



Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Fwd: Opposed to the Community Care Ordinance

1 message

Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Wed, Mar 23, 2011
at 5:45 PM

To: Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Manny Rodriguez <mannyr1@hotmail.com>

Date: Tue, Mar 22, 2011 at 5:49 PM

Subject: Opposed to the Community Care Ordinance

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Dear Michael Espinosa,

I am a resident in the City of Los Angeles and I am opposed to the Ordinance being proposed against sober living homes in Los Angeles. Below are a couple of my reasons why.

1. This ordinance will destabilize communities, increase homelessness and increase overall crime in the City of Los Angeles:

- o Homelessness will increase significantly

- § Sober living homes are life-saving resources for thousands of newly sober people who rely on supportive sober environments to become productive citizens.

- § Approximately 95% of our sober living homes are in low density residential zones supporting thousands of people each year. This ordinance will deny needed supportive housing to an estimated 7,000 people annually, just in Network-affiliated homes..

- This number does not include those from quality sober living homes accredited by other certifying organizations.

- Does not include the thousands of persons with mental health conditions also made homeless.

- Crime increases when thousands of addicts, alcoholics and the mentally ill persons now currently in stable and supportive housing are cast adrift in the community.
- This ordinance reverses the City's positive directions in its partnerships to deal with housing for the homeless in endeavors such as Home for Good.

2. This is not a legally sustainable ordinance—discriminatory intent is transparent and on the record.

- It violates civil rights laws by seeking to ban types of households (small group homes) from low density residential zones without inclusion of reasonable accommodation protocols for disabled households.
- It is not supported by any data that objectively measured that these homes targeted by the ordinance are indeed the homes that actually cause problems for communities.
- This is a new legal theory creating a conflict with California Supreme Court precedents.
- The City Attorney is defending this ordinance using incomplete and inappropriate case law:

§ One case is currently on appeal to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals

§ Precedents cited on the record are not applicable to disabled households.

§ California Supreme Court case law was not addressed.

Your attention and cooperation are appreciated.

Sincerely,

Manny Rodriguez
