



Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>

South Central Farm

neelam sharma <neelam@csuinc.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 1:24 PM

To: edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Cc: Heather Fenney Alexander <heather@csuinc.org>

Please see attached letter r.e. The South Central Farm.

Sincerely,

Neelam Sharma
Executive Director
Community Services Unlimited Inc.
www.csuinc.org
(213) 746-1216
Facebook @CSUINC
Twitter @CSUINCLA
Instagram @csuinc
"I am deliberate and afraid of nothing" Audre Lorde



 **SprtLrBuyBakSCF ADMIN_060317.pdf**
132K

COMMUNITY SERVICES UNLIMITED, INC.



PO BOX 62096 LOS ANGELES, CA 90062
phone/fax: 213-746-1216 www.csuinc.org

March 6th 2017

sent by email to: edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Subject: Re: **Council File Number 16-1411-S1** - Please grant the appeal of the South Central Farmers and deny the FEIR for 1051 S. Alameda, the PIMA project - Case No. AA-2012-919-PMLA CEQA No. ENV-2012-920-EIR

Dear Chair Huizar and Members Cedillo, Harris-Dawson, Price and Englander:

We at Community Services Unlimited Inc. oppose the FEIR for the parcel at 4015 S. Alameda, submitted by the PIMA Corporation (Case No. AA-2012-919-PMLA CEQA No. ENV-2012-920-EIR) because of the following deficiencies:

The Final EIR does not address the lack of data for the applicant's claim that their operation would result in only 75 proposed truck trips per day, most of them being small and medium trucks, with only 31 being diesel (down from 264 trucks proposed by the previous project, despite a larger operational footprint with the new plans). There are no studies nor statistics to back up this new lower, arbitrarily estimated, and unenforceable number. The applicant states that the current number of truck trips for their operation is 33, but, again, there are no verifiable data to support this. (See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-2017.)

The final EIR increases the Project's number of truck docks from 22 to 30. When these docks are utilized at maximum facility production ("worst case scenario"), they would result in far more than 75 truck trips per day. Additionally, the FEIR states that most of the 75 trucks would be small and medium trucks, yet 18 of the 30 loading docks are designed to accommodate long, multiple axle trucks, which must be assumed to be diesel trucks. This increase in number of the loading docks, including large docks, will most likely increase the Project's estimated truck traffic, including an increase in diesel trucks as well as small and medium trucks. These potential and likely increases are not reflected in the traffic impact analysis or health risk analysis, thus understating the Project's impacts. (See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-2017.)

Because of the inadequate truck trip analysis and unenforceable projections and an understatement of impacts related to number of employees, truck and delivery traffic and air emissions, the actual impacts on air quality cannot be truly known. The health risk assessment vastly understates the Project's health impacts with regard to diesel particulate matter generation and must be revised. A new air quality analysis must be done, based on a more accurate truck trip analysis. (See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-17.)

The Final EIR did not consider the submitted alternative to create a community food hub, proposed by the South Central Farmers. This alternative addresses the community's needs for green space, "project objectives" of local job creation, and access points for local, healthy, fresh produce to enter South Central LA and the larger LA community. The City has an opportunity to show civic leadership and political will by facilitating this community based solution in creating green, sustainable jobs that serve both the local community and the region in an area that is historically underserved in open space capita.

The Final EIR does not follow the City of LA's policies, as outlined in its "Open Space and Conservation Element". For example, policy 6.1.1 states, "Consider appropriate methodologies to protect significant remaining open spaces." Policy 6 states, "Consider preservation of private land open space to the maximum extent feasible. In areas where open spaces determine the character of the community, development should occur with special consideration of these characteristics." A methodology to protect the parcel in question could be to use Quimby funds to acquire it, or negotiate a land trust entity. As an undeveloped 13 acre parcel, it is a significant remaining open space. The character of the community was undeniably expressed when the South Central Farm operated between 1992 and 2006 and should be re-established, per this policy.

Policy 6.4.2 states, "Encourage increases in parks and other open space lands where deficiencies exist, such as South East South Central Los Angeles and neighborhoods developed prior to the adoption of the State Quimby Act in 1965." Re-establishment of a community farm/food hub would directly address this deficiency in a specifically named part of the City. Policy 6.4.7 states, "Consider as part of the City's open space inventory of pedestrian streets, community gardens, which are accessible to the public, even though such elements fall outside the conventional definitions of 'open space.' This will address the open space and outdoor recreation needs of communities that are currently deficient in these resources." A community farm/food hub may not be considered "conventional" yet this policy directs the City to not exclude it from consideration if it would address stated deficiencies.

In conclusion, please grant the appeal by the South Central Farmers and deny the FEIR for the PIMA Project.

Sincerely,
Rajam Sharma, Executive Director

SERVING THE PEOPLE BODY AND SOUL!



Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>

Re: Eastside Cafe letter of support for the South Central Farm

1 message

Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 10:55 AM

To: Angela Flores <angelaluciaf@gmail.com>, Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Cc: Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>, Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Please be aware that the correct email address for your written response is clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org
For your convenience, I have included the correct email address for you.

The Office of the City Clerk is in receipt of your comment. It is now included in the public record.

NOTE TO LA CITY STAFF

Please Cc sharon.dickinson@lacity.org on all emails related to PLUM Committee.

Zina Cheng, Legislative Assistant
Planning and Land Use Management Committee

City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Clerk
Council and Public Services
(213) 978-1537
zina.cheng@lacity.org

On Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 10:27 AM, Angela Flores <angelaluciaf@gmail.com> wrote:

We are the Eastside Cafe and we are in support of the South Central Farm

Angela Flores

 **SCF support letter.docx**
123K



3/7/17

To whom it may concern,

The Eastside Café is an autonomous space that has been operated by the residents community of El Sereno for 15 years. We are a space that strives to foster the ideals of autonomous democracy and self-determination that come from the grassroots. We provide a space for many collectives to organize community projects as well as cultural events, health workshops, socio-political discussions that would uplift the spirits in our immediate communities in North East Los Angeles.

We are in full support of South Central Farm to buy back back the land on 41st and Alameda. We are in full support to have the South Central farmers, gardeners, families, children and community to get their farm back, the land that was rightfully theirs after 11 years of it not being in use. Although the Eastside Café is located in the North East LA region, members of the Eastside Café stood side by side for months to help protest the demolition of the farm that not only fed families but strengthened the budding concepts of eco-conscious skills in having a deeper understanding of agricultural, biodiversity and most importantly climate change. Please take into consideration that by selling the land back and advocating for the South Central Farmers mission you will be in fact, on the ride side of history. Thank you!

- The members of the Eastside Café



Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>

Council File Number 16-1411-S1 - Please grant the appeal of the South Central Farmers and deny the FEIR for 4051 S. Alameda, the PIMA project - Case No. AA-2012-919-PMLA CEQA No. ENV-2012-920-EIR

2 messages

Sarah Nolan <sarah@theabundanttable.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 8:46 AM

To: plum.committee@lacity.org, edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Subject: Re: **Council File Number 16-1411-S1** - Please grant the appeal of the South Central Farmers and deny the FEIR for 4051 S. Alameda, the PIMA project - Case No. AA-2012-919-PMLA CEQA No. ENV-2012-920-EIR

Dear Chair Huizar and Members Cedillo, Harris-Dawson, Price and Englander:

In addition to the points below, I oppose the development of the PIMA project or any brick and mortar project on this piece of land that continues to create detrimental environmental impact on the land itself and the community around it.

We live in a current political climate where we need spaces that are community oriented, focused on our own sustainability as a city and not dependent on cheap imports and low wage jobs.

This property has the potential to be something Los Angeles can be proud of and not ashamed that it valued the large corporate interests and a myth of good jobs over investment in a community food system that brings meaningful work, community growth and good food for families.

Please reconsider any development on this land other than development that reflects the original vision the Food Bank had for the property to invite the community together to create something beautiful and good.

—

I oppose the FEIR for the parcel at 4015 S. Alameda, submitted by the PIMA Corporation (Case No. AA-2012-919-PMLA CEQA No. ENV-2012-920-EIR) because of the following deficiencies:

1. The Final EIR does not address the lack of data for the applicant's claim that their operation would result in only 75 proposed truck trips per day, most of them being small and medium trucks, with only 31 being diesel (down from 264 truck trips proposed by the previous project, despite a larger operational footprint with the new plans). There are no studies nor statistics to back up this new lower, arbitrarily estimated, and unenforceable number. The applicant states that the current number of truck trips for their operation is 33, but, again, there are no verifiable data to support this.

(See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-2017.)

2. The final EIR increases the Project's number of truck docks from 22 to 30. When these docks are utilized at maximum capacity production ("worst case scenario"), they would result in far more than 75 truck trips per day. Additionally, the FEIR states that most of the 75 trucks would be small and medium trucks, yet 18 of the 30 loading docks are designed to accommodate long, multiple axle trucks, which must be assumed to be diesel trucks. This increase in number of the loading docks, including large docks, will most likely increase the Project's estimated truck traffic, including an increase in diesel trucks as well as small and medium trucks. These potential and likely increases are not reflected in the traffic impact analysis or health risk analysis, thus understating the Project's impacts.

(See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-2017.)

3. Because of the inadequate truck trip analysis and unenforceable projections and an understatement of impacts related to the number of employees, truck and delivery traffic and air emissions, the actual impacts on air quality cannot be truly known. The health risk assessment vastly understates the Project's health impacts with regard to diesel particulate matter generation and must be revised. A new air quality analysis must be done, based on a more accurate truck trip analysis.

(See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-17.)

4. The Final EIR did not consider the submitted alternative to create a community food hub, proposed by the South Central Farmers. This alternative addresses the community's needs for green space, "project objectives" of local job creation, and access points for local, healthy, fresh produce to enter South Central LA and the larger LA community. The City has an opportunity to show civic leadership and political will by facilitating this community based solution in creating green, sustainable jobs that serve both the local community and the region in an area that is historically underserved in open space per capita.

5. The Final EIR does not follow the City of LA's policies, as outlined in its "Open Space and Conservation Element". For example, policy 6.1.1 states, "Consider appropriate methodologies to protect significant remaining open spaces." Policy 6.1.6 states, "Consider preservation of private land open space to the maximum extent feasible. In areas where open space values determine the character of the community, development should occur with special consideration of these characteristics." A methodology to protect the parcel in question could be to use Quimby funds to acquire it, or negotiate with a land trust entity. As an undeveloped 13 acre parcel, it is a significant remaining open space. The character of the community was undeniably expressed when the South Central Farm operated between 1992 and 2006 and should be re-established, per this policy.

Policy 6.4.2 states, "Encourage increases in parks and other open space lands where deficiencies exist, such as South East and South Central Los Angeles and neighborhoods developed prior to the adoption of the State Quimby Act in 1965." Re-establishment of a community farm/food hub would directly address this deficiency in a specifically named part of the City.

Policy 6.4.7 states, "Consider as part of the City's open space inventory of pedestrian streets, community gardens, which are accessible to the public, even though such elements fall outside the conventional definitions of 'open space.' This will help address the open space and outdoor recreation needs of communities that are currently deficient in these resources."

A community farm/food hub may not be considered "conventional" yet this policy directs the City to not exclude it from consideration if it would address stated deficiencies.

In conclusion, please grant the appeal by the South Central Farmers and deny the FEIR for the PIMA Project.

Thank you,

Sarah Nolan

The Abundant Table Episcopal Ministry

93001

Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>
To: Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 8:50 AM

*****NOTE TO LA CITY STAFF*****

*****Please Cc sharon.dickinson@lacity.org on all emails related to PLUM Committee.*****

Zina Cheng, Legislative Assistant
Planning and Land Use Management Committee

City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Clerk
Council and Public Services
(213) 978-1537
zina.cheng@lacity.org
[Quoted text hidden]



Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>

Council File Number 16-1411-S1 - Please grant the appeal of the South Central Farmers and deny the FEIR for 4051 S. Alameda, the PIMA project - Case No. AA-2012-919-PMLA CEQA No. ENV-2012-920-EIR

2 messages

Ivonne Rodriguez - NAI <ivonne.rodriguez.usc@gmail.com>
To: edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 8:16 AM

Dear Chair Huizar and Members Cedillo, Harris-Dawson, Price and Englander:

I strongly oppose the FEIR for the parcel at 4015 S. Alameda, submitted by the PIMA Corporation (Case No. AA-2012-919-PMLA CEQA No. ENV-2012-920-EIR) because of the following deficiencies:

1. The Final EIR does not address the lack of data for the applicant's claim that their operation would result in only 75 proposed truck trips per day, most of them being small and medium trucks, with only 31 being diesel (down from 264 truck trips proposed by the previous project, despite a larger operational footprint with the new plans). There are no studies nor statistics to back up this new lower, arbitrarily estimated, and unenforceable number. The applicant states that the current number of truck trips for their operation is 33, but, again, there are no verifiable data to support this.

(Kindly refer to Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-2017.)

2. The final EIR increases the Project's number of truck docks from 22 to 30. When these docks are utilized at maximum capacity production ("worst case scenario"), they would result in far more than 75 truck trips per day. Additionally, the FEIR states that most of the 75 trucks would be small and medium trucks, yet 18 of the 30 loading docks are designed to accommodate long, multiple axle trucks, which must be assumed to be diesel trucks. This

increase in number of the loading docks, including large docks, will most likely increase the Project's estimated truck traffic, including an increase in diesel trucks as well as small and medium trucks. These potential and likely increases are not reflected in the traffic impact analysis or health risk analysis, thus understating the Project's impacts.

(Kindly refer to Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-2017.)

3. Because of the inadequate truck trip analysis and unenforceable projections and an understatement of impacts related to the number of employees, truck and delivery traffic and air emissions, the actual impacts on air quality cannot be truly known. The health risk assessment vastly understates the Project's health impacts with regard to diesel particulate matter generation and must be revised. A new air quality analysis must be done, based on a more accurate truck trip analysis.

(Kindly refer to Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-2017.)

4. The Final EIR did not consider the submitted alternative to create a community food hub, proposed by the South Central Farmers. This alternative addresses the community's needs for green space, "project objectives" of local job creation, and access points for local, healthy, fresh produce to enter South Central LA and the larger LA community.

The City has an opportunity to show civic leadership and political will by facilitating this community based solution in creating green, sustainable jobs that serve both the local community and the region in an area that is historically underserved in open space per capita.

5. The Final EIR does not follow the City of LA's policies, as outlined in its "Open Space and Conservation Element". For example, policy 6.1.1 states, "Consider appropriate methodologies to protect significant remaining open spaces." Policy 6.1.6 states, "Consider preservation of private land open space to the maximum extent feasible. In areas where open space values determine the character of the community, development should occur with special consideration of these characteristics." A methodology to protect the parcel in question could be to use Quimby funds to acquire it, or negotiate with a land trust entity. As an undeveloped 13 acre parcel, it is a significant remaining open space. The character of the community was undeniably expressed when the South Central Farm operated between 1992 and 2006 and should be re-established, per this policy.

Policy 6.4.2 states, "Encourage increases in parks and other open space lands where deficiencies exist, such as South East and South Central Los Angeles and neighborhoods developed prior to the adoption of the State Quimby Act in 1965." Re-establishment of a community farm/food hub would directly address this deficiency in a specifically named part of the City.

Policy 6.4.7 states, "Consider as part of the City's open space inventory of pedestrian streets, community gardens, which are accessible to the public, even though such elements fall outside the conventional definitions of 'open space.' This will help address the open space and outdoor recreation needs of communities that are currently deficient in these resources."

A community farm/food hub may not be considered "conventional" yet this policy directs the City to not exclude it from consideration if it would address stated deficiencies.

In conclusion, please grant the appeal by the South Central Farmers and deny the FEIR for the PIMA Project.

Thank you,

Ivonne Rodriguez

Resident, Home-owner, mother, worker and student in CD9

Los Angeles, CA 90037

Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>
To: Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 8:56 AM

NOTE TO LA CITY STAFF

Please Cc sharon.dickinson@lacity.org on all emails related to PLUM Committee.

Zina Cheng, Legislative Assistant
Planning and Land Use Management Committee

City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Clerk
Council and Public Services
(213) 978-1537
zina.cheng@lacity.org
[Quoted text hidden]



Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>

re: South Central Farm

2 messages

L P <laurapalomares13@yahoo.com>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 12:49 AM

Reply-To: L P <laurapalomares13@yahoo.com>

To: "plum.committee@lacity.org" <plum.committee@lacity.org>, "edwin.grover@lacity.org" <edwin.grover@lacity.org>, "zina.cheng@lacity.org" <zina.cheng@lacity.org>, "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

To: plum.committee@lacity.org, edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Subject: Re: **Council File Number 16-1411-S1** - Please grant the appeal of the South Central Farmers and deny the FEIR for 4051 S. Alameda, the PIMA project - Case No. AA-2012-919-PMLA CEQA No. ENV-2012-920-EIR

Dear Chair Huizar and Members Cedillo, Harris-Dawson, Price and Englander:

We oppose the FEIR for the parcel at 4015 S. Alameda, submitted by the PIMA Corporation (Case No. AA-2012-919-PMLA CEQA No. ENV-2012-920-EIR) because of the following deficiencies:

1. The Final EIR does not address the lack of data for the applicant's claim that their operation would result in only 75 proposed truck trips per day, most of them being small and medium trucks, with only 31 being diesel (down from 264 truck trips proposed by the previous project, despite a larger operational footprint with the new plans). There are no studies nor statistics to back up this new lower, arbitrarily estimated, and unenforceable number. The applicant states that the current number of truck trips for their operation is 33, but, again, there are no verifiable data to support this.

(See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-2017.)

2. The final EIR increases the Project's number of truck docks from 22 to 30. When these docks are utilized at maximum capacity production ("worst case scenario"), they would result in far more than 75 truck trips per day. Additionally, the FEIR states that most of the 75 trucks would be small and medium trucks, yet 18 of the 30 loading docks are designed to accommodate long, multiple axle trucks, which must be assumed to be diesel trucks. This increase in number of the loading docks, including large docks, will most likely increase the Project's estimated truck traffic, including an increase in diesel trucks as well as small and medium trucks. These potential and likely increases are not reflected in the traffic impact analysis or health risk analysis, thus understating the Project's impacts.

(See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-2017.)

3. Because of the inadequate truck trip analysis and unenforceable projections and an understatement of impacts related to the number of employees, truck and delivery traffic and air emissions, the actual impacts on air quality cannot be truly known. The health risk assessment vastly understates the Project's health impacts with regard to diesel particulate matter generation and must be revised. A new air quality analysis must be done, based on a more accurate truck trip analysis.

(See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-17.)

4. The Final EIR did not consider the submitted alternative to create a community food hub, proposed by the South Central Farmers. This alternative addresses the community's needs for green space, "project objectives" of local job creation, and access points for local, healthy, fresh produce to enter South Central LA and the larger LA community. The City has an opportunity to show civic leadership and political will by

facilitating this community based solution in creating green, sustainable jobs that serve both the local community and the region in an area that is historically underserved in open space per capita.

5. The Final EIR does not follow the City of LA's policies, as outlined in its "Open Space and Conservation Element". For example, policy 6.1.1 states, "Consider appropriate methodologies to protect significant remaining open spaces." Policy

6.1.6 states, "Consider preservation of private land open space to the maximum extent feasible. In areas where open space values determine the character of the community, development should occur with special consideration of these characteristics." A methodology to protect the parcel in question could be to use Quimby funds to acquire it, or negotiate with a land trust entity. As an undeveloped 13 acre parcel, it is a significant remaining open space. The character of the community was undeniably expressed when the South Central Farm operated between 1992 and 2006 and should be re-established, per this policy.

Policy 6.4.2 states, "Encourage increases in parks and other open space lands where deficiencies exist, such as South East and South Central Los Angeles and neighborhoods developed prior to the adoption of the State Quimby Act in 1965." Re-establishment of a community farm/food hub would directly address this deficiency in a specifically named part of the City.

Policy 6.4.7 states, "Consider as part of the City's open space inventory of pedestrian streets, community gardens, which are accessible to the public, even though such elements fall outside the conventional definitions of 'open space.' This will help address the open space and outdoor recreation needs of communities that are currently deficient in these resources."

A community farm/food hub may not be considered "conventional" yet this policy directs the City to not exclude it from consideration if it would address stated deficiencies.

Los Angeles needs its lungs back and the South Central Farmers are ready to buy the land and bring the farm back. Please help us make that happen.

In conclusion, please grant the appeal by the South Central Farmers and deny the FEIR for the PIMA Project.

Laura Palomares
South Central Farm Restoration Committee

Social Justice Consultant * Event Producer & Manager * Anti-Mall Co-Founder & Director

"Maybe the purpose of being here, wherever we are, is to increase the durability and occasions of love among and between peoples." ~June Jordan

Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 9:04 AM

To: L P <laurapalomares13@yahoo.com>

Cc: "edwin.grover@lacity.org" <edwin.grover@lacity.org>, "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Please be aware that the correct email address for your written response is clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org
For your convenience, I have included the correct email address for you.

The Office of the City Clerk is in receipt of your comment. It is now included in the public record.

NOTE TO LA CITY STAFF

Please Cc sharon.dickinson@lacity.org on all emails related to PLUM Committee.

Zina Cheng, Legislative Assistant
Planning and Land Use Management Committee

City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Clerk
Council and Public Services
(213) 978-1537

3/7/2017

City of Los Angeles Mail - re: South Central Farm

zina.cheng@lacity.org
[Quoted text hidden]



Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>

Eastside Cafe letter of support for the South Central Farm

1 message

Angela Flores <angelaluciaf@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 10:27 AM

To: edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

We are the Eastside Cafe and we are in support of the South Central Farm

Angela Flores

 **SCF support letter.docx**
123K



3/7/17

To whom it may concern,

The Eastside Café is an autonomous space that has been operated by the residents community of El Sereno for 15 years. We are a space that strives to foster the ideals of autonomous democracy and self-determination that come from the grassroots. We provide a space for many collectives to organize community projects as well as cultural events, health workshops, socio-political discussions that would uplift the spirits in our immediate communities in North East Los Angeles.

We are in full support of South Central Farm to buy back back the land on 41st and Alameda. We are in full support to have the South Central farmers, gardeners, families, children and community to get their farm back, the land that was rightfully theirs after 11 years of it not being in use. Although the Eastside Café is located in the North East LA region, members of the Eastside Café stood side by side for months to help protest the demolition of the farm that not only fed families but strengthened the budding concepts of eco-conscious skills in having a deeper understanding of agricultural, biodiversity and most importantly climate change. Please take into consideration that by selling the land back and advocating for the South Central Farmers mission you will be in fact, on the ride side of history. Thank you!

- The members of the Eastside Café



Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>

Bring Back South Central Farm - Council File Number 16-1411-S1

3 messages

Julia Jaye Posin <julia@spectralq.com>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 7:45 AM

To: plum.committee@lacity.org, edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Chair Huizar and Members Cedillo, Harris-Dawson, Price and Englander:

Please grant the appeal of the South Central Farmers and deny the FEIR for 4051 S. Alameda, the PIMA project - Case No. AA-2012-919-PMLA CEQA No. ENV-2012-920-EIR.

We oppose the FEIR for the parcel at 4015 S. Alameda, submitted by the PIMA Corporation (Case No. AA-2012-919-PMLA CEQA No. ENV-2012-920-EIR) because of the following deficiencies:

1. The Final EIR does not address the lack of data for the applicant's claim that their operation would result in only 75 proposed truck trips per day, most of them being small and medium trucks, with only 31 being diesel (down from 264 truck trips proposed by the previous project, despite a larger operational footprint with the new plans). There are no studies nor statistics to back up this new lower, arbitrarily estimated, and unenforceable number. The applicant states that the current number of truck trips for their operation is 33, but, again, there are no verifiable data to support this.

(See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-2017.)

2. The final EIR increases the Project's number of truck docks from 22 to 30. When these docks are utilized at maximum capacity production ("worst case scenario"), they would result in far more than 75 truck trips per day. Additionally, the FEIR states that most of the 75 trucks would be small and medium trucks, yet 18 of the 30 loading docks are designed to accommodate long, multiple axle trucks, which must be assumed to be diesel trucks. This increase in number of the loading docks, including large docks, will most likely increase the Project's estimated truck traffic, including an increase in diesel trucks as well as small and medium trucks. These potential and likely increases are not reflected in the traffic impact analysis or health risk analysis, thus understating the Project's impacts.

(See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-2017.)

3. Because of the inadequate truck trip analysis and unenforceable projections and an understatement of impacts related to the number of employees, truck and delivery traffic and air emissions, the actual impacts on air quality cannot be truly known. The health risk assessment vastly understates the Project's health impacts with regard to diesel particulate matter generation and must be revised. A new air quality analysis must be done, based on a more accurate truck trip analysis.

(See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-17.)

4. The Final EIR did not consider the submitted alternative to create a community food hub, proposed by the South Central Farmers. This alternative addresses the community's needs for green space, "project objectives" of local job creation, and access points for local, healthy, fresh produce to enter South Central LA and the larger LA community. The City has an opportunity to show civic leadership and political will by facilitating this community based solution in creating green, sustainable jobs that serve both the local community and the region in an area that is historically underserved in open space per capita.

Best regards,
Julia Posin

Julia Jaye Posin
Campaign Strategist
Spectral Q ~ *Collaborative Art For The Common Good*
2272 Colorado Blvd, Suite 1349
Eagle Rock, CA 90041
949.939.4770
Julia@SpectralQ.com

www.SpectralQ.com



Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>
To: Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 8:57 AM

NOTE TO LA CITY STAFF

Please Cc sharon.dickinson@lacity.org on all emails related to PLUM Committee.

Zina Cheng, Legislative Assistant
Planning and Land Use Management Committee

City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Clerk
Council and Public Services
(213) 978-1537
zina.cheng@lacity.org
[Quoted text hidden]

Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>
To: Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 9:27 AM

NOTE TO LA CITY STAFF

***Please Cc zina.cheng@lacity.org on all emails related to PLUM Committee.**

--
Sharon Dickinson, Legislative Assistant
Planning and Land Use Management Committee

City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Clerk
Council and Public Services
Ph. (213) 978-1074
Fax (213) 978-1040
sharon.dickinson@lacity.org



With MyLA311, City of Los Angeles information and services are just a few taps away. Available for download from Google Play and App Store.

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

From: **Julia Jaye Posin** <julia@spectralq.com>
Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 7:45 AM
Subject: Bring Back South Central Farm - Council File Number 16-1411-S1
To: plum.committee@lacity.org, edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

[Quoted text hidden]



Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>

My opposition to FEIR for parcel 4015 S. Alameda

3 messages

Marcy Winograd <winogradteach@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 4:52 AM

To: plum.committee@lacity.org, edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

I oppose the FEIR for the parcel at 4015 S. Alameda, submitted by the PIMA Corporation (Case No. AA-2012- 919-PMLA CEQA No. ENV-2012-920-EIR) because of the following deficiencies:

1. The Final EIR does not address the lack of data for the applicant's claim that their operation would result in only 75 proposed truck trips per day, most of them being small and medium trucks, with only 31 being diesel (down from 264 truck trips proposed by the previous project, despite a larger operational footprint with the new plans). There are no studies nor statistics to back up this new lower, arbitrarily estimated, and unenforceable number. The applicant states that the current number of truck trips for their operation is 33, but, again, there are no verifiable data to support this.

(See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-2017.)

2. The final EIR increases the Project's number of truck docks from 22 to 30. When these docks are utilized at maximum capacity production ("worst case scenario"), they would result in far more than 75 truck trips per day. Additionally, the FEIR states that most of the 75 trucks would be small and medium trucks, yet 18 of the 30 loading docks are designed to accommodate long, multiple axle trucks, which must be assumed to be diesel trucks. This increase in number of the loading docks, including large docks, will most likely increase the Project's estimated truck traffic, including an increase in diesel trucks as well as small and medium trucks. These potential and likely increases are not reflected in the traffic impact analysis or health risk analysis, thus understating the Project's impacts.

(See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-2017.)

3. Because of the inadequate truck trip analysis and unenforceable projections and an understatement of impacts related to the number of employees, truck and delivery traffic and air emissions, the actual impacts on air quality cannot be truly known. The health risk assessment vastly understates the Project's health impacts with regard to diesel particulate matter generation and must be revised. A new air quality analysis must be done, based on a more accurate truck trip analysis.

(See Dr. Tom Williams' report, sent to your committee on 2-16-17.)

4. The Final EIR did not consider the submitted alternative to create a community food hub, proposed by the South Central Farmers. This alternative addresses the community's needs for green space, "project objectives" of local job creation, and access points for local, healthy, fresh produce to enter South Central LA and the larger LA community. The City has an opportunity to show civic leadership and political will by facilitating this community based solution in creating green, sustainable jobs that serve both the local community and the region in an area that is historically underserved in open space per capita.

5. The Final EIR does not follow the City of LA's policies, as outlined in its "Open Space and Conservation Element". For example, policy 6.1.1 states, "Consider appropriate methodologies to protect significant remaining open spaces." Policy 6.1.6 states, "Consider preservation of private land open space to the maximum extent feasible. In areas where open space values determine the character of the community, development should occur with special consideration of these characteristics." A methodology to protect the parcel in question could be to use Quimby funds to acquire it, or negotiate with a land trust entity. As an undeveloped 13 acre parcel, it is a significant remaining open space. The character of the community was undeniably expressed when the South Central Farm operated between 1992 and 2006 and should be re-established, per this policy.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Marcy Winograd
2447 3rd Street
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>
To: Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 8:58 AM

NOTE TO LA CITY STAFF

Please Cc sharon.dickinson@lacity.org on all emails related to PLUM Committee.

Zina Cheng, Legislative Assistant
Planning and Land Use Management Committee

City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Clerk
Council and Public Services
(213) 978-1537
zina.cheng@lacity.org
[Quoted text hidden]

Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>
To: Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 9:26 AM

NOTE TO LA CITY STAFF

***Please Cc zina.cheng@lacity.org on all emails related to PLUM Committee.**

--
Sharon Dickinson, Legislative Assistant
Planning and Land Use Management Committee

City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Clerk
Council and Public Services
Ph. (213) 978-1074
Fax (213) 978-1040
sharon.dickinson@lacity.org



With MyLA311, City of Los Angeles information and services are just a few taps away. Available for download from Google Play and App Store.

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

From: **Marcy Winograd** <winogradteach@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 4:52 AM
Subject: My opposition to FEIR for parcel 4015 S. Alameda
To: plum.committee@lacity.org, edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

[Quoted text hidden]



Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>

Council File No. 16-1411-S1 (Please grant appeal of South Central Farmers and reject the PIMA project)

3 messages

Bruce Campbell <madroneweb@aol.com>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 1:19 AM

To: plum.committee@lacity.org, edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Bruce Campbell

3520 Overland Ave. # A 149

Los Angeles, CA 90034

PLUM Committee

Los Angeles City Council

Dear Chair Huizar and members of the PLUM Committee,

I will focus on some notable **discrepancies in the environmental documentation in regards to the PIMA project** which hopefully convinces you that they are trying to do a "bait-and-switch" by **promising greatly reduced amount of trucks, but then using significantly more trucks than they claim in recent EIR-related documents.**

If 1000 employees were to work on site, then they would need to have a more thorough analysis on the development of these proposed warehouses. Instead, just **998 people are scheduled** to work at the facilities!

If there were to be **any residences** on the old South Central Farm site, then there would need to be **some toxic cleanup activities before the homes could be built.** But workers are considered fairly expendable, so the **proponent chose to not even cleanup the area identified with elevated arsenic since it was said to be within regulations for a workplace.**

Speaking of toxics, **the South Central Farm site is within the mile and a half radius of the Exide battery site in Vernon.** Yet, Boyle Heights is receiving the attention (as well it should, but not exclusively) in regards to cleanup of toxic soil in yards, **but the Alameda / Central neighborhood and the old South Central Farm site are last on the totem pole** and receive little attention except for projects promoting more toxic air emissions.

There is a lot of **fishy activity** in regards to **large projects being developed within the general vicinity,** as well as suspicious activity in regards to using some measurements of air pollutants north of Chinatown and act like that accounts for the serious air pollutants in the Alameda Corridor area – which is also toward the northern end of the main route for exhaust from planes flying into LAX. **In regards to major construction in the general region, the early phases of the PIMA evaluation was well before the huge amount of construction activity from about Wilshire Blvd. to the 10 Freeway in downtown Los Angeles got to a furious pace** – as well as in the USC area. And now luxury towers are scheduled south of the 10, so the amount of diesel trucks and black carbon emitted during construction (and emissions due to transport to and from construction) will be much higher than anticipated for the vicinity than when PIMA was proposed.

Before any determination in this matter – unless it is rejection, one must **definitively determine how many trucks these 4 companies currently use.** The initial garment warehouse proposal from Forever 21 would have had 2580 truck trips a day. They are computing a truck arriving, being loaded up, and departing as two trips, so it would be 1290 trucks per day. **Yet, as the months and years proceed, the environmental documentation for the PIMA project keeps predicting smaller and smaller numbers of trucks.** (It should also be pointed out that the garment warehouse that was to host 1290 different trucks a day was going to be on about 11 of the 13 plus acres, whereas the PIMA project is planning on building on the entire 13-14 acres.) The proponent has also been vague regarding my question about whether trucks with large sleeper cabs with 53 foot trailer attached will be a major kind of truck used at the project. The response was essentially that there will only be a small amount of those, but they will be able to be accommodated as far as docks and turning radius, etc. **Well if the trucks are not getting larger, yet there are far fewer trucks** (while garment manufacture is likely not moving into a new facility in order to produce fewer clothes), **then I contend that something is askew in the mathematics wielded by the PIMA companies.**

The traffic analysis is quite weak and not accounting for this era of lower gas costs and rampant construction, while the toxic air emission analysis for the Alameda Corridor area is entirely missing and also not accounting for the air pollution and health impacts of the aforementioned. Thus, the **inadequately analyzed PIMA plan should be rejected and a community farm restored on that site.**

Thank you for your consideration,

Bruce Campbell

Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>
To: Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 8:58 AM

NOTE TO LA CITY STAFF

Please Cc sharon.dickinson@lacity.org on all emails related to PLUM Committee.

Zina Cheng, Legislative Assistant
Planning and Land Use Management Committee

City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Clerk
Council and Public Services
(213) 978-1537
zina.cheng@lacity.org
[Quoted text hidden]

Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>
To: Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 9:26 AM

NOTE TO LA CITY STAFF

***Please Cc zina.cheng@lacity.org on all emails related to PLUM Committee.**

--
Sharon Dickinson, Legislative Assistant
Planning and Land Use Management Committee

City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Clerk
Council and Public Services
Ph. (213) 978-1074

Fax (213) 978-1040
sharon.dickinson@lacity.org



With MyLA311, City of Los Angeles information and services are just a few taps away. Available for download from Google Play and App Store.

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

From: **Bruce Campbell** <madroneweb@aol.com>

Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 1:19 AM

Subject: Council File No. 16-1411-S1 (Please grant appeal of South Central Farmers and reject the PIMA project)

To: plum.committee@lacity.org, edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

[Quoted text hidden]