

Communication from Public

Name: David Matthews

Date Submitted: 09/16/2026 08:36 PM

Council File No: 26-1141

Comments for Public Posting: SUPPLEMENTAL PUBLIC COMMENT- Council File 26-1141 I previously submitted public comment regarding CF 26-1141 and JCI Jones Chemicals. I am submitting this supplemental comment because additional information has since become available to me. I have not obtained a copy of a May 12, 2026 Site/Civil & Environmental Engineering Feasibility Report prepared by Langan CA. Inc. concerning this JCI facility. The report addresses the proposed production facility, chlorine railcar containment, environmental conditions, the Montrose SuperFund Site, remediation infrastructure, contaminated soils and potential impacts associated with construction. I respectfully ask the City to clarify whether this May 12, 2026 Langan report is the feasibility study referenced in CF26-1141; whether the version currently circulating within the community is complete; and whether an official version can be made publicly available. I am not making an assumption that the copy I received is either complete or incomplete. I also request transparency regarding any proposed consent order to the fullest extent legally permissible. I want to acknowledge that Jones Chemicals has supported local community events, and I appreciate the commitment I have personally witnessed. Community partnership and public-oversight, however, are not mutually exclusive. We can recognize a company's contributions while also asking for transparency, regulatory oversight and emergency preparedness. Harbor Gateway and neighboring unincorporated Los Angeles County communities deserve accurate information and meaningful inclusion in discussions involving operations that may affect them. Please see my attached PDF for my complete supplemental public comment. David Matthews Harbor Gateway Stakeholder

SUPPLEMENTAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Council File 26-1141 - JCI Jones Chemicals Feasibility Study

Date: September 16, 2026

Submitted by: David Matthews, Harbor Gateway Stakeholder

Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council:

I previously submitted public comment regarding Council File 26-1141 and the JCI Jones Chemicals facility. I am submitting this second comment to supplement my earlier remarks because additional information has since become available to me.

I have now obtained a copy of a May 12, 2026 *Site/Civil & Environmental Engineering Feasibility Report* prepared by Langan CA, Inc. concerning the JCI Jones Chemicals facility. The document is 184 PDF pages and includes site/civil engineering analysis, environmental conditions, project maps and appendices.

My purpose in submitting this additional comment is not to repeat my previous concerns, but to place this new information on the public record and request clarification regarding the feasibility study referenced in Council File 26-1141.

I also want to acknowledge something that makes this issue complicated for me personally.

Jones Chemicals has demonstrated a willingness to support local community events. I have personally seen that commitment, and I believe businesses that invest in the communities surrounding them deserve to have those contributions acknowledged.

At the same time, community partnership and public-safety oversight are not mutually exclusive. A company can support its neighbors while residents can reasonably ask questions about operations that may affect those same neighbors.

The May 12 report describes proposed improvements that include development of a new production facility to replace the existing facility, conversion of the existing production area to storage, and construction of a containment building supporting chlorine railcar unloading.

The report also identifies significant environmental considerations. It states that the site is within the boundaries of the Montrose Chemical Corporation Superfund site and that redevelopment will need to maintain institutional controls and be subject to CalEPA/USEPA review.

The report identifies additional environmental and logistical considerations associated with the proposed construction, including existing soil-vapor extraction infrastructure and contaminated soils requiring remediation. It states that excavation and off-site disposal of soil could result in significant truck traffic through the local community.

The report also addresses chlorine railcars and states that reducing the number of chlorine railcars by at least half would have a positive impact on the surrounding community. At the same time, it identifies operational challenges associated with the location of a proposed railcar enclosure and the piping necessary to connect it with the production facility.

These issues matter beyond the immediate boundaries of the JCI property and beyond the City of Los Angeles.

Harbor Gateway exists within an unusually complicated jurisdictional environment. Neighboring unincorporated Los Angeles County communities are in close proximity to this facility. Environmental conditions, emergency incidents, transportation impacts and other potential consequences do not necessarily stop at municipal boundaries.

Residents and businesses throughout these surrounding communities deserve accurate information and meaningful inclusion in discussions involving public safety and emergency preparedness.

The existence of this May 12 report also raises an important question in relation to Council File 26-1141.

The matter before the City Council requests that the City Attorney, in coordination with the Los Angeles Fire Department, Department of City Planning and Department of Building and Safety, obtain the feasibility study for the JCI Harbor Gateway facility, provide it to Council District 15, and assess whether and to what extent the study may be publicly disclosed.

I respectfully ask the City to clarify whether the May 12, 2026 Langan *Site/Civil & Environmental Engineering Feasibility Report* that is now circulating within the community is the same feasibility study referenced in Council File 26-1141.

If it is the same study, I respectfully ask the City to clarify whether the version circulating within the community is complete and whether an official version can be made publicly available.

I am not making an assumption that the document I received is either complete or incomplete, nor am I making an assumption regarding whether any portion should legally be withheld. I am simply asking the City to authenticate the document and provide clarity regarding what information can officially be disclosed.

Council File 26-1141 also addresses any proposed consent order concerning the facility. I respectfully ask that the proposed consent order receive the same level of transparency and public disclosure to the fullest extent legally permissible.

Beyond disclosure of these documents, I encourage the City to communicate in plain language what the proposed project would change at the facility, what safeguards would accompany those changes, what roles the City and environmental regulatory agencies would have, and how Harbor Gateway and neighboring unincorporated communities would be informed and involved.

Emergency preparedness should remain central to this discussion.

Residents should understand how they would be notified during a chemical emergency, whether they should evacuate or shelter in place, which government agency would provide those instructions, and how emergency communications would reach residents and businesses across City and County jurisdictional boundaries.

I want to reiterate that my comments should not be interpreted as an attack on Jones Chemicals or as dismissing the company's contributions to our community.

I appreciate the support I have personally witnessed.

But good community relations and transparency can coexist. So can economic activity, regulatory oversight and emergency preparedness.

We can acknowledge a company's contributions to its surrounding community while still asking serious questions about operations that may affect the people living and working around the facility.

My request is straightforward: provide the community with accurate information, clarify whether the May 12 report now circulating is the feasibility study referenced in Council File 26-1141, make the appropriate documents publicly available to the fullest extent legally permissible, and ensure that Harbor Gateway and our neighboring unincorporated communities remain part of the conversation.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Matthews

Harbor Gateway Stakeholder

Communication from Public

Name: Ron Robinson

Date Submitted: 09/16/2026 07:48 PM

Council File No: 26-1141

Comments for Public Posting: I write in strong support of Council File 26-1141 and the Planning and Land Use Management Committee's recommendations on the Motion by Councilmember McOsker and Councilmember Blumenfield. Harbor Gateway residents live within blocks of a facility that handles chlorine and other acutely hazardous materials, and they have earned the right to see the record for themselves. Federal inspectors have repeatedly documented serious safety failures at the JCI Jones Chemicals site at 1401 W. Del Amo Boulevard — corroded pipes and valves, improperly stored chlorine and sulfur dioxide containers, unsupported piping, a non-operational chemical release sensor, and a dilapidated roof — with violations found in 2015 and 2017, a \$200,000 Clean Air Act settlement in 2021, and many of the same conditions found again during the May 2024 inspection. Against that history, this Motion asks for exactly the right thing: that the City Attorney, working with LAFD, City Planning, and Building and Safety, obtain the feasibility study and any proposed consent order and bring them to Council District 15 before adoption, along with an assessment of what can lawfully be disclosed to the public. A consent order negotiated without the Council office and the surrounding community seeing its terms in advance is a decision made about this neighborhood rather than with it. Transparency here costs the City nothing and protects the families, workers, and children at the adjacent Cheryl Green Boys and Girls Club who bear the risk every day. On behalf of the residents I represent as a Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council District 1 Representative, I respectfully urge the Council to adopt the Committee report and the recommendations of the Motion in full.