

This is the secondary submission submitted to the City of Los Angeles, regarding CPC-2020-516-DB-PSH-SIP – related to the construction of PSH housing at 1141-1145 S. Crenshaw Blvd., that in 2018 was estimated to cost roughly \$570,000 a unit to construct. Previously Domas Development, the largest developer of public housing in the state, was tied to this project. It is unclear if Domas is still tied to the project, or why the project was awarded over 9 million in Prop HHH funds, when the property at 1141-1145 S. Crenshaw Blvd. is not suitable for PSH construction, due to the location in the AO Flood Zone and its sensitivity of being situated on Crenshaw Blvd., an integral artery leading to and from the 10 freeway.

I am deeply concerned that the Dept. of City Planning is engaging in malicious and willful disenfranchisement of residents and homeowners by using their positions as trusted public employees to commit fraud against the people of the city, and thus jeopardize their health, safety, and well-being.

Residents are forced to accommodate privately owned/publicly funded pre-covid apartment complexes that force neighborhoods of single-family homes to double as garden side parking lots. Why don't the needs of the City's current residents or the protection of the environment matter?

Why is the only time developers care about battered women is if they can use them to justify bilking the public of their paychecks to go toward funding a single unit of housing that was estimated to cost in 2018 approximately \$570,000 a unit to build. How much can the landlord raise rent, and will the people be forced to subsidize increases in rent as well? 50675.14 (f) states: The department may provide higher per-unit loan limits as reasonably necessary to provide and maintain rents that are affordable to the target population. What on earth does this mean in English, does this law apply to PSH housing built in the City of Los Angeles? How high can landlords make rents fly? So high that there are a lot of people on the street wondering why the city did nothing while they got thrown or bamboozled out of their little apartments like Rosa a local senior, whom I wrote to the city about in 2018, did. The new managers used lawyers to scare her to leave, when she didn't want to go.

According to Gov Code 15463 (b) The authority may issue....bonds in the amount not to exceed two billion dollars...(d) The authority may also utilize bond proceeds to fund necessary reserves for principal and interest, capitalized interest, credit enhancement or liquidity costs....and to **reimburse loans** under Section 5849.14 of the welfare and institutions code. (emphasis added)

In October 2019, the OPNC voted to send a letter of support for the Solaris 1141-1145 S. Crenshaw construction project, one month after they locked the neighborhood out of the meeting. I don't recall finding a letter of support from the OPNC in the SIP file.

Allowing a building to be constructed with no studies or CEQA in an AO Flood zone on a sensitive and integral street like Crenshaw is DANGEROUS, greedy, and foolish. Where else in the city have these building practices been employed? The Westside who are suffering from the City's bad planning which is realized when they attempt to drive home from work.

We live in a city that is earthquake prone, lacks water, and is dependent on cars to transport ourselves safely. Making streets immobile by improper/fraudulent planning is asking for serious problems and biblical suffering of epic proportions. LA does not have the water supply to support indefinite growth and development. Why does it plan like its Manhattan? New York could never have been the hellhole it is today without Niagara Falls to provide its fresh water supply.

Since my first submittal, there has been a correction. Since 2018, I have not found three but FOUR properties that claimed/or attempted to claim a fake CEQA exemption, all in the Olympic Park area, and include:

- C3 Luxury Subdivision (1102-1128 S. Crenshaw)
- Domas Development PSH Solaris Apts. (1141-1145 S. Crenshaw)
- Murray Mansions Condo Subdivision (1251 S. West Blvd)
- E.K. Art Gallery and Learning Center (1113-1127 S. Crenshaw) – In Construction

The Dept. of City Planning granted fake CEQA exemptions claiming that these locations were NOT in a flood zone. All locations are in an AO Flood Zone, and thus not applicable to exemption. They cannot be trusted to tell the truth.

For example, EK Art Gallery and Learning Center was provided with a CEQA exemption in 2016 or 2017. According to Zimas, the environmental clearance (Notice of exemption) was rescanned into the system five days after Planner Nuri Cho issued a letter to Domas Development on 8/23/19 "correcting" the zoning to 1145 S. Crenshaw Blvd from CR to R3. According to the SIP file, the applicant states that the ordinance "clearly shows" that the R3 zone applies to the property. Unless the City of Los Angeles and their developers still employ gaslighting, #165331/9670 cannot be clearly ascribed to the property in question.

In January 2017, the architect for EK Art Gallery, the property at 1113-1127 S. Crenshaw sent an email to several people, including Chris Elwell, the president of Oxford Square HPOZ, and former Executive Vice President for US Distribution Business Operations and Strategy for Sony Pictures. *Mr. Elwell was present during a neighborhood meeting when I attempted to address the neighbors gathered in a private home on Victoria Ave. who came to hear about Solaris, (after the OPNC had illegally*

cancelled its September 2019 meeting to prevent complaints). Mr. Elwell would not allow me to speak nor would allow the topic of Solaris to be discussed.

Included on the To line with Mr. Elwell, is the former OPNC president Laura Rudison (who penned a fake letter of support for C3 Luxury Subdivision in 2016), and several City Staff including Fernando Tovar; James Hwang; Jordan Beroukhim; Oliver Netburn; and Sylvia Lacy, etc. (Exhibit 19)

The PDF attached entitled *Re: Architect's Responses to the Comments from Neighbors* states the following: (Exhibit 20)

- underground parking was not a “feasible option due to the storm drain easement running diagonally across the property.”
- “initial environmental impact assessment does not found any significant and project was issued a Categorical Exemption, Class 32. A full traffic study also submitted and reviewed...No significant impact was identified and report was approved.”[sic]
- Conclusion – “our proposed design is little higher than allowable height to comply flood zone requirement.”

How can a development be granted a CEQA exemption when it is located in an AO Flood Zone? *See they mention flood zone in the document that was sent to City Planning staff and the HPOZ and OPNC Presidents, the findings must be legit....*

Was EK Art Gallery and Learning Center determined by the City Commission to be a by right/ministerial project when it, like 1141-1145 S. Crenshaw, is in an AO flood zone and thus subject to the City's Flood Plan and Title 44 of the Federal Flood Code and thus not ministerial in nature? If it was a by-right project, did City Staff inform the City Commission that it was in a flood zone as it had an obligation to do, did it include language to affirm that it conformed to the City's Flood Plan as required?

The City of Los Angeles is repeating the grave historical error of the City of San Francisco, whose destruction in 1906 had less to do with its earthquake, and more to do with corrupt politicians granting lucrative contracts to build city water mains and other infrastructure which failed because it was built by their buddies.

I hope the Commission makes the right decision for the people of this city when it comes to this project and others like it.

Sincerely,

Virginia Jauregui