

Communication from Public

Name: Sue Bell Yank

Date Submitted: 03/19/2024 09:19 AM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Council Members: I support the motion described in Agenda Item #15 brought by Councilmember Hernandez (CD-1) to conduct a fair and objective study of transportation alternatives for Dodger Stadium before proceeding with Frank McCourt's gondola proposal. There are obvious alternative solutions which very well could be better at solving the challenges at hand: traffic congestion, greenhouse gas emissions, and electrification of our transportation system. I personally currently use the the Hollywood a park-and-ride system from my neighborhood of Glendale, and that system works very well. A similar system servicing Dodger Stadium could be used for other special events, such as the Olympics and World Cup. And those buses could be deployed in regular service at other times, helping to speed the electrification of our bus system in Los Angeles. And, yet, this existing, feasible solution was never studied in the Gondola EIR. We should study it and other alternatives before proceeding with Frank McCourt's proposal, which would grievously harm the historic core of our city, El Pueblo and Olvera Street, and destroy the historic value and visitor experience at LA State Historic Park, AND remove over 250 trees from this city, while bringing negative impacts and little or no benefit to surrounding communities in and around Chinatown. Please support this motion. Sincerely, Sue Bell Yank Executive Director, Clockshop

Communication from Public

Name: Mary Button

Date Submitted: 03/19/2024 10:17 AM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing with Full Support of this motion, #24-0011-S4. I believe any work on the gondola project should be halted until a study has been made of transportation alternatives. We need a fair study of alternatives to the gondola. I believe there are better solutions for Dodger Stadium traffic, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and speeding electrification of transportation around Los Angeles. I am also very concerned about the impact the proposed gondola will have on the residents in the area. The community did not ask for this Gondola, which will disrupt the lifestyles of the people who live below this "ride". Thank you!

Communication from Public

Name: Jack Humphreville
Date Submitted: 03/19/2024 11:16 AM
Council File No: 24-0011-S4
Comments for Public Posting: Broke City Considering Giveaways of Over \$100 Million to Two Hotel Developers

City Considering Giveaways of Over \$100 Million to Two Hotel Developers

JACK HUMPHREVILLE

MARCH 18 2024



LA WATCHDOG - You would never know that the City of Los Angeles is looking at “budget gap” next year of over \$700 million as it is considering two development incentive agreements for over \$100 million for two luxury hotels in DTLA and the Arts District.

Beginning in 2007, the City has entered into eight development incentive agreements to encourage the construction of hotels within walking distance of the Convention Center. Under these agreements, the City agrees to provide project financing to the developers in an amount not to exceed 50% of the net new revenues generated by the project. Revenues include the transient occupancy (hotel) tax, property taxes, parking taxes, sales taxes, and other miscellaneous taxes. As for June 30, 2023, these giveaways have totaled approximately \$1 billion.

On March 1, the City Council approved a motion to update a 2018 analysis for the Venice Hope Group for its development of a \$132 million, 300 room hotel which

previously indicated that a \$63 million giveaway over a 10 to 15-year period was necessary to make this project economically “feasible.” This development also includes a \$171 million, 250-unit residential development.

In November, the City Council approved a motion by Kevin de Leon to authorize the hiring of a consultant, at the developer Vella Group’s expense, to determine if a proposed 236-room hotel at 670 Mesquit Street in the Arts District requires economic development incentives to make this project economically “feasible.” This proposed hotel, three miles from the Convention Center, is part of \$1 billion, 1.8 million square foot development that includes a million square feet of creative office space, 208 residential housing units, an Arts District Central Market, a grocery store, 136,000 square feet of retail space, a studio/event/gallery space of over 90,000 square feet, and a 62,000 square foot gym.

The estimated giveaway is estimated to be in the range of \$50 million over a 10 to 15 year time frame based on giveaways for other similar developments.

These subsidies are not in the best interests of the City and Angelenos since there are other more important priorities. These include funding the City’s homeless program; repairing and maintaining our streets, sidewalks, and parks; and balancing the City’s out of control budget.

There are also questions as to validity of the economic analysis of the consultants. Why do hotels within walking distance of the Convention Center deserve giveaways while hotels in Hollywood and the rest of the City do not? And hasn’t the City met its goals of having 8,000 rooms within walking distance of the Convention Center? And if these hotels receive subsidies, shouldn’t the developers reimburse (plus interest) the City if these projects exceed the consultants’ projections?

If the City Council decides to consider subsidizing these developers, there should be open and transparent hearings where we have the necessary time to review, analyze, and comment on any proposal that involves giveaways to deep pocketed developers.

<https://www.citywatchla.com/la-watchdog/28620-city-considering-giveaways-of-over-100-million-to-two-hotel-developers>

Communication from Public

Name: Jack Humphreville
Date Submitted: 03/19/2024 11:19 AM
Council File No: 24-0011-S4
Comments for Public Posting: Broke City Considering Giveaways of Over \$100 Million to Two Hotel Developers

City Considering Giveaways of Over \$100 Million to Two Hotel Developers

JACK HUMPHREVILLE

MARCH 18 2024



LA WATCHDOG - You would never know that the City of Los Angeles is looking at “budget gap” next year of over \$700 million as it is considering two development incentive agreements for over \$100 million for two luxury hotels in DTLA and the Arts District.

Beginning in 2007, the City has entered into eight development incentive agreements to encourage the construction of hotels within walking distance of the Convention Center. Under these agreements, the City agrees to provide project financing to the developers in an amount not to exceed 50% of the net new revenues generated by the project. Revenues include the transient occupancy (hotel) tax, property taxes, parking taxes, sales taxes, and other miscellaneous taxes. As for June 30, 2023, these giveaways have totaled approximately \$1 billion.

On March 1, the City Council approved a motion to update a 2018 analysis for the Venice Hope Group for its development of a \$132 million, 300 room hotel which

previously indicated that a \$63 million giveaway over a 10 to 15-year period was necessary to make this project economically “feasible.” This development also includes a \$171 million, 250-unit residential development.

In November, the City Council approved a motion by Kevin de Leon to authorize the hiring of a consultant, at the developer Vella Group’s expense, to determine if a proposed 236-room hotel at 670 Mesquit Street in the Arts District requires economic development incentives to make this project economically “feasible.” This proposed hotel, three miles from the Convention Center, is part of \$1 billion, 1.8 million square foot development that includes a million square feet of creative office space, 208 residential housing units, an Arts District Central Market, a grocery store, 136,000 square feet of retail space, a studio/event/gallery space of over 90,000 square feet, and a 62,000 square foot gym.

The estimated giveaway is estimated to be in the range of \$50 million over a 10 to 15 year time frame based on giveaways for other similar developments.

These subsidies are not in the best interests of the City and Angelenos since there are other more important priorities. These include funding the City’s homeless program; repairing and maintaining our streets, sidewalks, and parks; and balancing the City’s out of control budget.

There are also questions as to validity of the economic analysis of the consultants. Why do hotels within walking distance of the Convention Center deserve giveaways while hotels in Hollywood and the rest of the City do not? And hasn’t the City met its goals of having 8,000 rooms within walking distance of the Convention Center? And if these hotels receive subsidies, shouldn’t the developers reimburse (plus interest) the City if these projects exceed the consultants’ projections?

If the City Council decides to consider subsidizing these developers, there should be open and transparent hearings where we have the necessary time to review, analyze, and comment on any proposal that involves giveaways to deep pocketed developers.

<https://www.citywatchla.com/la-watchdog/28620-city-considering-giveaways-of-over-100-million-to-two-hotel-developers>

Communication from Public

Name: Kathleen Johnson

Date Submitted: 03/19/2024 01:18 PM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: Comment on Councilmember Hernandez's Motion, Council File: 24-0011-S4 Title: Dodger Stadium / Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit (LA ART) / Traffic Assessment / Council District 1 / Street Furniture Revenue Fund Dear Council Members: I'm Kathleen Johnson with LA River State Park Partners, the nonprofit support organization for LA State Historic Park. I support this motion to conduct a full study of transportation alternatives for Dodger Stadium before proceeding with LAART's gondola, an unsolicited private enterprise with significant, permanent impacts to the State Historic Park. Imposing an aerial highway through the park would negate years of community-driven activism and careful planning that transformed this brownfield into a vital urban oasis for our historically park-poor neighborhoods. The gondola's massive structures would permanently alter the park's open skies, viewsheds, and landscapes; take parkland; destroy mature trees; and convey bus-size gondola cars just 26 feet over park users' heads. Please consider the precedent of allowing taxpayer funded, public park land to be taken for this private use - a single destination ride, not even a true transit project broadly serving LA's daily commuters. There are alternative solutions to Dodger traffic - please at least study these options before proceeding with a project that would have such detrimental community impacts. Kathleen Johnson Executive Director Los Angeles River State Park Partners 1799 Baker Street Los Angeles CA 90012 323-717-9785 <https://www.larsppartners.org/>

Communication from Public

Name: Tany Ling

Date Submitted: 03/19/2024 12:58 PM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: I fully SUPPORT THE MOTION to do a comprehensive traffic study around Dodger Stadium and to put the gondola project on hold. We need clarity, transparency, and up-to-date information in order to make sensible decisions. Show your constituents that you stand for them and not for blindly promoting any big developer's projects. Thank you. Tany Ling

Communication from Public

Name: Marian Dodge
Date Submitted: 03/19/2024 05:48 PM
Council File No: 24-0011-S4
Comments for Public Posting: CF 24-0011-S4 SUPPORT

CF 24-0011-S4

I strongly support CM Eunisses Hernandez' motion to study potential alternatives to mitigate the traffic to Dodge Stadium. The LA ART proposal is being pushed ahead without having evaluated its efficiency. Is it the best option? You can't tell without doing studies of several options.

While aerial gondolas may be a practical way to move skiers to the top of a ski slope, there are huge differences in getting to Dodger Stadium. Skiers do not all arrive and leave at the same time. There are not 50,000 people trying to get to the same place at the same time. Ski gondolas do not pass over residential areas.

LA ART is really a transit system; it's sightseeing ride for tourists.

A thorough study of transportation options is essential to selecting the optimal way to mitigate traffic to Dodge Stadium. I urge a YES vote.

Marian Dodge

Communication from Public

Name: Susan Miller

Date Submitted: 03/19/2024 05:49 PM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to express that I am AGAINST the proposed gondola project (LA ART). -any difficulty in getting to Dodgers' stadium could be remedied by investing this money into existing infrastructure (busses). By having the terminal at Union Station, all this does is divert more traffic to that area which is already busy and doesn't need more cars. -the gondola completely disregards the health, privacy, and well-being of residents currently in its path. I love the Dodgers but the Chavez Ravine displacement is such a blemish on LA history and we cannot repeat it! Truly, imagine being in your home and having gondolas full of people passing overhead- how intrusive would that feel?

Communication from Public

Name: Christopher Molina

Date Submitted: 03/19/2024 05:36 PM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: I believe a fair, objective, and comprehensive study of possible transit options around Dodger Stadium should be done. First and foremost attention to the environmental impact as well as impact to local communities should be highly considered.

Communication from Public

Name: Marion L Siu

Date Submitted: 03/19/2024 09:47 PM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: I support the motion to study alternatives to the LA ART gondola before doing any further work on that proposal in the City. I oppose the building of the gondola which Frank McCourt wants for the purpose of transporting patrons to his planned future mall.
Marion L Siu