

Communication from Public

Name: George Francisco
Date Submitted: 06/10/2024 04:19 PM
Council File No: 21-0329-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmembers, On behalf of the Venice Chamber of Commerce - the oldest organization in Venice - and our over 300 members employing nearly 10,000 people, we are submitting our vigorous opposition to CF 21-0329-S5. CF 21-0329-S5 proposes on its face to “study” and create “uniform” strategies to guide the enforcement of LAMC 41.18 which prohibits camping, sleeping and storing belongings around certain designated “sensitive” areas; mainly schools, parks, day care centers common public space and other areas designated by the City Council. In our estimation, this measure is nothing less than a trojan horse to fully interdict the enforcement of LAMC 41.18 by creating multiple, complex, and redundant procedures prior to proceeding with enforcement. Enforcement that is already highly regulated. The current enforcement of LAMC 41.18 has been a tremendous benefit to the thousands of visitors and locals that visit Venice everyday. Increasing legislative and procedural impediments will be a detriment to the community making it more difficult to keep our business and residential areas safe and clean. Specifically, the Venice business community has many concerns about this proposed measure. Some of the most striking of which are as follows: 1. The over-reliance on LAHSA to provide information, statistics and recommendations. Issues with LAHSA management and fiscal responsibility is well-documented. Furthermore, LAHSA ideology prevents true innovation and solutions from even being considered and it views 41.18 enforcement as anathema. 2. The claim that enforcement of 41.18 has somehow been inconsistent throughout the city due to unclear protocols. If enforcement is truly inconsistent, the CLA report fails to even mention that each Council District encompasses different geography, different demographics, different characteristics in the built environment – and most importantly, different personalities and ideologies of Council members. Most Council Members such as the maker of this motion, refuse to enforce 41.18 to protect residents and businesses purely on the basis of political ideology. 3. The further claim that enforcement has been inconsistent due to the large number of Council-created sensitive areas that LAPD must enforce. This is a specious argument and utterly false on its face. The City Council has created less than 12% of the current total of 2,443 designated “sensitive” sites where 41.18 is applied.

The rest are schools and daycare centers. If the maker of the motion suggests that an increase of 12% in the number of sites has made the enforcement impossible, it is not because LAPD is stretched too thin or because of undefined inconsistencies; it is because the City Council has chosen to spend taxpayer resources elsewhere such as on homeless service consultants and overpriced property purchases for homeless housing. 4. The use of the term “credible offers of housing.” This is unacceptable and a longstanding false flag used to rebut without substantiation the enforcement of 41.18 and all public safety measures regarding public camping. In short, it is an undefined term and most PEH refuse offers out of hand. 5. The demand for a Uniform Tracking System. Again, another bureaucratic misdirection. After over a decade in a state of crisis regarding the homeless on our streets, it is utterly disingenuous for the maker of this motion to now demand some sort of tracking system. Especially when it has been clearly proven that the numerous competing privacy laws would plainly make this impossible. 6. The demand for tying enforcement to dedicated, funded housing and service components along with the installation of signage. First off signage can take years to install and is unnecessary. Second, with the absolute waste of taxpayer dollars and the failed attempts to provide services over the last decade, how can we reasonably expect the same city and county agencies to now be capable of cost-effective and results-oriented performance. Our public spaces have been under siege in Los Angeles for years. The COVID pandemic restrictions and failure of city government to provide a hospitable environment for residents, builders and businesses has only exacerbated the crisis. This effort, which is plainly designed to remove LAMC 41.18 as a tool to keep public space and sensitive areas like schools and parks free from encampments, is misguided and clearly not in the best interest of any stakeholder group. We urge you to reject CF 21-0329-S5. and the myriad interdictions to the enforcement of 41.18 certain to come should it be approved. Thank you, George Francisco Director of Policy & Planning Venice Chamber of Commerce



June 10, 2024

Los Angeles City Council
200 N Spring St
Los Angeles CA 90012

RE: CF 21-0329-S5

Dear Councilmembers,

On behalf of the Venice Chamber of Commerce - the oldest organization in Venice - and our over 300 members employing nearly 10,000 people, we are submitting our vigorous opposition to CF 21-0329-S5.

CF 21-0329-S5 proposes on its face to “study” and create “uniform” strategies to guide the enforcement of LAMC 41.18 which prohibits camping, sleeping and storing belongings around certain designated “sensitive” areas; mainly schools, parks, day care centers common public space and other areas designated by the City Council.

In our estimation, this measure is nothing less than a trojan horse to fully interdict the enforcement of LAMC 41.18 by creating multiple, complex, and redundant procedures prior to proceeding with enforcement. Enforcement that is already highly regulated.

The current enforcement of LAMC 41.18 has been a tremendous benefit to the thousands of visitors and locals that visit Venice everyday. Increasing legislative and procedural impediments will be a detriment to the community making it more difficult to keep our business and residential areas safe and clean.

Specifically, the Venice business community has many concerns about this proposed measure. Some of the most striking of which are as follows:

1. The over-reliance on LAHSA to provide information, statistics and recommendations. Issues with LAHSA management and fiscal responsibility is well-documented. Furthermore, LAHSA ideology prevents true innovation and solutions from even being considered and it views 41.18 enforcement as anathema.
2. The claim that enforcement of 41.18 has somehow been inconsistent throughout the city due to unclear protocols. If enforcement is truly inconsistent, the CLA report fails to even mention that each Council District encompasses different geography, different demographics, different characteristics in the built environment – and most importantly, different personalities and ideologies of Council members. Most Council Members such as the maker of this motion, refuse to enforce 41.18 to protect residents and businesses purely on the basis of political ideology.
3. The further claim that enforcement has been inconsistent due to the large number of Council-created sensitive areas that LAPD must enforce. This is a specious argument and utterly false on its face. The City Council has created less than 12% of the current total of 2,443 designated “sensitive” sites where 41.18 is applied. The rest are schools and daycare centers. If

the maker of the motion suggests that an increase of 12% in the number of sites has made the enforcement impossible, it is not because LAPD is stretched too thin or because of undefined inconsistencies; it is because the City Council has chosen to spend taxpayer resources elsewhere such as on homeless service consultants and overpriced property purchases for homeless housing.

4. The use of the term “credible offers of housing.” This is unacceptable and a longstanding false flag used to rebut without substantiation the enforcement of 41.18 and all public safety measures regarding public camping. In short, it is an undefined term and most PEH refuse offers out of hand.

5. The demand for a Uniform Tracking System. Again, another bureaucratic misdirection. After over a decade in a state of crisis regarding the homeless on our streets, it is utterly disingenuous for the maker of this motion to now demand some sort of tracking system. Especially when it has been clearly proven that the numerous competing privacy laws would plainly make this impossible.

6. The demand for tying enforcement to dedicated, funded housing and service components along with the installation of signage. First off signage can take years to install and is unnecessary. Second, with the absolute waste of taxpayer dollars and the failed attempts to provide services over the last decade, how can we reasonably expect the same city and county agencies to now be capable of cost-effective and results-oriented performance.

Our public spaces have been under siege in Los Angeles for years. The COVID pandemic restrictions and failure of city government to provide a hospitable environment for residents, builders and businesses has only exacerbated the crisis.

This effort, which is plainly designed to remove LAMC 41.18 as a tool to keep public space and sensitive areas like schools and parks free from encampments, is misguided and clearly not in the best interest of any stakeholder group.

We urge you to reject CF 21-0329-S5. and the myriad interdictions to the enforcement of 41.18 certain to come should it be approved.

Thank you,



George Francisco
Director of Policy & Planning
Venice Chamber of Commerce

Communication from Public

Name: Andrew Marton
Date Submitted: 06/10/2024 04:59 PM
Council File No: 21-0329-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Council Committee, As a concerned constituent, I am writing to express my strong opposition to this proposed motion to add six paragraphs of terms and conditions to LAMC 41.18. This ordinance is meant to protect sensitive areas, such as schools, daycare centers, playgrounds, and senior centers, by clearly communicating that camping is not allowed in these locations. The proposed additions are unnecessary and will only serve to complicate a straightforward issue. LAMC 41.18 is a measure to direct people where they can and cannot have an encampment. It's no different than any other parking ordinance/signage indicating where parking is prohibited. Similarly, the ordinance uses explicit signage to convey that camping is not permitted near areas that must be kept clear for the general public's use and safety. These are places where children gather, parents navigate with strollers, and individuals with walkers and wheelchairs require unobstructed access. The message is simple and should remain so. Just as we do not need six paragraphs of terms and conditions to inform people that they cannot park beside a fire hydrant, we should not need such excessive language to convey that camping is not allowed near children's schools or public libraries frequented by the elderly. The proposed additions to LAMC 41.18 are superfluous and will only create confusion. It is important to note that LAMC 41.18 is not a code designed to address housing solutions for the unhoused population. There are numerous other codes and initiatives in place to tackle that critical issue. The purpose of this ordinance is to ensure that sensitive areas remain clear and accessible for everyone to use safely. Additionally, 41.18 can also be utilized by each district as needed. It can be tailored for specific community concerns by design. While we continue to work on addressing the root causes of homelessness, we must not restrict our ability to establish essential safety perimeters where encampments are prohibited. LAMC 41.18, in its current form, is an effective tool for maintaining public safety and accessibility, much like red-painted curbs. It is a reasonable request to leave this ordinance unchanged. I urge the this committee and the LA City Council to reject the proposed motion and maintain LAMC 41.18 in its current form. The ordinance is clear, concise, and serves its intended purpose effectively. Thank you for your attention to this matter and for considering the

concerns of your constituents. Sincerely, Andrew Marton A
Concerned Constituent

Communication from Public

Name: Jason Enright

Date Submitted: 06/10/2024 08:39 PM

Council File No: 21-0329-S5

Comments for Public Posting: It is not enough to amend 41.18, we must repeal it. It criminalizes poverty and homelessness. It is a motion designed to soothe the fears of housed people by punishing unhoused people. Mostly it doesn't work. In my neighborhood they sweep the same block of encampments once a month and those people always come back. Because there is no interim housing available. Every dollar wasted on this motion could be used to build housing and create services. I have done homeless outreach in my area for year and several times, we would meet someone experiencing homelessness, start their paperwork, maybe set them an appointment to meet with a LAHSA rep or schedule to take them to the DMV to get an ID, and when we came back a few days later, their tent was gone and they were nowhere to be found, because they had been swept. We then have to spend time and resources finding them instead of helping them. Around one overpass, we found that after the sweeps, they had moved in the wash along the river and one gentleman was living in a drain pipe in January during the rainy season. These sweeps do not help people, they make the streets look better and they make housed people feel better. This policy is inhumane, dangerous and ineffective. It is a stain on our city and a moral failure of this council. Repeal it.