

Communication from Public

Name: Daniel Jimenez

Date Submitted: 12/09/2024 02:39 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: We encourage you to adopt these recommendations in order to ensure both the RPO and the CHIP equitably shape the future of affordable housing and communities in the City of Los Angeles.



Date: November 9, 2024

Re: Citywide Housing Incentive Program :Council File: 21-1230-S5; and Resident Protections Ordinance: 21-1230-S8

Dear Los Angeles City Council Members,

I submit this letter on behalf of Inner City Struggle regarding the Citywide Housing Incentive Program, 21-1230-S5, and the Resident Protections Ordinance 21-1230-S8. Inner City Struggle is an active member of the ACT-LA Coalition and we strongly support the coalition's work to address housing and displacement. While we commend the updates that strengthen tenant protections in the RPO we encourage you to implement the following:

Citywide Housing Incentive Program (CHIP) Recommendations

Adopt “Option 1” of the LA City Planning Department’s “Exhibit D- Single Family Considerations”¹

Excluding single family zoned parcels upholds and maintains exclusionary zoning. This will limit the effectiveness of the MIIP to affirmatively further fair housing, and undermine the goal of increasing affordable housing opportunities in neighborhoods with greater resources. The City's wealthiest and most privileged areas, R1 zones in high and highest opportunity areas, should not remain off-limits to mixed-income and affordable development. Exhibit D, Option 1 would allow the MIIP program to be used on sites in high-opportunity neighborhoods, and expand the sites in high-opportunity neighborhoods eligible for AHIP incentives. If coupled with deeper affordability requirements discussed below, Option 1 offers the potential to meaningfully increase access to affordable housing in high opportunity areas and reduce development pressure on sites where low-income renters live today, affirmatively furthering fair housing. The City should not acquiesce to exclusionary attitudes about housing development to maintain a status quo that was shaped through racial animus. We urge the Council to adopt Option 1 in combination with the deeper affordability requirements discussed below.

Encourage deeply affordable units by expanding ALI, ELI, VLI incentives

Rents in Moderate Income units are not affordable to the nearly two-thirds of renter households in Los Angeles that are low income or below. By definition, these units are for households *above* the median income. Housing incentives in the MIIP should focus on producing housing at rents where the need is greatest. The mixed affordability option for the Transit Oriented Incentive Areas and Opportunity Corridor Incentive 2 Areas should be amended to focus on deeply affordable housing.²The requirement for Moderate Income housing in Higher Opportunity Areas should be removed and replaced with an increased requirement for Acutely and Extremely Low

¹<https://planning.lacity.gov/odocument/6c6197bb-626e-456e-ae0a-75403bc73b56/EXHIBIT%20D-%20Single-Family%20Considerations.pdf>

² See Table 12.22 A. 38(c)(3)(iv) on page 57 of Exhibit A. 1.

Income housing. The mixed affordability requirement in Moderate and Lower opportunity areas should be adjusted to require a portion of the affordable units be affordable to acutely low income households. Additionally, under the current draft for Opportunity Corridor Transition Area Incentives, developers have no incentive to include any units at the ALI, ELI or VLI level. Projects using this incentive in the CT-1A area are only required to include one MI unit. In the CT-1B, CT-2, and CT-3 areas, developers are unlikely to include any VLI units because the incentive is available to projects with the same number of higher-rent LI units. Therefore, the VLI menu option is an empty promise. For this program to truly advance the City's obligation to affirmatively further fair housing, the affordability requirements for Opportunity Corridor Transition Area Incentives should be amended to replace the MI option with deeper affordability. To be eligible for this incentive, projects should be required to include at least one ALI, ELI, or VLI unit.³

Require robust environmental study and public participation before approving projects on sites with heightened environmental justice concerns

The CHIP ordinance requires that projects seeking the MIIP or AHIP incentives complete a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, and a Phase II if warranted, if the project is proposed on a site with heightened environmental risks. We support this policy and also believe additional measures are necessary. Current toxic site lists (such as DTSC's Cortese List and Envirostor) are incomplete and do not identify all the brownfields that exist. To address deficiencies in existing data and harness local knowledge, we recommend a community meeting of people living in the neighborhood for projects proposed in areas that score at the 80th percentile and above on CalEnviroScreen 4.0. The community meeting would be a non-CEQA, non-voting meeting to collect information from community members about historical uses of the site that may otherwise not show up through traditional data searches used during the Phase I process, as described above, and minimize environmental harms in vulnerable areas.

Resident Protections Ordinance Recommendations:

Strengthen replacement by requiring 2:1 replacement of demolished RSO units

Too often, new housing projects demolish existing below-market rent stabilized housing and create only a few more affordable units than the number of units demolished. In fact, the AECOM analysis revealed that mixed-income RSO development projects between 2020-2023 demolished 1,091 RSO units and produced only 1,161 affordable units - a net increase of only 70 protected units⁴. It is clear that development incentives need to change. Increasing the replacement requirement to require that RSO units be replaced with affordable covenanted units at a 2:1 ratio will steer modest development away from sites with large numbers of RSO units and ensure projects provide a net increase in affordable housing.

We encourage you to adopt these recommendations in order to ensure both the RPO and the CHIP equitably shape the future of affordable housing and communities in the City of Los Angeles.

³ See Table 22.22. A. 38(c)(3)(v) on page 57 of Exhibit A. 1.

⁴ 3 See page 9 of "Potential Impact of 1:1 RSO-Affordable Replacement Requirement" in [Appendix 3](#).

Sincerely,
Daniel Jimenez
Director of Community Organizing
Inner City Struggle

Communication from Public

Name: Daniel Jimenez

Date Submitted: 12/09/2024 02:40 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: We encourage you to adopt these recommendations in order to ensure both the RPO and the CHIP equitably shape the future of affordable housing and communities in the City of Los Angeles.



Date: November 9, 2024

Re: Citywide Housing Incentive Program :Council File: 21-1230-S5; and Resident Protections Ordinance: 21-1230-S8

Dear Los Angeles City Council Members,

I submit this letter on behalf of Inner City Struggle regarding the Citywide Housing Incentive Program, 21-1230-S5, and the Resident Protections Ordinance 21-1230-S8. Inner City Struggle is an active member of the ACT-LA Coalition and we strongly support the coalition's work to address housing and displacement. While we commend the updates that strengthen tenant protections in the RPO we encourage you to implement the following:

Citywide Housing Incentive Program (CHIP) Recommendations

Adopt “Option 1” of the LA City Planning Department’s “Exhibit D- Single Family Considerations”¹

Excluding single family zoned parcels upholds and maintains exclusionary zoning. This will limit the effectiveness of the MIIP to affirmatively further fair housing, and undermine the goal of increasing affordable housing opportunities in neighborhoods with greater resources. The City's wealthiest and most privileged areas, R1 zones in high and highest opportunity areas, should not remain off-limits to mixed-income and affordable development. Exhibit D, Option 1 would allow the MIIP program to be used on sites in high-opportunity neighborhoods, and expand the sites in high-opportunity neighborhoods eligible for AHIP incentives. If coupled with deeper affordability requirements discussed below, Option 1 offers the potential to meaningfully increase access to affordable housing in high opportunity areas and reduce development pressure on sites where low-income renters live today, affirmatively furthering fair housing. The City should not acquiesce to exclusionary attitudes about housing development to maintain a status quo that was shaped through racial animus. We urge the Council to adopt Option 1 in combination with the deeper affordability requirements discussed below.

Encourage deeply affordable units by expanding ALI, ELI, VLI incentives

Rents in Moderate Income units are not affordable to the nearly two-thirds of renter households in Los Angeles that are low income or below. By definition, these units are for households *above* the median income. Housing incentives in the MIIP should focus on producing housing at rents where the need is greatest. The mixed affordability option for the Transit Oriented Incentive Areas and Opportunity Corridor Incentive 2 Areas should be amended to focus on deeply affordable housing.² The requirement for Moderate Income housing in Higher Opportunity Areas should be removed and replaced with an increased requirement for Acutely and Extremely Low

¹<https://planning.lacity.gov/odocument/6c6197bb-626e-456e-ae0a-75403bc73b56/EXHIBIT%20D-%20Single-Family%20Considerations.pdf>

² See Table 12.22 A. 38(c)(3)(iv) on page 57 of Exhibit A. 1.

Income housing. The mixed affordability requirement in Moderate and Lower opportunity areas should be adjusted to require a portion of the affordable units be affordable to acutely low income households. Additionally, under the current draft for Opportunity Corridor Transition Area Incentives, developers have no incentive to include any units at the ALI, ELI or VLI level. Projects using this incentive in the CT-1A area are only required to include one MI unit. In the CT-1B, CT-2, and CT-3 areas, developers are unlikely to include any VLI units because the incentive is available to projects with the same number of higher-rent LI units. Therefore, the VLI menu option is an empty promise. For this program to truly advance the City's obligation to affirmatively further fair housing, the affordability requirements for Opportunity Corridor Transition Area Incentives should be amended to replace the MI option with deeper affordability. To be eligible for this incentive, projects should be required to include at least one ALI, ELI, or VLI unit.³

Require robust environmental study and public participation before approving projects on sites with heightened environmental justice concerns

The CHIP ordinance requires that projects seeking the MIIP or AHIP incentives complete a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, and a Phase II if warranted, if the project is proposed on a site with heightened environmental risks. We support this policy and also believe additional measures are necessary. Current toxic site lists (such as DTSC's Cortese List and Envirostor) are incomplete and do not identify all the brownfields that exist. To address deficiencies in existing data and harness local knowledge, we recommend a community meeting of people living in the neighborhood for projects proposed in areas that score at the 80th percentile and above on CalEnviroScreen 4.0. The community meeting would be a non-CEQA, non-voting meeting to collect information from community members about historical uses of the site that may otherwise not show up through traditional data searches used during the Phase I process, as described above, and minimize environmental harms in vulnerable areas.

Resident Protections Ordinance Recommendations:

Strengthen replacement by requiring 2:1 replacement of demolished RSO units

Too often, new housing projects demolish existing below-market rent stabilized housing and create only a few more affordable units than the number of units demolished. In fact, the AECOM analysis revealed that mixed-income RSO development projects between 2020-2023 demolished 1,091 RSO units and produced only 1,161 affordable units - a net increase of only 70 protected units⁴. It is clear that development incentives need to change. Increasing the replacement requirement to require that RSO units be replaced with affordable covenanted units at a 2:1 ratio will steer modest development away from sites with large numbers of RSO units and ensure projects provide a net increase in affordable housing.

We encourage you to adopt these recommendations in order to ensure both the RPO and the CHIP equitably shape the future of affordable housing and communities in the City of Los Angeles.

³ See Table 22.22. A. 38(c)(3)(v) on page 57 of Exhibit A. 1.

⁴ 3 See page 9 of "Potential Impact of 1:1 RSO-Affordable Replacement Requirement" in [Appendix 3](#).

Sincerely,
Daniel Jimenez
Director of Community Organizing
Inner City Struggle