been done. A new MND should have been initiated and circulated. The [Q] states: "Property owners shall satisfy any requirements from the State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) in relation to potential contamination on the subject site. Prior to the issuance of any clearances by the Department of City Planning (DCP), property owners shall provide to DCP a letter from DTSC that establishes DTSC's satisfaction that the subject site currently meets DTSC requirements for the proposed use or, alternatively, that establishes DTSC's satisfaction with the property owner's contamination testing plan for the proposed use" The reconsideration of the MND was faulty and deficient. CEQA is clear that it cannot be used for this purpose is the project is greatly increases the density, massing, FAR and height. The Planning Dept knew when they processed the zone change that the area was contaminated by dry cleaning chemicals. The environmental reconsideration should have identified the potential toxic soil as a potential impact and proposed an approval plan for rehabilitation of the soil' CEQA does not allow one to push impacts into the future. Further, if the CC feels compelled to give away grant money, then there should be measurable standards. The Idea the honorable Councilman Cedillo says there were no other worthy applicants for this grant money is hard to comprehend given the need for real housing that actually meets the income level for those ALREADY LIVING IN THIS AREA. This project DOES NOT meet these criteria. Are there not standards for recipients of the millions to factually ascertain based on census income, affordability etc, for housing in for a given area? Is the Planning department or Housing ascertaining if this project meets the standards before CC decides gratuitous give away millions? If

not, why not? The rental rates this project will surely engender here only creates gentrification, and the few units that are low income are not low enough for the very residents living in the area. This is not a NIMBY issue since the Lincoln Heights Coalition has never said they want the project to not go forward; the coalition wants assurances from experts not connected to the developer that the area is not toxic. As a planner, I would never have allowed this defective MND to go forward and would have made sure the [Q] condition met PRIOR to the Director's Determination. Secondly, the Site Plan Review portion of the case should have had a public hearing as defined by LAMC 16.05. "If the Director finds that the matter may have a significant effect on neighboring properties, the Director shall set the matter for public hearing. If the application is set for public hearing, written notice of the hearing shall be sent by First Class Mail at least fifteen (15) days prior to the hearing to the applicant, owners and tenants of the property involved, owners and tenants of all property within 100 feet (ca. 30 m) of the boundary of the subject site, the City Council members representing the area in which the property is located, and any organization representing property owners or the community in the project vicinity if they request in writing to be notified. Notice shall also be given by at least one publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, designated for that purpose by the City Clerk, not less than fifteen (15) days prior to the date of the hearing. (Amended by Ord. No. 186,325, Eff. 11/11/19.)" To make sure the area is toxic-free is prudent and morally the right thing to do. To push this through shows that Councilman Cedillo is out of touch with his constituents and I'm saddened by this idea.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/17/2021 05:23 PM

Council File No: 20-1359

Comments for Public Posting: Until the site is completely tested for toxins,it is a deathtrap for anyone exposed to it.We are very grateful to the Los Angeles Times for their excellent coverage of the site and surrounding problems,and revealing the misrepresentations regarding this development. Please take the necessary steps to make this project totally safe,or shut it down completely because it is no longer viable in any way ,shape or form. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Joe St. John

Date Submitted: 05/17/2021 09:13 PM

Council File No: 20-1359

Comments for Public Posting: Thank you for taking my comment. I'm concerned about committing public funds for this project before doing a soil analysis on the property. The adjacent property is known to have contamination and to accept a mitigation plan in lieu of an actual soil sample seems irresponsible.