

Communication from Public

Name: Jason Stock

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 01:55 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Jason Stock

jasonstock@gmail.com

Communication from Public

Name: Robert Lawrence

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 01:57 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. The following matters are only a few of the problems with this deeply flawed and overly expensive project:

Key concerns:

- Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds.
- Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue.
- Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints.

The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here."

Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking.

Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by

funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name: Joanna Puglisi

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 01:59 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name: Patrick Taylor

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 02:00 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name: Julien

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 02:11 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 02:12 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Robin Rudisill
wldrudi@mac.com

Communication from Public

Name: Deborah Keaton

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 02:17 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Deborah Keaton
debkeaton@mac.com

Communication from Public

Name: D. Pitt

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 02:28 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: I do not support the Venice Dell project. It does not make financial sense and the space has been approved for a transportation hub. This will be very helpful when we host the Olympics here. Los Angeles residents are tired of all the fraud and waste! Enough money has been wasted or not accounted for. We should do something by the beach to benefit all Los Angeles residents. The hub makes total sense. Thank you, Deborah Pitt

Communication from Public

Name: Jeff Hoffman

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 02:37 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you jeff hoffman

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 02:40 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers, As 35+ year Venice residents and stakeholders, we are deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project

in the past. Thank you for your consideration.

Communication from Public

Name: suellen mayfield
Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 02:42 PM
Council File No: 24-0971
Comments for Public Posting: We citizens of Venice deserve a fair hearing!

Communication from Public

Name: Mike Maloy

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 02:52 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: I am a resident of the Venice/Dell neighborhood and greatly appreciate the council's interest in keeping the project dormant. It has already been ruled against and further lawfare on behalf of the developers will cause unnecessary economic impact to the city. Their's is a losing cause. They lost! Please close the books on this. And, thank you!

Communication from Public

Name: John Campbell

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 02:54 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- John Campbell
johnwcampbell@verizon.net

Communication from Public

Name: Robert B. Parente
Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 02:58 PM
Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Robert B. Parente From:info@safecoastaldevelopment.org
To:clerk.cps@lacity.org,councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org,lyric.kelkar@lacity.org,councilmember.nazarian@lacity.org,alexis.wesson@lacity.org
Cc:karen.bass@lacity.org,vahid.khorsand@lacity.org,hydee.feldsteinsoto@lacity.org,kevin.james@lacity.org,john.heath@lacity.org Tue, Jan 27 at 2:52 PM Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Robert B. Parente
RBPParente@sbcglobal.net

Communication from Public

Name: Robert B. Parente
Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 02:59 PM
Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Robert B. Parente From:info@safecoastaldevelopment.org
To:clerk.cps@lacity.org,councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org,lyric.kelkar@lacity.org,councilmember.nazarian@lacity.org,alexis.wesson@lacity.org
Cc:karen.bass@lacity.org,vahid.khorsand@lacity.org,hydee.feldsteinsoto@lacity.org,kevin.james@lacity.org,john.heath@lacity.org Tue, Jan 27 at 2:52 PM Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Robert B. Parente
RBPParente@sbcglobal.net

Communication from Public

Name: Marjorie Weitzman

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:15 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name: Michael Moorhead

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:16 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Michael Moorhead
mmoorheadjr93@gmail.com

Communication from Public

Name: Murray Goldberg

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:18 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:21 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name: Carolyn Manaugh

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:22 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Carolyn Manaugh
r3chats@yahoo.com

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:23 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:24 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Susan Painter

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:46 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:53 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Dianne Wyatt
dew90292@yahoo.com

Communication from Public

Name: Alan Goldberg

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:54 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Democrats are idiots. They have yet to make one intelligent decision regarding the city of Los Angeles.. It is not the homeowners that want this to pass.. you allow these renters which are basically homeless people voting to ruin our community. If you do not own a home, you should not be able to vote when it is in regards to the community. You do not own a home you do not have stake in the community. The people that voted for this don't even live in Venice and should not have any say so on what happens to my community?. You just can't fix stupid when it comes to Democrats and how they have ruined the city of Los Angeles

Communication from Public

Name: Alan Goldberg

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:57 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: I don't understand how people that don't live in the city of Venice are allowed to vote on what happens at the community. Renters do not own property and have no stake in the community.. renters are like the homeless actually they are homeless. They don't own a home. They are just not used and have no right to vote on what happens in our community.. no one wants this in their community. It's to do nothing Democrats the liberals and all the renters that approved stuff like this because they don't care. It's all about the money.. and stop this affordable housing junk. When I was younger affordable, housing was where you could afford to live.. I don't need degenerate bringing down the property value if you can't afford to live in (venice) live and move ehereyou can afford to live. I can't believe how Democrats and Caron bass have destroyed this city because there's more people that are renters than homeowners.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 04:01 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name: Linnie 404 LLC - Venice Canals Property Owner

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 04:01 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name: Coalition for Safe Coastal Development
Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 04:04 PM
Council File No: 24-0971
Comments for Public Posting: Please see attached letter dated December 2, 2025 sent from 287 community members listed in support of additional funding to fight the Venice Dell lawsuits.

Members of the Budget and Finance Committee,

I strongly support the request for this funding to fight the Venice Dell lawsuits. It is ironic that the parties who stand to benefit from the City's giveaway of public land and public funds are now criticizing the City for spending public funds to defend against their baseless lawsuits. The City *must* defend itself against these bad actors and correct a pattern of lack of accountability and fiscal irresponsibility.

Regarding the Venice Dell project, the project is now dead and cannot proceed, based on the binding decision of the City's Transportation Commission (and supported by the Housing & Homelessness and Transportation Committees earlier this year). Members of Council had the opportunity to appeal that decision but did not. Reversing this dead project would inevitably lead to more litigation resulting in further delay of the Council-approved option of a feasibility study on the adjacent lot #701 to build a sensible affordable housing project, and a mobility hub on public lot # 731 to promote connectivity in Venice and welcome all visitors from LA and throughout the world. If the developers are genuine in their intent to help those in need, they should proceed with a housing project on the alternative adjacent public lot #701.

Make no mistake, the Venice Dell project was a land grab proposed for the most unsuitable site for the proposed project on one of the City's most valuable pieces of land a block from its #1 tourist attraction, Venice Beach.

The building of these outrageously expensive \$1.2 million, 400 sq ft units would drastically impede public access to the beach for all Angelenos and worldwide visitors. What should be of extreme concern to all involved is the highly questionable appraisal of \$3.349 million in 2020 for 40 lots a block from the beach. The same land was appraised in 2016 for \$34 million and, based on realistic comps, today is worth well over \$70 million. It seems the appraisal was used to deliberately undervalue the land in order to unconstitutionally "gift" this public land to preferred developers for a lease of \$1/year for 99 years, of which only 55 years would be restricted as "affordable," meaning the last 44 years can be market rate housing. This appraisal is still being used to solicit both federal and state funding for a project that is dead.

In addition, this heavily utilized recreational parking lot # 731 brings in \$1 million annually for the City, the loss of which is yet another cost to the City of the Venice Dell project.

This flawed project has been an embarrassment from the outset. The out of control costs were demonstrated repeatedly; for example, the architect was paid \$3.9 million but it was later found he did not qualify under funding guidelines, and had to be replaced. The developers' mistakes must not be the City's liability.

Those now suing the city to cover their mistakes are recruiting outside organizations to intervene via email and social media campaigns. These groups do not speak on behalf of Venice residents or the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. It is unfortunate that the City must defend itself against litigation full of mistruths and deceitful accusations from developers and their related parties who seem intent on extorting more money and land from the City, rather than facing the project's denial and moving forward in their mission of building "affordable housing."

I strongly support the funding for outside counsel to defend the City against the Venice Dell lawsuits and commend our elected officials for standing up to the grift. Please approve the legal funds needed to put an end to this bad faith exploitation of public policy that undermines both public trust and the integrity of Los Angeles' affordable housing policies.

Thank you-

nf-subs-7

#	Date Submitted	Name	Email
1	12/01/2025	Patricia Procter	Pattiprocter@gmail.com
2	12/01/2025	John Tapia	Ext2403@gmail.com
3	12/01/2025	Seth Lichtenstein	sl@hlymedialaw.com
4	12/01/2025	alan shaffer	shafferphoto@me.com
5	12/01/2025	Dianne Wyatt	dew90292@yahoo.com
6	12/01/2025	Hollye Levin	hollyepeno@me.com
7	12/01/2025	Eileen Pollack Erickson	eileen@slpmanagement.com
8	12/01/2025	Patrick Taylor	ptconstruction@mac.com
9	12/01/2025	Nancy Eubank	nancyhello@aol.com
10	12/01/2025	Marjorie Weitzman	marjorieweitzman@gmail.com
11	12/01/2025	Laurie Gilbert	llgilbert48@me.com
12	12/01/2025	Ralph Primo	ralphprm@aol.com
13	12/01/2025	Ed Orrett	orrette@yahoo.com
14	12/01/2025	Marie Hammond	mhamm96@aol.com
15	12/01/2025	Steven Ayromlooi	hirohawa@aol.com
16	12/01/2025	Benjamin Shahrabani	benjaminshahrabani@yahoo.com
17	12/01/2025	Robin Murez	ROBIN@ROBINMUREZ.COM
18	12/01/2025	Conny Lederer	connylederer@gmail.com
19	12/01/2025	Daryl Barnett	daryl.barnett@yahoo.com
20	12/01/2025	Linda Eberle	eberlearts@ca.rr.com
21	12/01/2025	Karen	ksw90292@yahoo.com
22	12/01/2025	Kurland Jenesa	jjisk7@hotmail.com
23	12/01/2025	Bridget Rohmer	bmcmeel@amuniversal.com
24	12/01/2025	Michael Ernstoff	ps144nyc@yahoo.com
25	12/01/2025	Robin Rudisill	wildrudi@mac.com
26	12/01/2025	Jeffrey Hoffman	jeff.hoffman@yahoo.com
27	12/01/2025	suellen mayfield	semayfield@aol.com
28	12/01/2025	Kelly Adams	kellyrud1@me.com
29	12/01/2025	Marianne Snell	luckylion@me.com

30	12/01/2025	Stuart Levy	stuartlevy@mac.com
31	12/01/2025	SEAN OBRIEN	dvpro@aol.com
32	12/01/2025	Noel Gould	aquarianstudios@hotmail.com
33	12/01/2025	Nyracai Davis	nsyncro@gmail.com
34	12/01/2025	Christine Lee	cylee88@mac.com
35	12/01/2025	Cori Ellis	cori.ellis@gmail.com
36	12/01/2025	Jane Velez-Mitchell	janevelezmitchell@yahoo.com
37	12/01/2025	Jasmine Kim	fengshuifriend@netscape.net
38	12/01/2025	Vin burns	theivote@gmail.com
39	12/01/2025	Krista Hopkins	kristahopkins5@gmail.com
40	12/01/2025	Manuel Katz	uskatz@aol.com
41	12/01/2025	Ana Diaz Ruiz	anadiazruiz@yahoo.com
42	12/01/2025	Kellene West	kellenewest@me.com
43	12/01/2025	S Beebe	sbeebe@prismpermits.com
44	12/01/2025	Alexandra Hall	totallyalex@mac.com
45	12/01/2025	Dwight West	westduewest@mac.com
46	12/01/2025	Nathalie brouwer	brouwer1@earthkink.net
47	12/01/2025	Richard Friedel	richardmfriedel@gmail.com
48	12/01/2025	Francine Simmons	fasimmons@me.com
49	12/01/2025	Connie Brooks	connie_brooks@verizon.net
50	12/01/2025	Karen Barber	karenibarber@hotmail.com
51	12/01/2025	Alix Gucovsky	beachbubbles94@gmail.com
52	12/01/2025	todd lorber	lorbertodd@gmail.com
53	12/01/2025	Karen La Cava	kalacava@yahoo.com
54	12/01/2025	Sonya Reese Greenland	sonyareesegreenland1@gmail.com
55	12/01/2025	jamie carlton	jamiecarlton0605@gmail.com
56	12/01/2025	Mexican Heritage Los Angeles	mexicanheritagela@gmail.com
57	12/01/2025	Chris Cerbo	chrisfilter-marinadelrey@yahoo.com
58	12/01/2025	Venice Lifeguards	venicelifeguardstation@gmail.com
59	12/01/2025	Jennifer Luke	jlukeme@gmail.com
60	12/01/2025	Mitra Lotfi	mitra815@yahoo.com
61	12/01/2025	P.Fierro	pat@dennen.com

62	12/01/2025	corinne chalx	corinnechaix1@icloud.com
63	12/01/2025	Julie Bean	julie@beanito.com
64	12/01/2025	Richard A Rothstein	rarbroker@cs.com
65	12/01/2025	Joshua Blacker	joshuablacker@me.com
66	12/01/2025	Max Bean	max@beanito.com
67	12/01/2025	Deborah Pitt	dpitt626@aol.com
68	12/01/2025	Gary Panas	gpanas@mff.org
69	12/01/2025	Aaron Miles	503aaron@gmail.com
70	12/01/2025	Deborah Cairo	Deborahcairo@yahoo.com
71	12/01/2025	Tracy Carpenter	tracycarpenter@me.com
72	12/01/2025	D. Panas	dpitt626@gmail.com
73	12/01/2025	Mark Rago	markrago1@yahoo.com
74	12/01/2025	Brad Barber	bbarbs@yahoo.com
75	12/01/2025	George Johannessen	chipjoh@msn.com
76	12/01/2025	Yolanda	firstmateyo@yahoo.com
77	12/01/2025	Todd Mescher	tmesher@mac.com
78	12/01/2025	Emily Alves	emal03@hotmail.com
79	12/01/2025	Russ Cletta	russ@russcletta.com
80	12/01/2025	Sarah Shoup	s_shoup@icloud.com
81	12/01/2025	Carmen Soriano	crmnsoriano@yahoo.com
82	12/01/2025	Fred Kia	fsk@pacbell.net
83	12/01/2025	Kevin Mullen	kevin@kgmullen.com
84	12/01/2025	Kamille Longstreet	kamillealongstreet@gmail.com
85	12/01/2025	Max Robinson	maxfrobinson@gmail.com
86	12/01/2025	Jeff Steiner	jeffrey.d.steiner@gmail.com
87	12/01/2025	Gary Pearl	garypearl@me.com
88	12/01/2025	Fred Ryan	fred1r@msn.com
89	12/01/2025	Enid Baron	efbaron4@gmail.com
90	12/01/2025	Nathalie Locas	nathalie.locas@gmail.com
91	12/01/2025	Beth Crosse	bethcrosse@gmail.com
92	12/01/2025	gillian wynn	freegilly@me.com
93	12/01/2025	Mark Standring	mark.standring@gmail.com

94	12/01/2025	Susan Beningfield	susanbenningfield@hotmail.com
95	12/01/2025	Shane Brouwer	shanebrouwer@aol.com
96	12/01/2025	Adam Draizin	adamdraizin@gmail.com
97	12/01/2025	Gila Standing	gila.standing@gmail.com
98	12/01/2025	Jennifer Luke	jlukeme@gmail.com
99	12/01/2025	Craig Tanimoto	craigtanimoto@gmail.com
100	12/01/2025	Monica Synergy CEO	synergyprods@yahoo.com
101	12/01/2025	Judy Esposito	judy.esposito@msn.com
102	12/01/2025	Cari Devine Bjelajac	caribjelajac@me.com
103	12/01/2025	Nely Galan	ngalan@galanent.com
104	12/01/2025	Vibiana Molina	vibmo@yahoo.com
105	12/01/2025	Garrick Ebbins	g.ebbtide@mac.com
106	12/01/2025	Glen Irani	girani@glenirani.com
107	12/01/2025	Mary Alice Crowe	mary.crowe@rocketmail.com
108	12/01/2025	Helen Fallon	fallons.hf@gmail.com
109	12/01/2025	Jay	jayhultman@sbcglobal.net
110	12/01/2025	Frank DeFurio	defurio@msn.com
111	12/01/2025	Dawn Hollier	dlhollier@gmail.com
112	12/01/2025	Jeff Steiner	jeffrey.d.steiner@gmail.com
113	12/01/2025	Nico Ruderman	nicoruderman@gmail.com
114	12/01/2025	Brandon	bbernalbusiness@gmail.com
115	12/01/2025	Danny Rojany	quarterpro@aol.com
116	12/01/2025	Teddy Tannenbaum	teddy@teddycoach.com
117	12/01/2025	Sima Kostovetsky	simakostov@gmail.com
118	12/01/2025	Peter Sherman	Peter.Sherman@gmail.com
119	12/01/2025	Leo Gregoriy	Lgshermanator@gmail.com
120	12/01/2025	Lukas	lrodriguez878@gmail.com
121	12/01/2025	Matthew Risan	mattcraigr@yahoo.com
122	12/01/2025	Mark Galanty	xgalanty@juno.com
123	12/01/2025	Ingrid Miles	ingridsmiles5@gmail.com
124	12/01/2025	Dominique Hirschcron	dominvenice@gmail.com
125	12/01/2025	Gary Hirschcron	hirschcron@gmail.com

126	12/01/2025	Prem Manjooran	premanjooran@gmail.com
127	12/01/2025	Lee Scott	beachct@mac.com
128	12/01/2025	Arnaldo Peralta	ai@peralta.net
129	12/01/2025	Louise Peralta	toto@peralta.net
130	12/01/2025	Lori Christensen	gunvor3@gmail.com
131	12/01/2025	Jaimie McMullen	poppins612@gmail.com
132	12/01/2025	Mia Patt	lymie62@gmail.com
133	12/01/2025	Debra Blocker	debrablocker@aol.com
134	12/01/2025	Linda Shusett	Lshusett@gmail.com
135	12/01/2025	Kevin McMullen	kevin1mcmullen@gmail.com
136	12/01/2025	Allen Spiegler	aspiegler@gmail.com
137	12/01/2025	John Finney	lunarpotion2020@gmail.com
138	12/01/2025	Petra Rudisill	pkarina@mac.com
139	12/01/2025	Christina Krause	christina@beyonders.com
140	12/01/2025	Felisha Raymon	carbiedollz@gmail.com
141	12/01/2025	Dan Zuckerman	danzuckerman@gmail.com
142	12/01/2025	Renee Kaplan	reneekaplan@yahoo.com
143	12/01/2025	Susan Painter	spainter226@gmail.com
144	12/01/2025	Ivette Rodriguez	ivette@aem-la.com
145	12/01/2025	Melissa Goddard	melgod@me.com
146	12/01/2025	Jeff Gold	recordmecca@mac.com
147	12/01/2025	Rita Silverman	rscanalgal@gmail.com
148	12/01/2025	Lynn Silverman	lsilverman@mac.com
149	12/01/2025	Senia Silverman	seniasilverman@icloud.com
150	12/01/2025	Eric Gurry	EG@HouseOfGurry.com
151	12/01/2025	Esther Chaing	hchaing@yahoo.com
152	12/01/2025	Dana Millikin	dmillikin@aol.com
153	12/01/2025	Brooke Afkhami	Brookiestyles@gmail.com
154	12/01/2025	Shelley Berger	sbergeresq@gmail.com
155	12/01/2025	Michael W. Sioss	sibergeeze@aol.com
156	12/01/2025	Stella Takara	cookietakara@aol.com
157	12/01/2025	Laura Weissbecker	weissbec@gmail.com

158	12/01/2025	Bila kahan	bilakahan@yahoo.com
159	12/01/2025	Digby Davies	digby@digbydavies.com
160	12/01/2025	Alexa Brandt	Alexa.brandt@gmail.com
161	12/01/2025	Ezra Strausberg	ezra@strausberggroup.com
162	12/01/2025	Isabella Rodriguez	isabellaivetter@gmail.com
163	12/01/2025	Joel Shapiro	joel@electriclodge.org
164	12/01/2025	Lothar Schmitz	lschmitz@ucla.edu
165	12/01/2025	Alison Bean	a@orsonbean.com
166	12/01/2025	Ron Robinson	stacyron@yahoo.com
167	12/01/2025	April McKay	aprilmckay@gmail.com
168	12/01/2025	Ruby Wilder	RybyWilder55@gmail.com
169	12/01/2025	Milad Hassani	miladhass@gmail.com
170	12/01/2025	Howard Weisenfeld	Howard.Weisenfeld@gmail.com
171	12/01/2025	Rose	roseshelly62@gmail.com
172	12/01/2025	Ashley Ebbert	ashleyebbert@gmail.com
173	12/01/2025	Audrey Alger	auddiealger@gmail.com
174	12/01/2025	Janelle Riley	janellelynnriley@hotmail.com
175	12/02/2025	Michael Maloy	maloytv@mac.com
176	12/02/2025	Barbara Broide	bbroide@hotmail.com
177	12/02/2025	Darryl DuFay	darryldu@pobox.com
178	12/02/2025	David Isagholian	isagholian@ca.rr.com
179	12/02/2025	James Ianza	lanzaf4@aol.com
180	12/02/2025	JILL HOLDEN	jilly.holden@gmail.com
181	12/02/2025	Susan Spivak	earsispublic@outlook.com
182	12/02/2025	Ed Rucker	edwardarucker@gmail.com
183	12/02/2025	devon daley	devonne_daley@hotmail.com
184	12/02/2025	Donald Kushner	donald@junctionfilm.com
185	12/02/2025	Julien Barthe	jbarthe92@yahoo.com
186	12/02/2025	Natalie Torbati	ntorbati1@gmail.com
187	12/02/2025	Lori Schneide Shapiro	rabbilori@opentemple.org
188	12/02/2025	Edward Docherty	dochejed@yahoo.com
189	12/02/2025	Mark Helmut Mack	mark.mackmack@gmail.com

190	12/02/2025	susan Guensch	sguensch@ca.rr.com
191	12/02/2025	Michael Lira	mlira@ca.rr.com
192	12/02/2025	Steven Pearl	SBPearl@gmail.com
193	12/02/2025	Bev Weise	bev.weise@gmail.com
194	12/02/2025	Murray Goldberg	murraygoldberg@gmail.com
195	12/02/2025	Stacey Teruya	stacey_teruya@yahoo.com
196	12/02/2025	Julie Friedman	julie@friedmangrp.com
197	12/02/2025	Jason Utas	jasonutas@gmail.com
198	12/02/2025	Regan Kibbee	regank777@gmail.com
199	12/02/2025	Stacey fields	Ffields2502@aol.com
200	12/02/2025	Elizabeth Stringer	elizabethpaigesmith@gmail.com
201	12/02/2025	Carolyn Manaugh	r3chats@yahoo.com
202	12/02/2025	Michael Manaugh	37knucklehead.mm@gmail.com
203	12/02/2025	Naomi Dabby	naomi@modmd.com
204	12/02/2025	Kevin Hyman	kevindhymen@aol.com
205	12/02/2025	Branden Berger	brandenmberger@gmail.com
206	12/02/2025	Christian Wrede	cwrede@innercore.net
207	12/02/2025	wendy satmary	wsatmary@gmail.com
208	12/02/2025	Steve Slayden	steveslayden@yahoo.com
209	12/02/2025	Mihal Skaggs	mihal@vbcollections.com
210	12/02/2025	Laura Snoke	laurasnoke@icloud.com
211	12/02/2025	Doreen MacCuish	dsmaccuish@gmail.com
212	12/02/2025	Alyson Wilson	alyson.wilson@gmail.com
213	12/02/2025	alan gldberg	agelectric@aol.com
214	12/02/2025	janet sherry	verysherry@verizon.net
215	12/02/2025	Ted Mico	Tmico@aol.com
216	12/02/2025	Macaulay Bruton	Mackiemails@gmail.com
217	12/02/2025	Brian Finney	bhfinney@bhfinney.com
218	12/02/2025	Jeremiah Wilson	jnadya+@gmail.com
219	12/02/2025	Hector Ayala	hectorayala.g1@gmail.com
220	12/02/2025	Jason Stock	jasonstock@gmail.com
221	12/02/2025	Amber Turner	ambereturner@hotmail.com

222	12/02/2025	Daniel Whalen, AIA	whalen@ca.rr.com
223	12/02/2025	Nanette Reed	nanettereed@gmail.com
224	12/02/2025	Vita Lucia	vitatone1@hotmail.com
225	12/02/2025	Mitchel Kadish	mitchel.kadish@gmail.com
226	12/02/2025	Jeanne C. Austin	jcaustin11@hotmail.com
227	12/02/2025	Constance Schwartz-Morini	cs@smac-ent.com
228	12/02/2025	Gene Cunningham	deltabuilders@yahoo.com
229	12/02/2025	Jean Thrift	jthrift@sbcglobal.net
230	12/02/2025	richard revelins	rrevelins@peregrinecorporate.com
231	12/02/2025	Danielle Revelins	daniellerevelins@gmail.com
232	12/02/2025	Lubov Azria	lubovazria@gmail.com
233	12/02/2025	Nicole Miner	nlbminer@aol.com
234	12/02/2025	Alexandra Iamm	adonnelley@gmail.com
235	12/02/2025	Amy Gorton	agorton@towerpr.com
236	12/02/2025	Brett Doonan	brett.doonan@compass.com
237	12/02/2025	Robert Lawrence	rlawrence@anlf.com
238	12/02/2025	Steve Bevilacqua	emb233@yahoo.com
239	12/02/2025	Keira Morrisette	KEIRALM@AOL.COM
240	12/02/2025	James Georgopoulos	georgopoulosjames@gmail.com
241	12/02/2025	Ron Orr	ronorresq@aol.com
242	12/02/2025	Joan D. Wrede	jwrede@jwevents.com
243	12/02/2025	Glenn Jaffe	glennpiaffe@gmail.com
244	12/02/2025	Cora Bird	dean-cora@sbcglobal.net
245	12/02/2025	Eve Jaffe	evejaffe@gmail.com
246	12/02/2025	JIM WILLIAMS	jimmwill@yahoo.com
247	12/02/2025	Sara Mccowan	saramac95@hotmail.com
248	12/02/2025	David Blocker	dblocker@aol.com
249	12/02/2025	Claudia Kielich	ckielich2@gmail.com
250	12/02/2025	Josh Shure	joshuashure@yahoo.com
251	12/02/2025	Brauer Jeffrey	jeff34net@ca.rr.com
252	12/02/2025	Dale Howard	dalerichardhoward@gmail.com
253	12/02/2025	Patty Dobrowsky	pattyd21@gmail.com

254	12/02/2025	Louise Weber	louiseweber@me.com
255	12/02/2025	Sean Lavery	balderdashmail@gmail.com
256	12/02/2025	Anna Rudakova	anna.d.rudakova@gmail.com
257	12/02/2025	Sabroux	asabroux@ca.rr.com
258	12/02/2025	Gail Silverman	gailsilverman@gmail.com
259	12/02/2025	Sarah Schacht	ssschacht@ca.rr.com
260	12/02/2025	John Schacht	j.schacht@ca.rr.com
261	12/02/2025	Bill Gross	bg144@mac.com
262	12/02/2025	Will Jay Pirkey	willjaypirkey@mac.com
263	12/02/2025	Susanne Kampe	soozkame@aol.com
264	12/02/2025	Vicki Seim	vseim@yahoo.com
265	12/02/2025	Monica Brautovich	m19brautovich@gmail.com
266	12/02/2025	Adam Wolman	ahw875@gmail.com
267	12/02/2025	Eileen Heisler	ehisler@me.com
268	12/02/2025	Jan Reichmann	jreichmann@sbcglobal.net
269	12/02/2025	Cynthia Conway	smileycyn@yahoo.com
270	12/02/2025	clay boss	clayboss369@gmail.com
271	12/02/2025	Silvia Faerman	silff.ba@gmail.com
272	12/02/2025	Steffan Fantini	steffanfantini@gmail.com
273	12/02/2025	Kailey Fantini	kaileyfantini@gmail.com
274	12/02/2025	M A Beck	matt@entityfx.com
275	12/03/2025	Bill Silverman	silvermanprop@gmail.com
276	12/03/2025	Richard Davis	rickadickadoo@verizon.net
277	12/03/2025	STACY FISCHER	srobinson420@gmail.com
278	12/03/2025	Evangelina Castillo	evagreene99@yahoo.com
279	12/03/2025	Jessica	jessica@sogwa.com
280	12/03/2025	Monica Ramone - CEO	monicaramone@yahoo.com
281	12/03/2025	Pattee Bishop	tishsher@gmail.com
282	12/03/2025	Catherine Holliss	c@sander-architects.com
283	12/03/2025	Carol katona	katona jean@gmail.com
284	12/04/2025	Braden Pittman	braden.pittman8@gmail.com
285	12/05/2025	Allen Edwards	allenedwards@ca.rr.com

286	12/06/2025	Karen Manfield	karen@manfield.net
287	12/08/2025	charles rosin	charles.rosin@gmail.com

Communication from Public

Name: Alexandra Lamm

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 04:15 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Alexandra lamm

adonnelley@gmail.com

Communication from Public

Name: Devon Daley

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 04:29 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 04:37 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns:

- Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds.
- Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue.
- Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints.
- The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding.
- Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here."
- Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals.
- Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking.

Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to

better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thanks

Communication from Public

Name: Steve Bradbury

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 04:45 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: * Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. * Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. * The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. * Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you, Steve Bradbury

Communication from Public

Name: Lothar Schmitz

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 04:47 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Lothar Schmitz
lschmitz@ucla.edu

Communication from Public

Name: Noel Gould

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 04:47 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000–\$1 million in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Noel Gould
aquarianstudios@hotmail.com

Communication from Public

Name: Robert C Berman DDS

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 05:03 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Please see that the funding the attorneys requested is fulfilled. The lawsuits brought by the other side are frivolous at best. The final cost per unit of the project they are championing is totally ridiculous.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 05:09 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Renee Kaplan
reneekaplan@yahoo.com

Communication from Public

Name: Ron Orr

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 05:12 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Ron Orr
ronorresq@aol.com

Communication from Public

Name: Nathalie Brouwer
Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 04:19 PM
Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Nathalie Locas

brouwer1@earthlink.net

Communication from Public

Name: Howard Weisenfeld

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:30 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns:

- Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds.
- Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue.
- Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints.
- The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding.
- Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here."
- Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals.
- Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking.

Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Howard Weisenfeld
hrwmnw@earthlink.net

Communication from Public

Name: Coalittion for Safe Coastal Development

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:38 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Please see attached file in support of City Attorney request for funds. Council Meeting January 28th, Item 22



January 27, 2026

Re: Council File 24-0971

City Council Meeting of January 28th, Agenda Item 22

Need to Support the City Attorney's Request for Funds for Legal Services to Defend the City Against the Venice Dell-related Meritless Lawsuits.

To: City Councilmembers and City Clerk

We are extremely concerned with the serious legal, procedural and financial irregularities regarding the Venice Dell project. The City is being pressured to concede to a fiscal "boondoggle" that shifts massive costs and liabilities onto taxpayers under the guise of "community benefit."

The astronomical price tag of a currently estimated \$233 million (includes an estimated \$70 million market value of the City's land and the estimated City cost for the new parking structure) results in an estimated cost of **\$2.1 million per average 400 sq. ft. unit, for 113 net new units of "affordable housing"** (3 of the 120 units are for managers and 4 units replace the already existing affordable housing on the site). According to the developers, the cost per unit (presumably only includes \$130 million of total project cost to them) is \$1.1 million. **Whether the cost per unit is \$2.1 million "all-in" or \$1.1 million without the land and garage cost, it is an egregious waste of taxpayer dollars!**

Estimated "All-in" Cost per Net New Affordable Unit--Venice Dell (1.26.26)	
<u>Project cost</u>	
130,401,064 **	Total project cost per developers (from 1/14/26 project pro forma for L.A. County Development Authority (LACDA))
22,000,000	Most recent estimated cost for new garage structure, to be paid by City
14,600,000	Interest on MICLA loan for new garage structure, to be paid by City over 20 years
-3,400,000	Reduce by \$3.4 million assuming this appraisal value is included by developer in total project cost
<u>70,000,000</u>	Market value estimate of project site
<u>233,601,064</u>	"All-in" project cost
<u>Units</u>	
120	Total project units
-3	Manager units
-4	Replacement units
<u>113</u>	Net new affordable units
233,601,064	"All-in" project cost
<u>113</u>	Net new affordable units
2,067,266	Cost per 113 net new average 400 SF unit
\$2.1 million	
** Per unit cost per developer is \$130,401,064 divided by 120 units = \$1.1 million	
Note 1: even using the City's \$34 million 2016 appraisal instead of \$70 million, the cost per net new unit is \$1.8 million.	
Note 2: even using 120 total units instead of 113, the cost per unit is \$1.97 million (rounds to \$2.0 million)	

This is just the type of project that is attracting national attention for misuse/overuse of taxpayer funds and not following state and federal laws in place to protect the taxpayers.

Even a Superior Court Judge could see the potential grift and noted at trial (in the transcript record), “Look, you have very good arguments they are squandering money here.” This is reason enough to walk away from this project! Excerpt from June 2022 DDA trial transcript, page 19:

THE COURT: I DIDN'T SAY IT WAS OKAY.

LOOK, YOU HAVE VERY GOOD ARGUMENTS THEY ARE
SQUANDERING MONEY HERE. OKAY. I AM NOT SUBSCRIBING TO

Clearly, there is no question that the Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) decision is valid and stands. As per Deputy City Attorney John Heath’s comments at the Coastal Commission hearing for the Venice Dell, as the City’s statutorily designated manager of all City owned parking lots, the BOTC is authorized to determine whether lot #731 should be utilized as proposed and/or whether other City parking lots are better options **to balance the urgent need for more affordable housing with parking for coastal access**. Typically, BOTC would have considered such a significant proposal to re-develop lot #731 much earlier in the City’s review process; however, due to prior litigation and other claims against the City and developer, the BOTC hearing on the project was delayed. However, on December 10, 2024, the BOTC voted 5 to nothing to deny the use of lot #731 for the proposed project and to consider using adjacent lot #701 to develop affordable housing. At that BOTC hearing, the Commissioners spoke about the importance of doing everything within the City’s power to address the affordable housing crisis and balancing this work with the need to facilitate better solutions for public coastal access and related public transportation solutions.

The BOTC also noted the potentially significant fiscal impacts of the proposed project during a time of fiscal crisis in the City. Projected construction costs have significantly increased, and the City would have been required to commit over \$20 million dollars to a new parking structure to replace an existing surface parking lot that generates approximately \$750,000 each year. Under the City Charter, BOTC’s action was final as a super majority of City Council members did not take the matter up within five council meeting days.

The BOTC approval issue went before Judge Chalfant in Superior Court in June 2022. Regarding the required BOTC approval, the Judge stated: “They can kill the deal, right? They can say ‘Oh, no, this parking structure is not good, we don’t want it here, we disapprove,’ in which case the project can’t go forward unless the City Council overturns that.” According to the City that is exactly right, and the City Council did not overturn the BOTC ruling; thus, the ruling stands. Excerpt from June 2022 DDA trial transcript, page 27:

THE COURT: THEY CAN KILL THE DEAL; RIGHT? THEY
CAN SAY "OH, NO, THIS PARKING STRUCTURE IS NO GOOD, WE
DON'T WANT IT HERE, WE DISAPPROVE," IN WHICH CASE THE
PROJECT CAN'T GO FORWARD UNLESS THE CITY COUNCIL
OVERTURNS THAT.

Below are a few of the many false claims, misrepresentations and/or violations of law, which together have corrupted the process and the project, as well as invalidated the DDA:

Possible Violation of Surplus Land Act

An administrative bait and switch circumvented the state Surplus Land Act law when this City owned land was offered up to the Affordable Housing Opportunity Site (AHOS) program in 2016 by Mayor Garcetti, CAO Miguel Santana and CD-11 Councilman Mike Bonin, all of whom knowingly falsely represented that the land was “surplus, vacant or underutilized,” which was material to the decision to put the land into the AHOS program. The site was neither surplus, vacant nor underutilized. The site has been used for decades for Coastal Commission-required visitor-serving parking, coastal access, a required boat launch for access to the Venice Canals, as well as a 4-unit multi-family building, housing low-income families. This false claim was later quietly “corrected” in a 2019 City Council motion describing the lot as **“heavily utilized by the public to access recreational opportunities at Venice Beach.”** The motion goes on to say, **“The reuse of City property must strike the right balance between affordable housing and other public benefits, including coastal access.”** The effect of the 2019 Council motion was to perpetuate the project even though it had originally been approved in possible violation of the Surplus Land Act, while at the same time transferring the cost of the visitor-serving parking on to the City. The City would be responsible for replacing the coastal parking with a public parking garage structure at a cost of over \$36 million in debt service, *including principal of an estimated \$22 million and interest of approximately \$14 million, over 20 years.* The City would also lose somewhere between \$750,000 to \$1 million per year in beach parking revenue as this income would be required to go towards the debt service for the new garage structure. Excerpt from May 2022 CAO report, including erroneous statement that the \$7.8 million interest *is included in* the \$19 million garage cost (based on 4 year old costs no longer accurate):

CAO File No. PAGE
0220-00540-1605 3

based on the Key Terms and Conditions attached to the LAHD's Report. The project will result in the construction of 68 units of supportive housing for households experiencing homelessness, 34 units of affordable housing for low-income individuals, 34 units of affordable housing for low-income artists, and four unrestricted manager units. The project will also include a public parking structure of approximately 244 parking spaces, which are comprised of 27 Beach Impact Parking spaces, two Boat Launch Spaces (short-term) parking spaces, 196 replacement parking spaces, and up to 19 additional parking spaces. It is expected that the public parking structure will be financed by the City with Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) lease revenue bonds. The issuance of MICLA debt is a General Fund obligation. The 2022-23 Proposed Budget contains \$11,645,634 in MICLA authorization to finance the first year of construction costs. The total estimated cost to construct the public parking structure is \$19,492,682. Additional MICLA authorization totaling \$7,847,048 will be required in 2023-24 to pay for the remaining project cost. The total estimated debt service for the public parking would be \$19,490,000, including interest of approximately \$7,844,000. The estimated interest is based on a 20-year bond issuance at a 5.5 percent interest rate. Actual interest rates may differ as rates are dependent on market conditions at the time of issuance. Additional information regarding the proposed project can be found in the LAHD Report.

Fortunately, the “right balance” referred to in the 2019 motion was finally achieved with the BOTC's December 10, 2024 decision that existing beach parking must remain on Lot #731, to preserve visitor coastal access and allow for a much needed transit hub, and that the affordable housing should be relocated to Lot # 701, directly across the street. This decision corrected any violation of the state's Surplus Land Act as Lot # 701 is underutilized. Feasibility analyses for these two projects have been subsequently advanced by City Council in 2025.

Re-Use Analysis and Loan Committee Reports Withheld from City Council

City Council decision makers were not provided, prior to voting on the DDA agreement, with the Keyser Marston Re-Use Analysis that purports to justify the \$1/year lease amount (for 99 years). A \$3.349 million manipulated appraisal was used for the Re-Use analysis so that (as

per Superior Court Judge Chalfant) the consultant was able to knock down the market value from the original appraisal done by the City of \$34 million so that the “fair reuse” of the property would be 0 or less and the City could charge the developers only a dollar. The subsequent lower appraisal also lowered the cost per unit which enabled the state funding. Excerpt from June 2022 DDA trial transcript, page 6:

SO -- AND THEN THE PETITIONERS POINT OUT THE HORRIBLES OF THIS CASE, WHICH IS THAT THERE WAS A FAIR MARKET VALUE APPRAISAL OF THE PROPERTY IN 2016 AT \$34 MILLION, NONETHELESS, THE FAIR USE ANALYSIS WAS PREPARED BY THE CITY'S CONSULTANT KM -- WHICH I CAN'T REMEMBER WHAT THE NAME OF KM IS, ANYWAY IT'S KM -- AND MISS ROMNEY, R-O-M-E-Y, WHO STARTED WITH A MORE RECENT APPRAISAL OF THE PROPERTY AT ONLY \$3.349 MILLION DOLLARS SAID SHE HAD TROUBLE BUT SHE WAS ABLE TO KNOCK IT DOWN SO THAT THE FAIR REUSE OF THE PROPERTY WITH CONSTRUCTION OF DEVELOPMENT WOULD BE ZERO SO THAT THE CITY COULD CHARGE THE DEVELOPERS ONLY A DOLLAR.

However, the re-use analysis also demonstrates that **with any appraisal amount the annual rent would come to the \$1 per year lease for 99 years**, rendering the re-use analysis justification meaningless and “an exercise” (also validated by Housing Department senior staff in a deposition). This means that ***transferring the land for the Venice Dell project, which is some of the most valuable land in the City but materially undervalued for this analysis, would, in fact, be an unconstitutional gift of public assets.***

The April 6, 2022 Loan Committee Report was also not provided to City Council before its decision on the DDA. This report warned of **several material project risks**, including the disclosure that PBV (Project Based Vouchers) funding PSH units were guaranteed for only 20 years, creating immediate negative NOI risk thereafter. Excerpt from Loan Committee Report:

Project Risk

The Developer has experience with similar projects and has a successful track record.

However, the PBV vouchers will only be guaranteed for 20 years. If the contract is not extended therefore, the Project is expected to experience immediate negative NOI if this were to occur.

City Councilmembers were also not made aware that the lease for \$1/year for 99 years loses its “affordable status” in just 55 years, when the deed restrictions expire. **The plan for the remaining 44 years is unknown.**

Before any decisions are made with respect to Venice Dell, the City Council ***must*** demand to see an updated reuse analysis and loan analysis. These documents are now 4 years old and, based on the current financial and economic conditions, as predicted in the risk factors included in the initial reuse analysis, many risk factors have become the reality, such as increased interest rates and construction costs.

While the developers and those to benefit from the tax credits profit, the public loses land valued at an estimated \$70 million, while also losing approximately \$1 million in annual revenue from the current beach parking and paying \$36 million in debt service for a new garage structure.

This Venice Dell project has been corrupted and must not be revived. The costs are astronomical and embarrassing and there is huge future liability. The Press would have a field day with an approval of this project. The whole world would wonder why the City of Los Angeles would make such a terrible decision, especially in the wake of so much corruption in the “homeless industrial complex.” Sadly, the people benefiting most from this transaction would be the developers and investors, not the “unhoused,” not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach.

There are vastly better alternatives- specifically lot #701, already approved for an affordable housing feasibility study and truly underutilized, directly across the street.

Please provide the funding to fight off these meritless lawsuits, which is a much cheaper and much more efficient option than moving ahead with this wildly expensive and risky project!

Thank you-

Safe Coastal Development

CC:
Mayor Karen Bass
City Attorney Hydee Feldstein-Soto
City Transportation Commission

Communication from Public

Name: Laura Snoke

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 03:43 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Please see the email sent to you regarding the Dell project. I have been a homeowner in Venice since 1988 and on the canals since 1994.

Communication from Public

Name: Sarah Schacht

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 05:56 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Sarah Schacht

ssschacht@ca.rr.com

Communication from Public

Name: John Schacht

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 05:59 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- John Schacht

j.schacht@ca.rr.com

Communication from Public

Name: Josef Davydovits

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 06:04 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name: Felicia Emad

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 06:05 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 06:21 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 06:32 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Karen

ksw90292@yahoo.com Reply Reply all Forward

Communication from Public

Name: Michael Krupp

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 06:51 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Image Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Michael Krupp
mkrupp@mac.com

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 06:54 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Image Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Frankie Krupp
mhk9993@gmail.com

Communication from Public

Name: stuart levy

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 07:12 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- stuart levy
stuartlevy@mac.com

Communication from Public

Name: todd lorber

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 08:54 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- todd
lorbertodd@gmail.com

Communication from Public

Name: Robin Murez

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 08:58 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Robin Murez
ROBIN@ROBINMUREZ.COM

Communication from Public

Name: Juan C

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 09:06 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Juan C
mexicanheritagela@gmail.com

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 09:13 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name: Rita

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 09:26 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name: Shelley Berger

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 09:26 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Urging City Council to resist “extortion” and blackmail of public officials by providing funds for legal defense of lawsuits intended to bully city officials who should be protected by their public service. (Otherwise - in addition to being morally wrong, sets a clear precedent discouraging public servants from holding office and doing their duty to serve constituents.).

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 09:31 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 09:59 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed Venice Dell project in the past. Thank you- Chris C.

chriscfilter-marinadelrey@yahoo.com

Communication from Public

Name: Carie Martin

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 10:09 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: See attached correspondence from plaintiff's representatives in the pending lawsuit LA Forward, et al. v. City of Los Angeles, et al. (Super. Ct., Los Angeles County, Case No. 24STCV17156), submitted to Council File No. 24-0971. We urge the Council to protect Los Angeles' integrity, fiscal health, and commitment to inclusive housing and vote no on Agenda Item 22. Carie Martin
Public Counsel



January 27, 2026

City of Los Angeles City Council
200 N Spring St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: January 28, 2026, Agenda Item 22 (Council File Number 24-0971)

Dear Members of the City Council:

We represent plaintiffs LA Forward Institute, Sylvia Aroth, Professor Gary Williams, and Kathleen Coates in the pending lawsuit *LA Forward, et al. v. City of Los Angeles, et al.* (Super. Ct., Los Angeles County, Case No. 24STCV17156). We write to preserve the public record regarding the egregious waste of taxpayer money as the City uses outside counsel to defend its discriminatory practices and to sue affordable housing developers. We encourage the Council to vote no on Item 22.

LA Forward, et al. v. City of Los Angeles, et al. alleges that the City's failure to build the Venice Dell affordable housing project is the result of a pattern and practice by Councilmember Park and the City Attorney's Office to use City processes to subvert the Project's approval and thwart its development in violation of the California Constitution, State housing laws, and the City's Charter and Administrative Code.¹ Our lawsuit is one of five separate lawsuits the City is currently defending related to its ongoing underhanded and unlawful efforts to prevent the construction of an affordable and permanent supportive housing project in CD11 for chronically homeless and low-income people ("Venice Dell" or the "Project").² Perhaps even more egregious, the City is now suing the Venice Dell developers, mission-driven nonprofit developers that provide desperately needed affordable housing in the midst of a housing crisis.

¹ See *LA Forward, et al. v. City of Los Angeles, et al.* (Super. Ct., Los Angeles County, Case No. 24STCV17156), <https://publiccounsel.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/240710-Complaint-for-Injunctive-and-Declaratory-Relief.pdf>.

² *LA Forward, et al. v. City of Los Angeles, et al.* (Super. Ct., Los Angeles County, Case No. 24STCV17156); *People Organized for Westside Renewal vs. Board of Transportation Commissioners* (Super. Ct., Los Angeles County, Case No. 25STCP01091); *Venice Community Housing Corp. et al. v. BOTC et al.* (Super. Ct., Los Angeles County, Case No. 25STCP00892); *Venice Community Housing Corp. et al. v. City of Los Angeles et al.* (Super. Ct., Los Angeles County, Case No. 25STCV20355). A fifth lawsuit, *Venice Community Housing Corporation, et al. v. City of Los Angeles, et al.* (Super. Ct., Los Angeles County, Case No. 25STCP03578), is related to these other matters but the City is only represented by the City Attorney's Office.

These lawsuits challenge the City's obstructionist tactics taken since Councilmember Park and the City Attorney took office at the start of 2023 and are singularly focused on one thing: building much-needed affordable housing for our unhoused and low-income neighbors. The City's actions since 2023 are especially troubling considering that the City itself successfully defended Venice Dell in two prior lawsuits³ brought by Project opponents in 2021 and 2022, suggesting that, at least at one point, the City was in support of the Project and willing to invest in its development.

That the City is now itself an opponent of the Project is not only a reversal of the City Council's will but, as the lawsuits allege, unlawful. There are other potential costs to the City as a result of its current course of action, including being found in violation of California's Housing Element Law, having its Prohousing Designation revoked⁴, and losing over \$42 million in State Multifamily Housing Program funds awarded to the Project in September of last year.⁵ This continued conduct by the City will have consequences far beyond a single project in a single Council district, starting with blowing a hole through the City budget when every dollar is necessary to address critical City services.

Rather than work collaboratively and in good faith to resolve these issues, the City has also chosen to sue the nonprofit developers of Venice Dell, accusing them of trying to faithfully execute the still existing contract they have with the City to build the Project, and are spending additional taxpayer money to avoid building a desperately needed and long-promised housing development it has already agreed to build. Should the City maintain its present course of obstructing this much-needed housing, in addition to the significant amount the City will have to pay its outside counsel to defend against these five pending lawsuits, it is also likely to have to pay out millions, if not tens of millions, of dollars in monetary damages and attorneys' fees as a result of this panoply of pending litigation. This is an egregious waste of taxpayer funds during a historic budget crisis for the City.

The most cost-effective way for the City to move forward is to settle the lawsuits and advance the Project. Yet, Agenda Item 22 signals an intent from the City Attorney's Office to continue its underhanded and unlawful efforts to prevent the construction of Venice Dell by requesting that

³ See *Coalition for Safe Coastal Development v. City of Los Angeles and Real Parties, Hollywood Community Housing Corporation, Venice Community Housing Corporation*. (Super. Ct. Los Angeles Court, Case No. 22STCV00162 (Lead); and consolidated with Case No. 22STCV03626), [Court Ruling on Writ of Mandate](#).

⁴ See California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Letter of Inquiry (LOI), <https://drive.google.com/file/d/19D5QZyzvSYP2fybNPd1hBd8VWy3TY865/view>.

⁵ See MFSN R3 Awards List, <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-and-funding/supernofa>.



the Council *increase* funding to outside counsel Nossaman LLP, from the original allocation of \$620,000 to a new total of \$1,380,000. The City Attorney has also requested that the Council amend its existing contract with Nossaman LLP to include assistance with *Venice Community Housing et al. v. City of Los Angeles* (Super. Ct., Los Angeles County, Case No. 25STCV20355), expanding its scope of work and further stalling the Project.

We urge the City Council to reject this blatant misuse of taxpayer funds and vote no on Item 22.

Sincerely,

A black ink signature of Carie Martin, consisting of a large, stylized 'C' followed by a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke.

Carie Martin
Public Counsel

A blue ink signature of Katherine J.G. McKeon, featuring a stylized 'K' and 'M' followed by a long horizontal stroke.

Katherine J.G. McKeon
Western Center on Law & Poverty

Communication from Public

Name: Alexa Lynn Brandt

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 11:25 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Support City Attorney's request for legal funding

Councilmembers, As a community member, I am deeply concerned about the Venice Dell project and urge you to fund the City Attorney's defense against these meritless lawsuits. Moving forward with this project would expose the City to enormous financial and legal risk. Key concerns: Extremely high cost: Estimated total cost is \$233 million, including the value of City land and a new parking structure. That equals over \$2 million per small "affordable" unit — an indefensible use of taxpayer funds. Loss of valuable public land and revenue: The City would give up land worth an estimated \$70 million. The City would also lose about \$750,000–\$1 million per year in beach parking revenue. Parking replacement would cost taxpayers millions: Replacing existing beach parking would require a new garage with over \$36 million in long-term debt service. This comes at a time when the City is already facing serious budget constraints. The Board of Transportation Commissioners (BOTC) already rejected this project: On December 10, 2024, BOTC voted 5-0 to deny use of lot #731 for Venice Dell housing. The City Council did not overturn that decision, so it is final and binding. Even the court raised red flags: A Superior Court judge noted with respect to the project that there are "very good arguments they are squandering money here." Serious process and legal problems: The site was wrongly labeled "surplus or underutilized," even though it has long been used for coastal access parking, a boat launch for Venice Canals access, and 4 units of existing affordable housing, and provides upwards of \$750,000 in City Revenue. Key financial documents and risk warnings were not provided to City Council before initial approvals. Better alternatives exist: Lot 701, directly across the street, is genuinely underutilized and already approved for a feasibility study. Housing can be built there without sacrificing coastal access or public parking. Bottom line: Defending the City against these lawsuits is far cheaper and far safer than reviving a deeply flawed project. Venice Dell would primarily benefit the non-profit developers and banks — not taxpayers, not the unhoused, not the community, and not the millions of visitors to Venice Beach. Please protect the City by funding the City Attorney's defense against frivolous lawsuits and let's move on to better solutions and leave the deeply flawed

Venice Dell project in the past. Thank You. Alexa Brandt
Resident 90291

Communication from Public

Name: Janice Wyatt

Date Submitted: 01/27/2026 05:45 PM

Council File No: 24-0971

Comments for Public Posting: I wholeheartedly support the City Attorney's request for additional legal fees for outside counsel to fight the frivolous lawsuits attempting to revive the Venice Dell project.