



Council 1/29/19

The SEO Doctors <theseedoctors@gmail.com>
To: Clerk.CPS@lacity.org

Mon, Jan 28, 2019 at 7:16 AM

Hello !

I come with more input. This time it's early ! I hope you all had a nice weekend :)

-Korie Schmidt

Item 1 - File# 18-0900-S111
Item 2 - File# 18-0900-S112
Item 3 - File# 18-0900-S133
Item 19 - File# 18-0900-S137
Item 20 - File# 18-0900-S138
Item 21 - File# 18-0900-S139
Item 22 - File# 18-0900-S140
Item 23 - File# 18-0900-S110

Lighting Districts.

I oppose these files unless there are omni-directional EMF monitors, that capture amplitude, wave-length, and direction of Electromagnetic Frequencies emitted, displayed in an online, publicly accessible histogram to generate a means of enforcement against potential irresponsible use of specific and/or concentrated electromagnetic waves.

Item 4 - File# 17-0760
Item 24 - File# 17-0760

Easements for sanitation tunnels.

I oppose this because it may conflict with the goals of affordable housing and homelessness.

Item 5 - File# **18-1064**

Demo Restaurant rebuild Gas Station w Storage above; 4 stories.

Sounds cool. Doesn't seem too large or intrusive. Yes.

Item 6 - File# **07-1212-S7**

Castration.

There shouldn't be a requirement to spay or neuter any animal. By choice yes, and if stray at a homeless shelter I understand. (To be honest they should spay and release, rather than euthanize.) It's the smart thing to do. But it should be a choice, not mandatory. Because, what, that means there's some kind of civil penalty if you don't chop their you-know-whats out ?

Item 7 - File# **18-1170**

Merging 1220-1226 S. Bedford St.

This is another case of wealth accumulation. I have no problem with that in small doses.

As I've mentioned previously in this file, there are several other large properties in the area, so I don't see this standing apart too much from what's already going on. I'd really like to hear what the neighbors in the single-family properties think.

I prefer the older buildings in our city because they have architectural uniqueness. They are very much "LA". The downside - they're a billion years old. We really could use an overhaul. We just can't lose our minds, or our city. If these properties are merged to build a unique structure, a certain theme, I would not be opposed to it. Look at Malibu for an example. All the homes are very different from one another. Some have a specific theme. We should be emulating that with all these developments.

Also, I'm interested in procedures such as this to reconfigure the map.

Item 8 - File# 18-1169

8-story tower in small residential neighborhood along Hollywood 101 freeway. 5717 - 5719.5 W. Carlton Way.

I strongly oppose this project. It's in a small neighborhood along the freeway. There isn't a lot of access. There are several adjacent single-family 2-story residences. Noise and privacy and density. This is going to ruin these people's lives. I think this is a terrible project for the location.

I also strongly oppose this because there was a strong voice of opposition from the neighborhood.

Item 9 - File# 18-1243

Allowing the homeless to procure animal licenses.

Yes.

Item 10 - File# 18-1218

Bridge Housing in Industrial Sector of West LA.

Yes. This seems like the right location for this in terms of out-of-the-public eye. I noted previously in this file that I am in support of this, and I still am. However, now that I think about it, I am a bit leery on the location because it's always been a bit sketchy at night. I question if the bridge housing would make it sketchier, or better.

I think that would more likely boil down to implementation. I'm sure the property could help clean up the area. It might even activate it. I want to see what the CAO has to say about it and have a look around the neighborhood.

Item 11 - File# 18-1221

Underpass development for emergency shelter/bridge housing.

Yes. This sounds like it's along the lines of my ideas.

Item 12 - File# 18-1191

Bridge housing 5874 Miramonte Blvd, South LA.

This is an empty lot of dirt. My immediate reaction is yes. However, I used to play in lots like this when I was a kid, so my inner kid says no. I would want more experience with the neighborhood to give a better answer. I will abstain on this, although I lean more towards approval.

Item 13 - File# 18-1119

Evaluation of properties for Bridge Housing/Crisis Response; warehouse district and skid row.

Yes, yes, and yes.

Item 14 - File# 18-1022

Evaluate properties for bridge housing; Western, South of the 10.

Lol. Sure, why not.

Item 15 - File# 14-1275-S1

Supportive housing, people with a disability; 12901 Venice Blvd.

Yes.

Item 16 - File# 17-0090-S10

Add subsidies/allocations From Measure HHH to High/Highest Opportunity Areas.

I'm not sure if I support this. I'm definitely for making sure the funds are equally distributed. Yes, 100% for that. These funds seem to be flying out the window as fast as they can.

However, I'm not sure that this is the way. Adding additional funding to areas deemed one category, by logic, would not ensure equal distribution of funds.

Further, where can one find information on the definition of "High and Highest Opportunity area"?

Item 17 - File# 17-0090-S4

Reserve \$120M for competitive HHH pilot program.

I'm touched. Thank you. Yes. Let's do this.

Item 26 - File# 18-0007-S26

Michael Buble to Walk of Fame.

Lol. I know who motioned this. Tell her I said hi. Yes.

Item 27 - File# 18-0007-S25

Jeff Goldblum to Walk of Fame.

Lol. Yes. <https://youtu.be/WxS0kiUX6p0> I was looking more for when they said "Um...hide".

Item 28 - File# 18-1244

HIV Prevention directed by Dept. of Disability.

I support this

Item 29 - File# 17-0059-S1

Russian Watchmen.

Lol ! I'm from California. But I guess that's a good idea though. I support this. Transparency is good.

Item 30 - File# 19-0073

Funding for Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.

Yes.



2442 Barry Ave.
Los Angeles, Ca 90064
(310)600-2278

TheSEODOctors@gmail.com
www.TheSEODOctors.com



This electronic message contains information from *The SEO Doctors*, which may be privileged or confidential. This message and the information it contains is intended solely for use by the individual(s) or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, use of or benefit from the contents of this information (without the express prior written consent of its author) is prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please notify us by telephone or email immediately.