Land Use, Construction, and Housing Council  
September 25, 2013  
10 – 11:30 A.M.

1. Welcome and Self Introductions

2. Discussion with Kevin Keller, Mayor Garcetti’s Director of Planning and Housing Policy

   Special Guest:  
   Kevin Keller, Director of Planning and Housing Policy, Office of Mayor Eric Garcetti

3. Presentation: California Connections, A Program of the Southern California Leadership Network

4. Update Items:
   - CEQA Modernization: SB 731 Update
   - AB 1229 (Atkins) Inclusionary Zoning
   - Consolidation of City Departments
   - Chamber Health & Wellness Chapter Comments
   - Housing Element comments
   - Re:Code LA Chamber Task Force

Upcoming Chamber Events:
   - ACCESS City Hall, Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Next Council Meeting:
   Wednesday, November 20, 2013  
   10-11:30 A.M.
KEVIN J. KELLER
Director of Planning and Housing Policy
Officer of Mayor Eric Garcetti

Kevin is Director of Planning and Housing Policy for Mayor Eric Garcetti. Within the Mayor’s Economic Development office, Kevin manages land use planning and entitlements, development services, and housing programs and policies.

Kevin joined the City of Los Angeles in 1999, after receiving his master’s degree in urban planning from Harvard University’s Graduate School of Design and an undergraduate degree in environmental studies from UCLA. He served as Planning Deputy to Councilmember Eric Garcetti in 2003, and Chief Planning Deputy to Councilwoman Cindy Miscikowski from 2003 to 2005. Most recently, Kevin was a Senior Planner with the City Planning Department, managing land use planning for Central Los Angeles, the Westside, and the San Fernando Valley including the development of the Hollywood Community Plan, the Los Angeles Sports and Entertainment District and LA Live, and transit oriented district plans around rail stations.

Kevin is a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners, and served as President of the California Chapter of the American Planning Association from 2011 to 2013.
September 24, 2013

The Honorable Jerry Brown
Governor, State of California
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Oppose AB 1229

Dear Governor Brown:

On behalf of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce and our 1,600 member organizations employing 700,000 individuals throughout our region, I write to oppose AB 1229 (Atkins). This bill would allow legislative bodies of any county or city to establish costly inclusionary housing requirements, which force developers to offer residential units affordable to and occupied by lower-income owners or tenants, as a condition for development.

AB 1229 will seriously hurt the construction and housing industries. Los Angeles and the surrounding areas are among the most densely populated areas in the country, and accordingly there is an immense demand for housing and development. When the housing market is strong, the industry contributes over $270 billion to California’s economy and provides nearly 960,000 jobs. However, the recession of the past six years has severely limited new development and the region’s construction industry has yet to fully rebound to pre-recession levels. New residential construction has averaged less than 150,000 permits per year, lagging well behind the State’s annual average need.

Harming a still-fragile construction market through imposition of costly new price restrictions on an under-performing new home market will hinder the affordability of housing in California and stall our delicate economic recovery. AB 1229 would continue to limit the housing industry and keep it at recession-level development levels. The bill imposes unnecessary and intrusive regulations on developers, which would reduce incentives for new housing projects and thereby drive up the price of existing housing from a lack of future growth in the overall supply. Housing affordability will be reduced due to additional costs imposed on developers through affordable housing mandates. Developers will simply pass the costs of the below-market units to market-rate customers, who will thus pay a higher cost for their units.

The California court system already delivered a notable decision on this issue in 2009 with Palmer/Sixth Street Properties, L.P. v. City of Los Angeles. The court ruled that it was not permissible to force Palmer to provide affordable housing units at regulated rents, since the Costa-Hawkins Act allowed Palmer to establish the initial rental rate for his units.

In light of the Palmer decision, the state legislature’s efforts to grant local governments the authority to enact inclusionary housing ordinances are therefore legally questionable. Costa-Hawkins protections for new construction are appropriate and should be maintained, not
decimated. Furthermore, abrogating the Palmer holding would allow localities to enact any sort of inclusionary zoning ordinance they want without negotiating with developers or providing any sort of economic incentive.

Providing affordable housing is the domain and responsibility of local governments, and not market-rate housing developers. Inclusionary zoning unfairly places the cost burden of providing affordable housing on a small portion of the population – developers. Jurisdictions that wish to promote affordable housing as a way of benefitting society must finance their efforts with public resources, not funds from a private entity. In very few other industries is it mandated that a product be provided at below-market price to customers who cannot afford the full price.

Due to the deleterious effects the bill will have on the construction and housing industries, the questionable legal basis for its provisions, and the unfair burden it places on private developers, we strongly urge you to oppose AB 1229. AB 1229 will only place burdensome regulations and restrictions on Los Angeles’ developers and jeopardize future growth in housing by imposing significant additional costs.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Tina Hossain at 213.580.7531 or thossain@lachamber.com. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Gary Toebben
President & CEO

CC: Camille Wagner, Deputy Legislative Secretary, Office of the Governor
September 17, 2013

Honorable Eric Garcetti
Mayor, City of Los Angeles
City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA

Re: Health & Wellness Chapter

As representatives of the Los Angeles business community and members of the Community Advisory Council, the undersigned organizations wish to provide the following comments to shape the City of Los Angeles’ Health and Wellness Chapter. In addition to these broad recommendations, we have included an annex responding to recommendations included in the Citizen Advisory Council’s Summary Documents. We would first like to thank staff from the Department of City Planning (DCP) for the considerable time and effort they have spent on this issue, and commend them for elevating the discussion of health in the City of Los Angeles.

Los Angeles will be the largest city to voluntarily write and implement a Health and Wellness Chapter into its General Plan Framework Element, thereby promoting assessment of all future development and land use policies through a lens of impacts to health. While we do not believe such a distinct connection is necessary to the practical use of a General Plan as a guiding document for land use planning, we understand the city’s broad aspiration to address health disparities. We are eager to work with the city and its stakeholders to identify strategies to improve public health without sacrificing economic growth.

Focus on Economic Opportunity and Access to Health Care to Reduce Health Disparities

The foundation for a healthy community is healthy economic development. Creating a strong business climate and supporting private investment that contributes to jobs can create an economically-thriving community that strengthens education, social networks, and community resources – which in turn contributes to good health outcomes.

The Health and Wellness Chapter should maintain a strong focus on improving our economy as a means of improving the health of all Angelenos. Income is one of the greatest determinants of a person’s health status, and high unemployment is a major contributing factor to disparate health outcomes. As such, the city should encourage incentives and removal of barriers to private investment in development which create jobs and promote healthy living, such as walkable communities, transit-oriented districts and mixed-use development.
We also encourage the city to acknowledge the role that lack of access to health care coverage plays in determining community health. The city areas identified in the Health Atlas as disparate in health outcomes are also those which differ in access to health care coverage. Not all health disparities are created by land use policies nor can be solved through further regulation and control. It is important to keep in context the primary underlying reasons for unequal health outcomes throughout the City, namely access to health care and jobs. The city cannot shape the entire health care system through its General Plan but it can, and should, identify tools at its disposal to encourage improved access to health facilities, such as incentivizing construction and expansion of medical centers and community features that encourage healthy living in partnership with the private sector and non-profit community.

**Limit the Scope of the Health & Wellness Chapter to Issues Regulated by the General Plan**

The city should only adopt principles for the Health and Wellness Chapter which relate to land use and which are within the city’s limited jurisdiction. As identified by DCP staff, the Health and Wellness Chapter will be comprised of nine elements; however, only three elements overlap with those contained in the General Plan - land use, transportation, and housing. The remaining elements in the Chapter pertain to other subject areas that have little, if any, direct relation to planning and development.

We caution the city to avoid using the Health & Wellness Chapter as a vehicle to mitigate every issue of concern facing Angelenos, such as reforms in education, immigration, and the criminal justice system. Although we understand the role that these issues may play in exacerbating the health disparities in our communities, the General Plan is not the appropriate mechanism to resolve these concerns. A General Plan creates a blueprint for the city’s future development. The Chapter should focus on those elements within the city’s General Plan Framework that relate to guiding long-range development.

We look forward to working with the city to develop a Health and Wellness Chapter that will encourage, rather than impede, land use and economic development with the potential to enhance community health and well-being. We hope the city will employ creative incentives for businesses to enhance public health, rather than limit or prohibit specific activities and industries. We look forward to working as members of the Community Advisory Council to achieve these goals.

Sincerely,

Gary Toebben
President & CEO
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce

Stuart Waldman
President
Valley Industry & Commerce Association

Carol Schatz
President & CEO
Central City Association of Los Angeles

Holly Schroeder
CEO
Building Industry Association of Southern California: Los Angeles-Ventura Chapter

CC: Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council
    Michael LoGrande, Director, Department of City Planning

Attachments:
Annex: Analysis of Policy Recommendations
Annex: Analysis of Policy Recommendations

Policy Solutions with Promise

The following are listed policy solutions in the draft Summary Comments which the undersigned business groups applaud and wish to help shape and advance as a means to improving public health in Los Angeles:

- Business friendly policies
- Streamline the permitting and development process for projects and businesses
- Address the homelessness issue.
  - We support Housing First policies for the homeless, especially the construction and maintenance of permanent supportive housing units.
- Increase production of affordable housing through greater incentives. Locating affordable housing around transit stations can be best achieved through appropriate incentives.
  - The best way to prevent displacement is to create and preserve affordable housing stock, perhaps by offering incentives for the development of affordable housing along transit corridors.
- Create opportunities and incentives to increase the number of retailers that sell healthy food
- Educate the public about healthy practices and healthy living
  - The city can provide incentives to engage and support the private sector in an effort to educate communities about healthful living.
- Incentivize businesses that sell healthy foods (corner markets, farmers’ markets, supermarkets, etc.)
  - While we do not advocate favoring certain types of businesses, there is room to target development of food outlets that provide diverse food offerings through incentives.
- Revise the processes for the preparation of environmental review process (CEQA)
  - CEQA is in need of modernization to curb abuses and expedite projects beneficial to the environment and economy, though these reforms require state action with local cooperation.
  - Streamlining city planning and permitting process would actually reduce the delays in building permitting and help the city build much needed infrastructure and transit to alleviate congestion, pollution, and improve air quality.

Policy Solutions to Reconsider

While we look forward to working with you on the above solutions, we also have serious reservations about some of the other recommendations, including but not limited to, ones proposed in the Summary Document, listed below:

- Tax activities that pollute and unhealthy products
  - Instead of mandating business to go green, the city should offer tax incentives that encourage green building, pollution control, or renewable energy use
- Craft policies that create a buffer between fast food restaurants and residential neighborhoods
  - We oppose such restrictions on development, which would undoubtedly harm the restaurant industry and kill jobs in the communities with highest unemployment. Instead, incentives should be developed that attract restaurants with diverse food offerings and allow development of full-scale grocery stores.
  - Studies have shown that there is no association between fast food outlets near homes and dietary intake of fast food.\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) [http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/11/543](http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/11/543)

\(^2\) [http://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2013/12_0123.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2013/12_0123.htm)
- Create regulations for factories to mitigate environmental impacts
  - We prefer the less coercive route of tax incentives rather than regulations for encouraging businesses to be greener. Regulations such as these create an unfriendly business environment.
- Restrict billboards
  - Such a measure will have no bearing on improving community health.
- Lack of healthcare facilities serving the uninsured
  - All facilities must technically serve the uninsured. However, facilities can charge the uninsured more than insured patients. Additionally, 70 percent of the uninsured in LA County reported they could not get access to healthcare when they needed it. This is emblematic of a lack of adequate provider community in the areas where care is most needed. We advocate for increased provider rates, graduated loan incentives for primary care physicians, and sufficient payments to hospitals which provide service to a disproportionate share of uninsured and low-income populations to help mitigate some of these disparities in care.
- Establishing a relationship between environmental health and mental health
  - There is not sufficient evidence that one impacts the other.
- Limit fast food; limit convenience stores
  - It would be more productive to incentivize convenience stores to carry healthier food (such as in Oregon) and provide incentives for the opening of grocery stores in the middle of food deserts, than to restrict job-creating businesses.
- Assess health impacts of a project before granting a permit
  - CEQA impacts address environmental impact. Additional regulatory burdens for project approval would seriously harm the possibility of developing healthy projects in any community.
- Concentrate and move industrial uses into the periphery away from residential neighborhoods
  - The city needs to be careful in preserving a balance in industrial and job-producing lands without creating a too wide radius around residential areas. There are substantial improvements to quality of life and mental health when residents are able to live close to their employment.
- Current investment in transit reinforces inequity
  - Rail lines have larger capacities, do not clog traffic, and produce fewer pollutants than even the “green”-est buses.
- Refine AB 2588 (Air Toxic “Hot Spots” Informational Assessment Act) to be more useful in planning
  - This is a state bill that has not been amended since 1996 and is administered by a state agency (the California Air Resources Board) along with Air Quality Management Districts. “Refining” AB 2588 is outside the city’s jurisdiction.

Avoid Targeting of the City’s International Trade Engine – The Port of Los Angeles
The Port of Los Angeles is addressed repeatedly in the Summary Documents as a source of health disparity and pollution. The city must keep in mind the positive impact of the port on our region – a $50 billion per year regional economic engine and the nation’s busiest seaport.

3 http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3298889/
4 Cousineau, Michael R. “Health and Health Care Access in Los Angeles County.” Center for Community Health Studies, University of Southern California Keck School of Medicine
5 http://web.multco.us/chair/multnomah-county-healthy-retail-initiative
6 http://www.actfortransit.org/docs/2008JulLRTvsBRTemmissions.pdf
The port has taken several steps to reduce its environmental and health impact over the past decade, including:

- Ambitious green initiatives that reduced pollutants by more than 27,000 tons
- Rail upgrades that decreased emissions by 49 percent
- Vessel regulation that decreased emissions from oceangoing vessels by 73 percent
- Vehicle fleet modernization that decreased emissions from trucks by 92 percent
- Cleaner cargo handling equipment reduced emissions by 56 percent
- Hybrid tugboats that reduced pollution from harbor vessels by 30 percent\(^7\)
- $1.5 billion dedicated to modernize the Port over the next five years, in part by fostering clean energy initiatives\(^8\)
- The Clean Air Action Plan that provides for a 72 percent reduction in diesel particulate matter, 22 percent reduction of nitrogen oxide, and 93 percent decrease in sulfur oxides emitted from 2010 to 2014\(^9\)

The city should recognize these economically feasible policies to adopt technology that will reduce harmful emissions. Mandating further green initiatives will prove counterproductive, dangerous, and economically harmful.

\(^8\) http://articles.latimes.com/2013/may/07/business/la-fi-port-convention-20130508
\(^9\) http://www.cleanairactionplan.org/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=2474
August 20, 2013

Matthew Glesne
Housing Planner
City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
200 N. Spring Street, Room 667
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce Comments on Draft Los Angeles City Housing Element, Released May 30, 2013

Dear Matt:

On behalf of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce (Chamber) and the Building Industry Association of Southern California, Inc. - Los Angeles /Ventura Counties Chapter (BIA), thank you for your efforts in updating the City’s Housing Element as a portion of the broader General Plan update. We have appreciated the opportunity to work with you on this important guide for housing policy and programs in the City of Los Angeles.

We have reviewed Chapter 6 of the Housing Element draft circulated to the public on April 18, 2013 and find much progress in terms of incentives for developers to build or rehabilitate affordable housing units and a citywide focus on coordination to end chronic and veteran homelessness, as supported through the Chamber’s leadership on Home for Good. Good strides have been made to help attract businesses investment in the Los Angeles real estate market and address affordable housing. We were initially concerned with the inclusion of potentially placing increased fees, requirements, and stifling red-tape procedures on the development industry. We believe this would result in loss of opportunities for affordable housing construction. However, we remain concerned about a number of other proposed programs.

We submit the following comments (in italics) in response to the policies and directions contained in Chapter 6 of the Draft Housing Element:

1.2.8 Preserve the existing stock of affordable housing near transit stations and transit corridors. Encourage one-to-one replacement of demolished units.

**Recommendation 1:** We ask for caution in creating requirements for one-to-one replacement of demolished units, or in creating barriers to make it difficult to disrupt that ratio. Protection of current units of affordable housing should be done through incentives rather than as a
requirement, which discourages developers from renovating, upgrading, or attracting new development.

Recommendation 2: We encourage the Housing Department and Building & Safety to work together to develop a program that enables non-compliant properties to come into compliance without penalties to aid in increasing the affordable housing stock.

2.1.2 Establish development standards and other measures that enhance health outcomes.

Recommendation: Discussions and policies regarding public health should be left to development of the City’s potential Health & Wellness Chapter of the General Plan Framework Element or the Department of Public Health. We discourage references in the Housing Element to impose additional development standards, potentially impeding the construction or maintenance of housing, to achieve health outcomes.

4.1.6 Eliminate zoning and other regulatory barriers to the placement and operation of housing facilities for the homeless and special needs populations in appropriate locations throughout the City

Recommendation: We oppose barriers to citing permanent supportive housing in certain neighborhoods, such as through the Community Cares Facilities Ordinance.

8. Land Use Program to Increase the Production of Affordable Housing
Explore the feasibility and appropriateness of creating affordable housing requirements for projects that receive benefits from the City, including projects that receive City subsidies or City land, projects receiving zone changes that result in significantly more units than otherwise permitted (Density Bonus?), as well as projects that obtain a Development Agreement.

Recommendation: The creation of housing and development brings benefits to the City other than simply housing. These economic benefits, such as jobs, tax revenues, and decreases in homeless or near homeless populations (and the money the City spends on them for services) should not be held up by requirements to create affordable housing. It is a worthwhile investment for the City to spend funds on housing projects in and of themselves. Creating affordable housing should not deter or prevent the City from receiving other benefits (schools, fire stations, etc.) resulting from projects. Further, it is not appropriate to uniformly tie the production of affordable housing to projects governed by a Development Agreement, which are unique to each project and should be negotiated independently.

11. Innovative Housing Unit Design
A variety of initiatives are needed to help create and adapt more housing units to employ universal design standards in order to accommodate different life stages with minimal structural changes. 1) Establish a Task Force to review current barriers to aging-in-place in City Codes. 2) Explore and propose recommendations for increasing the number of accessible units in multi-family developments occupied by special needs households while maintaining consistency with state ADA codes. 3) Assist older adults understand various types of home modifications that may be helpful.

**Recommend:** This is an acceptable policy as long as additional burdens and requirements are not placed on developers to guarantee a greater number of special need appropriate units in affordable housing developments. Consistency with state code is recommended to ease businesses in working with City.

16. Downtown TFAR Public Benefit Fee
Assess a Public Benefit Fee on all projects in the Downtown Area that use TFAR. Study the relationship between the incentives provided under the Downtown TFAR program and those in the Downtown Affordable Housing Bonus program (#96).

**Recommendation:** A potential Public Benefit Fee on Downtown TFAR projects is problematic and would make it difficult for projects to be economically feasible for development of any kind, even disinventing market rate housing development and potentially driving up costs for everyone because housing will not keep up with demand. Prior to any new fee proposal or implementation staff and consultants should thoroughly explore and analyze both benefits and implications of any new fees (Affordable Housing Benefit Fee, Public Benefit Fee, Trust Fund, etc.) as well as increases and modification of existing fees.

19. Foreclosure Registry Program
The Foreclosure Registry Ordinance (181,185, 2012) was established as a mechanism to protect residential neighborhoods, including abandoned properties, from blight through the lack of adequate maintenance and security as a result of the foreclosure crisis. Any lender (or beneficiary or trustee who holds or has an interest in a deed of trust) who issues a notice of default on a residential property located within the City of Los Angeles must register that property with the Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD).
Recommendation: It is redundant and onerous to require registration of foreclosed properties with LAHD when two-thirds or greater of all properties are registered through Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems (MERS). By using MERS, lenders and investors avoid the need to file properties in county and city records, which lowers costs for lenders and consumers by reducing recording fee expenses resulting from real estate transfers and provides a central source of information and tracking for mortgage loans. In addition, it eliminates a costly process for the City to staff, maintain and monitor. We encourage continued use of this system as a central location for information on foreclosed properties and to avoid questions of responsibility for property maintenance through the long foreclosure process. Doing so will save City dollars, avoid placing additional reporting requirements on lenders and driving up costs for consumers.

41. Housing Choice Voucher Program
Provide rental assistance to very low-income families in the form of vouchers that cover a share of the monthly rental payment of privately-owned market rate rental housing. Continue to streamline the program administration.

Recommendation: Gaining additional housing choice vouchers for Los Angeles is a federal priority for the Chamber. We support inclusion of this priority, as vouchers are necessary to ensure more families can access housing and stay off the streets. In fact, we encourage language which supports prioritizing use of these vouchers for the chronically homeless. These programs should be created to help as many individuals as possible, and have a sunset clause to encourage permanent housing and employment opportunities.

96. Downtown Affordable Housing Bonus
Provide the following incentives for all residential developments in Downtown that include very low-, low-, moderate-income, or workforce housing: 35% more floor area; exclusion of halls and lobbies from the calculation of allowable floor area; option to pay an in lieu fee for 50% of the internal building open space requirement; elimination of parking requirements for units serving very low-income households; reduction in parking requirement to one space per dwelling unit. Require one-for-one replacement of all converted or demolished units serving households earning up to 50% of the area median income in downtown. Explore ways to improve affordable housing production under the program, including how the incentives under this program relate to those provided under the Downtown TFAR program.

Recommendation: What would trigger the one-for-one replacement requirement? That should
only apply if the project is getting a benefit or incentive (otherwise it would be a precedent for a general requirement). Prior to adopting these recommendations into the Housing Element, all these proposals should be thoroughly analyzed and studied to ensure the expected desired results are yielded and do not, in fact, deter development opportunities.

121. Homeless Housing and Services Coordination
Coordinate with LAHSA, the County and other government and non-profit agencies to develop plans to reduce and end homelessness and to implement homeless policies and programs. Support the Homes for Good initiative and work to implement the Homes for Good Action Plan. The Continuum of Care’s strategy is continuing to evolve through development of place-based community plans aligned with the Federal Strategic Plan and Home for Good. A total of 10 community plans will be developed and incorporated into the City’s strategic efforts over the next five years (not all in the City of Los Angeles). Participate in regular coordinating efforts with LAHSA and ensure that the needs of all sectors of the homeless population are addressed. Coordinate the local distribution of public funding sources for the effective use of resources and program implementation. Monitor LAHSA’s financial and contract management to ensure effective, efficient program implementation consistent with the City’s goals.

**Recommendation:** The Chamber is a strong partner with the United Way of Greater Los Angeles on Home for Good, a public-private initiative to end chronic and veteran homelessness in Los Angeles County by 2015. Our collective efforts have housed over 7,500 formerly chronically homeless and veteran individuals into permanent supportive housing over the last two years. We are heartened by the City’s use of the Home for Good Action Plan as a guide to reduce chronic and veteran homelessness. Private programs such as these should be encouraged and promoted throughout the City.

133. Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) Data Collection
Support homeless service providers in the implementation of the HUD-required HMIS to gather data on individuals and families who use homeless service systems. Collect and analyze data over time to better identify service needs, barriers to accessing services, and program-, region-, and system-wide results. Share data on clients with other service providers. Continue HMIS User Group Forums, a discussion series that helps generate ideas for further innovations to help ease use of the system. Develop and expand a comprehensive HPRP data quality process to ensure that information collected exceeds HUD’s quality standards.

**Recommendation:** Increased and wide adoption of the HMIS system is critical to coordinating housing placement among existing housing stock and reducing homelessness.
The Chamber and the BIA are glad to see new content in this draft that addresses homelessness. Policy 4.2.4, which targets outreach and permanent supportive housing resources to the homeless, and Program 136, which promises technical assistance to homeless housing providers, are both encouraging steps forward in the fight to reduce homelessness and accordingly have our full support.

As a general comment, we strongly support efforts to streamline and expedite the permitting process for developers in order to incentivize development, and add certainty and transparency while reducing costs associated with the development process. However, we look forward to clarification on how the City will accomplish this goal, especially through new opportunities to influence the development process during the implementation of Realignment of the Departments of City Planning and Building and Safety into a new Department of City Planning and Development.

We thank you for the opportunity to participate on the Housing Element Task Force and look forward to working with you on this and future versions of the Housing Element to ensure a final product which reflects the opportunities to steer this City’s housing development in the right direction to create jobs, economic growth, and improve quality of life. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Tina Hossain at 213.580.7531 or thossain@lachamber.com or Sandy Sanchez at (661) 257-5056x3 or ssanchez@bialav.org.

Sincerely,

Gary Toebben
President & CEO
(213) 580-7500

Sincerely

Sandy Sanchez
Director, Government Affairs
(661) 257-5046