

Communication from Public

Name: Tony Hocking

Date Submitted: 10/09/2026 07:57 AM

Council File No: 25-0006-S38

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Chair Park and Committee members, Thank you for bringing the feasibility study forward. Team Palisades supports forming the DRD, and we would ask the Committee to keep this moving so the Resolution of Intention is adopted well ahead of the 7 January 2027 deadline rather than at it. Before the detail, a wider point for the whole Council. The Palisades and Altadena have now waited longer for a federal recovery appropriation than any major declared disaster in recent memory, and that wait is still going. Disaster now touches every part of this city in one form or another, and the lesson of the last 21 months is that Los Angeles has to be ready to fund its own recovery, locally and quickly, rather than wait on Washington. SB 782 gives the City that tool. A vote to form this district is also a vote to have the playbook ready the day it is needed in any other council district, whatever form the disaster takes. A few points from the report itself: The numbers argue for speed. Assessed value inside the boundary fell by \$5.0 billion, about 23%, and is growing at 1.6% this year against 5% citywide. The base stays with the General Fund and the study still shows a net surplus to the City at 25% of increment. The plan assumes a 2026-27 base year. If formation slips past next year's roll, the first year of recovery growth, roughly \$1 billion of assessed value on the report's own projection, lands in the base instead of the district. Could the Committee set a date certain for the CAO report-back, say mid-November, so an ROI can reach full Council in December with the 10-day notice period in hand? Please read the feasibility study alongside the City's own Long-Term Recovery Plan at projects.pali411.com. The draft LTRP lists 61 projects, and by the plan's own funding sheets 37 of them have no funding source, including the plan's own Multi-Year Funding Strategy. The DRD appears in that plan as Project 2.7, and it is the only large funding tool the City has identified. Residents can see every project and its funding status at projects.pali411.com. The study's \$863 million is sized against a preliminary \$1.0 billion utilities list, almost all of it LADWP, and that is a fraction of what the City's own plan says the recovery needs. The IFP should be written against the full LTRP, not the utilities subset, so the district can fund the rest of the plan as increment allows. SB 782 also allows low-interest construction loans and prevention of displacement, and the report itself says

revolving loans to homeowners would accelerate the increment. The draft IFP has nothing for the owner-occupiers who actually generate that increment. Would the Committee ask CID to keep a modest revolving rebuild-gap loan fund for underinsured owner-occupiers in the plan? Even a small one changes the growth curve the whole model depends on. Sequence the DRD behind FEMA and CDBG-DR, and let it reimburse front-funded work. Several projects on the list are FEMA DR-4856 permanent-work projects still in appeal. The DRD should pay for the resilience betterment above in-kind restoration, not stand in for FEMA. And since bonding is not assumed until Year 5, the ROI and IFP should say explicitly that the City, LADWP and the County can front-fund eligible work now and be reimbursed from increment later. Otherwise the money arrives after the rebuild rather than during it. Streets, slopes and walls at \$7 million is a placeholder. Caltrans' slope work, the cleared hillside lots and construction-traffic damage to roads will all be larger than that, so please keep the reallocation language and have the CAO prioritise from current field data rather than the 2025 list. Ask the County to join now. The County has already formed districts for Altadena and the unincorporated Santa Monica Mountains next door, and a parallel ROI from the Board of Supervisors roughly doubles the capacity. Could the Committee ask the Mayor's office and CD11 to make that request formally this month? On governance, we support the Community Recovery Lab recommendations already in the file: a PPCC-appointed seat on the PFA and a community advisory board that works on the investment plan. The two public members should be Palisades residents who are rebuilding. Thank you for the work that has gone into getting this far. Nobody wants to be the next community that needs this, but every district will be glad the City learned how to do it here. Happy to help the CAO and CID with field data as they finalise the plan - we are on the ground every week. Tony Hocking Team Palisades Pacific Palisades Highlands resident, rebuilding

Communication from Public

Name: Victoria K Warren

Date Submitted: 10/09/2026 08:31 AM

Council File No: 25-0006-S38

Comments for Public Posting: I have been a resident of Pacific Palisades for most of my life, and I lost my primary residence and the inherited rental property that provided most of my income in the January 2025 Palisades Fire. Since the fire, I have volunteered my time to support my hometown's recovery and bring back the diversity and history of our community. I'm proud of our talented and committed community volunteers, but we need more funding to recover from this disaster. I strongly encourage the city council to establish a disaster recovery district (DRD) for Pacific Palisades. This will benefit both our immediate community and the city as a whole, and will be a model for recovery from future disasters in Los Angeles and in California. The DRD's tax increment financing mechanism is by far the most efficient means for the city to invest funds in the Palisades' recovery for at least two reasons. First, DRD's governing board and its mandate to develop an integrated investment plan will help coordinate across the city government's departmental silos. Such coordination will make it more likely that the city's funds will be spent wisely and most effectively towards ensuring that the Palisades will never burn again. Second, the DRD's guaranteed, multi-decadal income stream would allow it to issue bonds and thus make funds available in the near-term when such funds have the most leverage in helping all Palisades residents who wish to return to be able to do so. As made clear by the DRD feasibility report a Palisades DRD would be financially beneficial to both the Palisades and the City as a whole. A DRD would help speed the Palisades' recovery and could invest in the fire resilience that would lower future insurance costs and significantly decrease economic losses from future fires. A faster, more resilient Palisades recovery will also return revenues to the City's general fund faster than would a slowly recovering, less resilient Palisades. So, the DRD is a win-win for both the Palisades and the City. What do Palisadians want? One authoritative source is the results of the Community Recovery Lab held last April by the Palisades Recovery Coalition. Thirty Palisadians, randomly chosen to be representative of the community, convened with experts in a civic assembly. The residents deliberated for two days on the questions: If the Palisades were to have a disaster recovery district, what should it fund? And how could such a district remain accountable to community? You can find the consensus

recommendations here:

<https://palirecovery.org/crl-1-governance-report-recommendations/>

. In brief, the assembly recommended that a Palisades DRD be able to fund public infrastructure, provide rebuilding help for returning residents, support economic recovery for local businesses, and fund wildfire and climate resilience. To hold the DRD accountable, the assembly recommended that one member of the DRD board be appointed by the Pacific Palisades Community Council and that a twelve-member advisory board, appointed by the community, work with the DRD board and its staff to develop and revise as needed the DRD investment plan. I encourage you to take these recommendations into account when chartering the Palisades DRD.