



March 20, 2012

To: **The Honorable Ed Reyes, Chairman**
Planning & Land Use Management
City of Los Angeles Councilmember
200 North Spring Street, Room 410
Los Angeles, CA 90012-1793
Councilmember.Reyes@lacity.org

RE: **COMMUNITY CARE FACILITIES (CCF) ORDINANCE No: 11-0262**
Recommend NO ACTION Today

My name is Cheryl A. Branch and I represent as Executive Director of Los Angeles Metropolitan Churches, a network of 25 African-American congregations in South LA in Council Districts 8, 9, 10, 15 with allies in districts 7, 1 and 14 as well.

Today, I urge this committee to continue this matter for 45 days for the following reasons.

- 1) Unemployed and Under-employment in LA City at the beginning of 2012 remains 43 percent higher than the U.S. rate. Land use, zoning, and occupancy rules are among the most important tools of local government for rebuilding the economy; they are indirect but very powerful over the long term, if used well.
- 2) Supporters of the current ordinance may be negatively impacted upon its passing without considering its impact on the **high numbers of unemployed and indigent adults with multiple barriers that are the subject of their concerns**. It's not just about the homeless, substance abusers, and parolees; it's about poor people and people of color—who make up the majority of residents in south and east Los Angeles. We must have a better joint analysis of this ordinance as is and not assume we covered everybody, and that everybody fits in the same basket.
- 3) Allow ALL STAKEHOLDERS on both sides opportunity to meet, consider all measurable concerns and work together to come up with a compromise in 45 days and come back to this Committee with joint recommendations. The Ordinance as written does not take into account the interplay and



impact of sustained poverty and high unemployment on Planning and Land Use priorities and interests.

4) We urge you to consider, after 45 days a joint committee meeting consisting of HCED (who we understand has concerns regarding the proposed ordinance) and PLUM to hear the results of the proposed community meetings (should the other interest agree and this committee allow). We believe it is urgent that these two committees analyze and better understand the impact and interplay of affordable housing scarcity; impacts of no CRA and slow growth in some areas.

5) Some nuisance and loitering complaints are not necessarily law enforcement issues and appropriate responses need to be developed in order that law enforcement may not be burdened by such calls and can devote resources to more urgent public safety issues. Local implementation of AB 109 makes this an issue of concern due to the many new and unknown factors that come with the new law City is forced to implement without additional resources in some cases. We want law enforcement to maintain freedom to do their primary job—which is keep order and protect and serve.

6) I reiterate, continue this item in committee after 45 days to allow community interest to meet together and discuss all impacts of this ordinance and work to come up with joint recommendations to the committee that are agreeable to both sides, and hear this item in joint session with HCED and potentially the Public Safety Committee. Thank you – I am happy to answer any questions the committee may have.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cheryl A. Branch".

Cheryl A. Branch
LAM Executive Director