Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, <u>as is currently written</u>, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;

2009 NOV -4 ANII: 07
CITY CLERK

- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and,

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to the City Council on this Amendment is a "No Vote."

Very truly yours,			
Ine lingen	JOE	JENKINS	Name(sign & print)
1 554 W 117	57		(Address)
LA C4 90	044		(city and zip code)
Date: 10-24-0	9		
cc: Committee Members:		on; Smith	
Councilwoman J. Hahr	n - 15th Distric	ct	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and,

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

Very truly yours,	
Dana Bonnel Claub	Name(sign & print)
1701 Denver Ave.	(Address)
LA CA 90044	(city and zip code)
Date: 10-24-09	
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	,
Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District	
Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, <u>as is currently written</u>, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and,

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

Very truly yours,	
	L. Name(sign & print)
556111112181	(Address)
Low Unnales Car 90044	(city and zip code)
Date: 10/26/09	
cc: Committee Members! Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	
Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District	
Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and,

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

Very truly yours,	
anthony To Benfor Son Anthony Lo Ber	<u> </u>
636 W. 117 12 Bts	(Address)
Los Angeles Ca. 90044	(city and zip code)
Date: 10/26/09	-
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	
Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District	
Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs; and,
- (f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to the City Council on this Amendment is a "No Vote."

Very truly yours,	
Virette Benford - Verette Best	od Name(sign & print
636 W. 117th St	(Address)
Los Angeles Ca 90044	(city and zip code)
Date: October 26, 2009	
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	
Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and,

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to the City Council on this Amendment is a "No Vote."

Very truly yours,		į	
ma Hichary	- ANA	F-ChAVRG	Name(sign & print
		, , , , ,	(Address)
720, We, 11	7 51	L-A = (14. 40044	(city and zip code)
Date: 10/25/04			
cc: Committee Members: H	luizar; Alarcon;	Smith	-
Councilwomen I Uchn	15th District		

Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;and,
- (f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to the City Council on this Amendment is a "No Vote."

Very truly yours,	
2 HT ON to Dall [pp.]	(
551UW 177th	(Address)
LA CA 90044	(city and zip code)
Date: 10-26-09	
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	
Commitment of I II-har 15th District	

Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were (a) not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further (b) financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and (c) driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances (d) of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation (e) cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs; and,
- The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the (f) City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to the City Council on this Amendment is a "No Vote."

Very truly yours,	
South Type Anth Pinleng	Name(sign & print) (Address)
CA 90444	(city and zip code)
Date: 10-20-19	
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	,

Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and,

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

Very truly yours,	·
JAMES Bookes Janes Broles	Name(sign & print)
551 W 117 th SIT	(Address)
UA CA 90044	(city and zip code)
Date: 10-26-09	
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	
Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District	
Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, <u>as is currently written</u>, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and.

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

Very truly yours,	
Judhory Casodish ANTHONY COROTHERS 314/8 CENTURY BL. LA CALIF 90003	(Address)
	(city and zip code)
Date: 10-26-09	Necessary
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	
Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District	
Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and.

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to the City Council on this Amendment is a "No Vote."

Very truly yours,

Manage Don fay L. Mc Day Name---(sign & print)

723 W. 117th 5-tr (Address)

Vo Angeles M. 90044 (city and zip code)

Date: 10 - 26 - 69

cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith

Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and,

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to the City Council on this Amendment is a "No Vote."

Very truly yours,	
Beatriz Tofolla headzis to	Rall Name(sign & print)
707 W117 St LADA 90044	(Address)
	(city and zip code)
Date: 10/06/69	
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	
Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and,

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

Very truly yours,	
Thomas It Burns Vo weeks Brown	Name(sign & print)
716 WEST 11774ST	(Address)
1 A CA 90044	(city and zip code)
Date: $(0-2i_0-0)^{4}$	
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	
Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District	
Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and,

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

Very truly yours,	
Who Hem DONALD PENEGAR	_Name(sign & print)
809 W. 11774 STREET	(Address)
LOS ANGELES OF 90044	(city and zip code)
Date: 10/22/2009	
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	
Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District	
Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further (b) financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and (c) driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances (d) of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and,

The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the (f) City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to the City Council on this Amendment is a "No Vote."

Very truly yours,	
A In glerega Vora lenegge	Name(sign & print
1809 West 119 +4 5+	(Address)
Los Angeles Palit 90044	_(city and zip code)
Date: 10-22-09	_
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	

Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and.

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

Very truly yours,	
hather Brown Katl	N Browname(sign & print)
7610W 11774 St	(Address)
LA CA 90044	(city and zip code)
Date: 10-22-09	
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	
Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District	
Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and.

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to	the City Council on this Amendment is a
"No Vote."	MD/M
Very truly yours,	17-tull
GIL CAENSHAW	Name(sign & print)
750 Will 751 156	(Address)
PH 814 90044	(city and zip code)
Date: 10-77-09	:
cc: Committee Members! Huizar; Alarcon; Sr.	nith
Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs; and,

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to the City Council on this Amendment is a "No Vote."

Very truly yours,

lame---(sign & print

_(Address)

(city and zip code)

Date: 10-12-019

cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith

Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were (a) not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further (b) financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances (d) of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation (e) cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs; and.
- The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the (f) City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to the City Council on this Amendment is a "No Vote."

Very truly yours, Name---(sign & print) (Address) (city and zip code)

cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith

Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs; and,
- (f) The Amendment, **as written**, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to the City Council on this Amendment is a "No Vote."

Very truly yours,	
Margaret Tells Mongaret J. Piths	Name(sign & print
819 W1911 4/2 117 Hoster	(Address)
Los Angeles, (X. 90044	(city and zip code)
Date: 10/21/09	
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	

cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and,

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

Very truly yours,	
Soney Inthe SIDNEY	Name(sign & print)
819 W. 11774/58 9604A	(Address)
LACA	(city and zip code)
Date: 10/22/2009	
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	
Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District	
Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- (a) The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- (b) If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- (e) Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and.

(f) The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

Very truly yours,	
Nany K. Smith	Name(sign & print)
Mely L. L. Smith	(Address)
LOS Mondes 6 90047	(city and zip code)
Date: 10/22 9/09	
cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith	
Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District	
Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council	

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were (a) not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further (b) financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and (c) driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- (d) Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation (e) cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs;

and,

The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the (f) City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to the City Council on this Amendment is a "No Vote."

Very truly yours, (sign & print) (Address) (city and zip code) Date: cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith

Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District

Re: Council File No. 05-1853

Ordinance to Amend Subsection (e) of Section 62.104

{Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)}

Hearing date: {Pending}

TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

I am a property owner residing within the South Los Angeles Community Planning Area. I am opposed to the Amendment to Subsection (e) of Section 62.104 of the LAMC, as is currently written, for reasons not limited to the following:

- The ages of the offending trees are "red flags" indicating they were (a) not planted by the property owners now expected to bear this burden;
- If the Amendment to the Ordinance is enacted, this would place a further (b) financial hardship upon community senior and low-income residents already severely impacted by the economic downturn;
- (c) In this community planning area hundreds of sidewalks, curbs and driveways are severely damaged due to tree roots;
- Residents currently and over past years phoned/reported instances (d) of tree roots damage and requested repairs;
- Complainants, in most cases, are/were then informed of a "rotation (e) cycle" in effect and given some distant, future date for repairs; and,

The Amendment, as written, smacks of punitive action by the (f) City of L.A. to unjustly shift the burden, responsibility, and liability onto property owners who are not responsible for planting the trees. Property owners find themselves in an untenable position: they cannot remove an offending tree; it violates a City Ordinance.

I request that your recommendation to the City Council on this Amendment is a "No Vote."

Madeline Kell (Name---(sign & print) (Address) (city and zip code)

cc: Committee Members: Huizar; Alarcon; Smith

Councilwoman J. Hahn - 15th District