

## Google Groups

## Fwd: Comment regarding the South Central Farm

Sharon Dickinson

Mar 7, 2017 9:24 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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: **Rachel Bruhnke** <sojournerrb@yahoo.com>

Date: Mon, Mar 6, 2017 at 9:38 PM

Subject: Comment regarding the South Central Farm

To: "clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org" <clerk.plumcommittee@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>

Dear fellow Angelinos-

Your task at hand is a VERY important one for the future of Los Angeles, and for this whole country. I have been following the farm since 2005, and now "urban farming" myself since 2007. We need DOZENS of South Central Farms! What an amazing opportunity to right such a terrible injustice that has been done over the past 10 years!

Please, give government a GOOD NAME and support the Farmers, and ALL of us Angelinos who are working for a more Sustainable LA!

Your votes will either be epic, or small. You decide your legacy as individuals and as a council.

Best wishes

Rachel Bruhnke

334 w 17th St.

San Pedro, Ca. 90731

(310) 971 8280

## Google Groups

---

**Re: South Central Farm at PLUM**

---

**Zina Cheng**

Mar 7, 2017 9:09 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Please be aware that the correct email address for your written response is [clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org)

On Mon, Mar 6, 2017 at 9:35 PM, Miguel Paredes <[miguelparedesramos@gmail.com](mailto:miguelparedesramos@gmail.com)> wrote:  
To Whom It May Concern

In the ten years since the brutal eviction of the South Central Farmers, many have chosen to continue the mission of bringing organic produce to underserved areas of Los Angeles while also successfully resisting multiple efforts to develop the former land for industrial use in the hopes of one day seeing the land returned to urban farming and related activities. Currently, the South Central Farms sells organic produce at 10 Farmers Markets throughout Los Angeles as well as drop-off CSA boxes in over 15 locations and are the urban pioneers of the farm to table movement we see today.

A new clothing conglomerate, PIMA, has now received approval for their final environmental impact report (FEIR) from the LA City Planning Department. The plans include building four clothing factories and warehouses on the land. While PIMA's "Made in LA" project has merit, there are many other locations that would serve their purposes without occupying one of the last large open spaces in Los Angeles, and the formerly largest urban garden in the entire nation.

The South Central Farmers have filed an appeal of this decision which will go before the City Council's Planning and Land Use Management Committee (PLUM Committee) on Tuesday, March 7, 2017, at 2:30 in Room 350 at LA City Hall, 200 North Main St., LA, 90012. I am requesting that the Planning and Land Use Management Committee delay this hearing. Specifically, I want to reference the **Council File Number 16-1411-S1**.

My name is Miguel Paredes and I am a Board Member with the ACLU of Southern California, a Director of Community Organizing in South Los Angeles, the Executive Producer and creator of Soul Rebel Radio on KPFK, and I was previously employed by the LAUSD Community Outreach Department to develop 6 new schools in South Central Los Angeles.

It was an honor to participate in the SCF and see the farm grow into a fundamental autonomous space in Los Angeles along the Alameda corridor. The SCF is a symbol of hope and resistance to anyone that cares about environmental racism, health disparities, community spaces, and access to quality food. The farmers turned an empty lot into an urban oasis and this created a positive example in a historically underserved community of Los Angeles.

The SCF is a critical space in south-central Los Angeles that can help foster black and brown unity, create environmental justice, and provide a safe space for families to learn how to grow their own food and survive off the land. As indigenous people, we believe that we belong to the land and in this manner, the south-central farm belongs to the community.

I urge the city of Los Angeles to approve the use of the land for the re-creation of the south-central farm and not for any type of development project. The SCF is absolutely necessary in South LA and the working class people of that community deserve a place like this for underrepresented and disenfranchised families. Please help the South Central Farm to grow and flourish again and provide hope for many people who otherwise may turn to violence, vices, and crime. The South Central Farm deserves our support.

Thank you

Miguel Paredes  
Los Angeles, CA

## Google Groups

---

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

---

Zina Cheng

Mar 7, 2017 9:09 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Please be aware that the correct email address for your written response is [clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org)

On Mon, Mar 6, 2017 at 9:02 PM, Michael Kuehnert <[michael@magiclampmedia.com](mailto:michael@magiclampmedia.com)> wrote:

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.

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

Thank you,  
Los Angeles, CA, 90066

MICHAEL KUEHNERT  
PRODUCER/DIRECTOR  
michael@magiclampmedia.com  
cell (310) 968-0396

Google Groups

---

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

---

**Sharon Dickinson**

Mar 7, 2017 9:27 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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

**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



## Google Groups

---

**Fwd: My opposition to FEIR for parcel 4015 S. Alameda**

---

**Zina Cheng**

Mar 7, 2017 8:59 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee****\*\*\*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

----- 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

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

## Google Groups

---

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

---

Zina Cheng

Mar 7, 2017 8:59 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

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

\*\*\*Please Cc [sharon.dickinson@lacity.org](mailto: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](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org)

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

From: **Bruce Campbell** <[madroneweb@aol.com](mailto: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](mailto:plum.committee@lacity.org), [edwin.grover@lacity.org](mailto:edwin.grover@lacity.org), [zina.cheng@lacity.org](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org), [sharon.dickinson@lacity.org](mailto: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

## Google Groups

---

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


---

Sharon Dickinson

Mar 7, 2017 9:26 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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

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

## Google Groups

## Fwd: The South Central Farm Restoration

Sharon Dickinson

Mar 7, 2017 9:25 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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: **Marla Bernstein** <marlaismom@gmail.com>  
 Date: Mon, Mar 6, 2017 at 10:15 PM  
 Subject: The South Central Farm Restoration  
 To: plum.committee@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.

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,

The Green Party of Los Angeles County

## Google Groups

---

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

---

**Zina Cheng**

Mar 7, 2017 8:58 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee****\*\*\*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

----- 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

**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



Google Groups

---

## Fwd: Council File Number 16-1411-S1

---

**Sharon Dickinson**

Mar 7, 2017 10:52 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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: **Jack Neff** <jackneff01@yahoo.com>  
Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 10:40 AM  
Subject: Council File Number 16-1411-S1  
To: "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

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:

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 originally proposed by the developer. This contradicts the fact the FEIR herein is for a larger operational footprint with the new plans. Applicant )has no studies nor statistics to back up this truck 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.

The South Central Farm is securing pledges with partners who are ready to step up with funding if PIMA becomes a willing seller.

There is no need for applicant's project. There are abandoned warehouses in the vicinity that should be repurposed for PIMA's project instead of taking up precious open space that should be a neighborhood and regional resource. The closed American Apparel operation about a mile north of the farm site is a case in point.

The land is only vacant and "underutilized" because the City bulldozed the land in 2006, effectively stripping the South Central Farm of their crops, labor, food source, environmental resources, community open space, and neighbor networking center. This theft has never been constructively addressed nor has the damage been healed.

The surrounding area is not exclusively industrial. There is a food bank immediately south, a grocery store not far away and single family homes to the west, just one block south. This area of the city is particularly deficient and underserved in open space and it would serve environmental justice to establish a community farm/food hub there.

The Metro Blue Line is not incompatible with a community farm/food hub. The Metro Expo Line is adjacent to Expo Park and numerous museums, thus setting a precedent.

Please exercise the political will to return the land to community serving purposes.

Jack Neff  
P.O. Box 491272  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

## Google Groups

---

### Re: South Central Farm

---

Zina Cheng

Mar 7, 2017 9:04 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Please be aware that the correct email address for your written response is [clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org)

On Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 12:49 AM, L P <[laurapalomares13@yahoo.com](mailto:laurapalomares13@yahoo.com)> wrote:

To: [plum.committee@lacity.org](mailto:plum.committee@lacity.org), [edwin.grover@lacity.org](mailto:edwin.grover@lacity.org), [zina.cheng@lacity.org](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org),  
[sharon.dickinson@lacity.org](mailto: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*

## Google Groups

## Fwd: South Central Farm

Sharon Dickinson

Mar 7, 2017 9:32 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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: L P &lt;laurapalomares13@yahoo.com&gt;

Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 12:49 AM

Subject: re: South Central Farm

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*

Google Groups

---

## Fwd: Eastside Cafe letter of support for the South Central Farm

---

**Sharon Dickinson**

Mar 7, 2017 10:34 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

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

\*\*\* Please Cc [zina.cheng@lacity.org](mailto: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](mailto: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: **Angela Flores** <[angelaluciaf@gmail.com](mailto:angelaluciaf@gmail.com)>

Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 10:27 AM

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

To: [edwin.grover@lacity.org](mailto:edwin.grover@lacity.org), [zina.cheng@lacity.org](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org), [sharon.dickinson@lacity.org](mailto:sharon.dickinson@lacity.org)

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

Angela Flores

Google Groups

---

## Fwd: Council File Number 16-1411-S1

---

Sharon Dickinson

Mar 7, 2017 10:52 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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: **Jack Neff** <jackneff01@yahoo.com>  
Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 10:40 AM  
Subject: Council File Number 16-1411-S1  
To: "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

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:

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 originally proposed by the developer. This contradicts the fact the FEIR herein is for a larger operational footprint with the new plans. Applicant )has no studies nor statistics to back up this truck 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.

The South Central Farm is securing pledges with partners who are ready to step up with funding if PIMA becomes a willing seller.

There is no need for applicant's project. There are abandoned warehouses in the vicinity that should be repurposed for PIMA's project instead of taking up precious open space that should be a neighborhood and regional resource. The closed American Apparel operation about a mile north of the farm site is a case in point.

The land is only vacant and "underutilized" because the City bulldozed the land in 2006, effectively stripping the South Central Farm of their crops, labor, food source, environmental resources, community open space, and neighbor networking center. This theft has never been constructively addressed nor has the damage been healed.

The surrounding area is not exclusively industrial. There is a food bank immediately south, a grocery store not far away and single family homes to the west, just one block south. This area of the city is particularly deficient and underserved in open space and it would serve environmental justice to establish a community farm/food hub there.

The Metro Blue Line is not incompatible with a community farm/food hub. The Metro Expo Line is adjacent to Expo Park and numerous museums, thus setting a precedent.

Please exercise the political will to return the land to community serving purposes.

Jack Neff  
P.O. Box 491272  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android



Edwin Grover &lt;edwin.grover@lacity.org&gt;

---

**Council File Number 16-1411-S1**

4 messages

**Jack Neff** <jackneff01@yahoo.com>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 11:38 AM

Reply-To: "jackneff01@yahoo.com" &lt;jackneff01@yahoo.com&gt;

To: "edwin.grover@lacity.org" &lt;edwin.grover@lacity.org&gt;, "plum.committee@lacity.org" &lt;plum.committee@lacity.org&gt;, "zina.cheng@lacity.org" &lt;zina.cheng@lacity.org&gt;

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

Council File Number 16-1411-S1

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

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 originally proposed by the developer. This contradicts the fact the FEIR herein is for a larger operational footprint with the new plans). Applicant )has no studies nor statistics to back up this truck 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.

The South Central Farm is securing pledges with partners who are ready to step up with funding if PIMA becomes a willing seller.

There is no need for applicant's project. There are abandoned warehouses in the vicinity that should be repurposed for PIMA's project instead of taking up precious open space that should be a neighborhood and regional resource. The closed American Apparel operation about a mile north of the farm site is a case in point.

The land is only vacant and "underutilized" because the City bulldozed the land in 2006, effectively stripping the South Central Farm of their crops, labor, food source, environmental resources, community open space, and neighbor networking center. This theft has never been constructively addressed nor has the damage been healed.

The surrounding area is not exclusively industrial. There is a food bank immediately south, a grocery store not far away and single family homes to the west, just one block south. This area of the city is particularly deficient and underserved in open space and it would serve environmental justice to establish a community farm/food hub there.

The Metro Blue Line is not incompatible with a community farm/food hub. The Metro Expo Line is adjacent to Expo Park and numerous museums, thus setting a precedent.

Please exercise the political will to return the land to community serving purposes.

Jack Neff  
P.O. Box 491272  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

**Zina Cheng** <zina.cheng@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 12:11 PM

To: "jackneff01@yahoo.com" <jackneff01@yahoo.com>, Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Cc: "edwin.grover@lacity.org" <edwin.grover@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  
[Quoted text hidden]

**Rosa Romero** <romero@oxy.edu>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 12:33 PM

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,

The Urban & Environmental Policy Institute at Occidental College respectfully submits the attached letter to the PLUM Committee in opposition to the FEIR for the parcel at 4015 S. Alameda, submitted by the PIMA Corporation.

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

Thank you.  
Rosa

Rosa Romero, MEd  
Adjunct Professor  
Program Director  
LA Farm to School & Wellness Initiative  
Urban & Environmental Policy Institute  
Occidental College, Los Angeles, CA

t: 323.341.5090 | f: 323.258.2917 | www.uepi.oxy.edu | romero@oxy.edu



**Council File Number Number 16-1411-S1\_UEPI Occidental College.doc.pdf**  
91K

**Rosa Romero** <romera.rosa@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 12:41 PM

To: clerk.plum.committee@lacity.org, edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, Harris-Dawson@lacity.org

Cc: Frank Tamborello <frank@hungeractionla.org>

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

3/7/2017

City of Los Angeles Mail - Council File Number 16-1411-S1

Please accept the attached letter on behalf of the Hunger Action Los Angeles to the PLUM Committee in opposition to the FEIR for the parcel at 4015 S. Alameda, submitted by the PIMA Corporation.

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

Thank you.

Rosa (Sent on behalf of Frank Tamberello, Executive Director of Hunger Action LA)



**HALA Support Letter for S Central Farm.docx**

56K



Edwin Grover &lt;edwin.grover@lacity.org&gt;

---

**South Central Farm**

3 messages

---

**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 &lt;heather@csuinc.org&gt;

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*




---

 **SprtLtrBuyBakSCF ADMIN\_060317.pdf**  
 132K

---

**Zina Cheng** <zina.cheng@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 1:44 PM

To: neelam sharma &lt;neelam@csuinc.org&gt;, Clerk-PLUM-Committee &lt;clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org&gt;

Cc: Edwin Grover &lt;edwin.grover@lacity.org&gt;, Sharon Dickinson &lt;sharon.dickinson@lacity.org&gt;, Heather Fenney Alexander &lt;heather@csuinc.org&gt;

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  
[Quoted text hidden]

---

 **SprtLtRBuyBakSCF ADMIN\_060317.pdf**  
132K

---

**neelam sharma** <neelam@csuinc.org> Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 1:53 PM  
To: Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>, Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>  
Cc: Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>, Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, Heather Fenney Alexander <heather@csuinc.org>

Thanks so much, very appreciated!

---

**From:** Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 7, 2017 at 1:44 PM  
**To:** neelam sharma <neelam@csuinc.org>, Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>  
**Cc:** Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>, Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, Heather Fenney Alexander <heather@csuinc.org>  
**Subject:** Re: South Central Farm

[Quoted text hidden]



Edwin Grover &lt;edwin.grover@lacity.org&gt;

## Council File Number 16-1411-S1

5 messages

Jack Neff <jackneff01@yahoo.com>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 11:38 AM

Reply-To: "jackneff01@yahoo.com" <jackneff01@yahoo.com>

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

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

Council File Number 16-1411-S1

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

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 originally proposed by the developer. This contradicts the fact the FEIR herein is for a larger operational footprint with the new plans). Applicant )has no studies nor statistics to back up this truck 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.

The South Central Farm is securing pledges with partners who are ready to step up with funding if PIMA becomes a willing seller.

There is no need for applicant's project. There are abandoned warehouses in the vicinity that should be repurposed for PIMA's project instead of taking up precious open space that should be a neighborhood and regional resource. The closed American Apparel operation about a mile north of the farm site is a case in point.

The land is only vacant and "underutilized" because the City bulldozed the land in 2006, effectively stripping the South Central Farm of their crops, labor, food source, environmental resources, community open space, and neighbor networking center. This theft has never been constructively addressed nor has the damage been healed.

The surrounding area is not exclusively industrial. There is a food bank immediately south, a grocery store not far away and single family homes to the west, just one block south. This area of the city is particularly deficient and underserved in open space and it would serve environmental justice to establish a community farm/food hub there.

The Metro Blue Line is not incompatible with a community farm/food hub. The Metro Expo Line is adjacent to Expo Park and numerous museums, thus setting a precedent.

Please exercise the political will to return the land to community serving purposes.

Jack Neff  
P.O. Box 491272  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

**Zina Cheng** <zina.cheng@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 12:11 PM

To: "jackneff01@yahoo.com" <jackneff01@yahoo.com>, Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Cc: "edwin.grover@lacity.org" <edwin.grover@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  
[Quoted text hidden]

**Rosa Romero** <rromero@oxy.edu>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 12:33 PM

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,

The Urban & Environmental Policy Institute at Occidental College respectfully submits the attached letter to the PLUM Committee in opposition to the FEIR for the parcel at 4015 S. Alameda, submitted by the PIMA Corporation.

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

Thank you.  
Rosa

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rosa Romero, MEd  
Adjunct Professor  
Program Director  
LA Farm to School & Wellness Initiative  
Urban & Environmental Policy Institute  
Occidental College, Los Angeles, CA

t: 323.341.5090 | f: 323.258.2917 | www.uepi.oxy.edu | rromero@oxy.edu

 **Council File Number Number 16-1411-S1\_UEPI Occidental College.doc.pdf**  
91K

**Rosa Romero** <romera.rosa@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 12:41 PM

To: clerk.plum.committee@lacity.org, edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, Harris-Dawson@lacity.org

Cc: Frank Tamborello <frank@hungeractionla.org>

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

Please accept the attached letter on behalf of the Hunger Action Los Angeles to the PLUM Committee in opposition to the FEIR for the parcel at 4015 S. Alameda, submitted by the PIMA Corporation.

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

Thank you.

Rosa (Sent on behalf of Frank Tamberello, Executive Director of Hunger Action LA)



**HALA Support Letter for S Central Farm.docx**

56K

---

**Zina Cheng** <zina.cheng@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 1:38 PM

To: Rosa Romero <romera.rosa@gmail.com>, Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Cc: Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>, Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, Harris-Dawson@lacity.org, Frank Tamborello <frank@hungeractionla.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

[Quoted text hidden]



**HALA Support Letter for S Central Farm.docx**

56K



## Hunger Action Los Angeles

961 S. Mariposa # 205 Los Angeles CA 90006

Ph (213) 388 8228 Fax (213) 388 8448 [www.hungeractionla.org](http://www.hungeractionla.org)

March 1, 2017

To: [edwin.grover@lacity.org](mailto:edwin.grover@lacity.org), [zina.cheng@lacity.org](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org), [sharon.dickinson@lacity.org](mailto: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-EIR

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

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

1. The final EIR doesn't address the fact that there are no data to back up the applicant's claim that their operation will result in only 75 truck trips per day. In fact, the final EIR increases the project's number of truck docks from 22 to 30. If these docks are utilized at maximum capacity, that would result in far more than 75 truck trips per day. Eighteen of the docks seem to be designed for diesel trucks, although the EIR states that most of the trucks will be small and medium trucks. These variances introduce uncertainty into the estimates of the impact on air quality that the project will have.
2. The final EIR also did not consider the alternative plan submitted by the South Central Farmers, for a community food hub. This alternative addresses the community's need for green space and the opportunity for local job creation. The principal of preserving open space is also enumerated in the city's "Open Space and Conservation Element" where policy 6.1.1 states "Consider appropriate methodologies to protect significant remaining open spaces" and 6.1.6. states "Consider preservation of private open land space to the maximum extent feasible." The South Central Farm 13 acre area represents significant remaining open space. In addition, Policy 6.4.2 states "Encourage increases in parks and other open space lands where such deficiencies exist, such as South East and South Central Los Angeles....". Re-establishment of the South Central Farm would be in line with this stated policy of the city.

Please consider reinstating this vital, innovative project, the South Central Farm, which is a symbol of self-sufficiency, wise land use, hard work, and diversity. Please grant the appeal by the South Central Farmers and deny the FEIR for the PIMA project.

Sincerely,

Frank Tamborello  
Executive Director  
Hunger Action Los Angeles  
961 S Mariposa # 205, LA CA 90006

## Google Groups

---

### Fwd: Council File Number 16-1411-S1

---

**Sharon Dickinson**

Mar 7, 2017 9:23 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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: **Emma** <emmatree02@yahoo.com>

Date: Mon, Mar 6, 2017 at 7:15 PM

Subject: RE: Council File Number 16-1411-S1

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

Hello! I am writing to ask that you show support for the restoration of the South Central Farm.

It is extremely important for this land to be re-instated to the community as there are so many possibilities for this land.

Some possibilities are a food hub, garden space, recreation area, cultural center or even an environmental justice museum.

The benefits would include sustainable job creation, improved public health and nutrition, community benefits, lowered rates of violence, climate change mitigation, biodiversity, culturally appropriate food and an example of environmental justice.

Thank you for your time and it is the right moment to return this land to the community.

My name is Emma, Mar Vista 90066.  
 Thank you!

Sent from my iPhone

Google Groups

---

**Fwd: Council File Number 16-1411-S1**

---

**Sharon Dickinson**

Mar 7, 2017 10:52 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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: **Jack Neff** <jackneff01@yahoo.com>  
Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 10:40 AM  
Subject: Council File Number 16-1411-S1  
To: "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

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:

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 originally proposed by the developer. This contradicts the fact the FEIR herein is for a larger operational footprint with the new plans). Applicant )has no studies nor statistics to back up this truck 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.

The South Central Farm is securing pledges with partners who are ready to step up with funding if PIMA becomes a willing seller.

There is no need for applicant's project. There are abandoned warehouses in the vicinity that should be repurposed for PIMA's project instead of taking up precious open space that should be a neighborhood and regional resource. The closed American Apparel operation about a mile north of the farm site is a case in point.

The land is only vacant and "underutilized" because the City bulldozed the land in 2006, effectively stripping the South Central Farm of their crops, labor, food source, environmental resources, community open space, and neighbor networking center. This theft has never been constructively addressed nor has the damage been healed.

The surrounding area is not exclusively industrial. There is a food bank immediately south, a grocery store not far away and single family homes to the west, just one block south. This area of the city is particularly deficient and underserved in open space and it would serve environmental justice to establish a community farm/food hub there.

The Metro Blue Line is not incompatible with a community farm/food hub. The Metro Expo Line is adjacent to Expo Park and numerous museums, thus setting a precedent.

Please exercise the political will to return the land to community serving purposes.

Jack Neff  
P.O. Box 491272  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

## Google Groups

---

### Re: Council File Number 16-1411-S1

---

Zina Cheng

Mar 7, 2017 12:12 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Please be aware that the correct email address for your written response is [clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org)

On Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 11:38 AM, Jack Neff <[jackneff01@yahoo.com](mailto:jackneff01@yahoo.com)> wrote:

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

Council File Number 16-1411-S1

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

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 originally proposed by the developer. This contradicts the fact the FEIR herein is for a larger operational footprint with the new plans). Applicant )has no studies nor statistics to back up this truck 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.

The South Central Farm is securing pledges with partners who are ready to step up with funding if PIMA becomes a willing seller.

There is no need for applicant's project. There are abandoned warehouses in the vicinity that should be repurposed for PIMA's project instead of taking up precious open space that should be a neighborhood and regional resource. The closed American Apparel operation about a mile north of the farm site is a case in point.

The land is only vacant and "underutilized" because the City bulldozed the land in 2006, effectively stripping the South Central Farm of their crops, labor, food source, environmental

resources, community open space, and neighbor networking center. This theft has never been constructively addressed nor has the damage been healed.

The surrounding area is not exclusively industrial. There is a food bank immediately south, a grocery store not far away and single family homes to the west, just one block south. This area of the city is particularly deficient and underserved in open space and it would serve environmental justice to establish a community farm/food hub there.

The Metro Blue Line is not incompatible with a community farm/food hub. The Metro Expo Line is adjacent to Expo Park and numerous museums, thus setting a precedent.

Please exercise the political will to return the land to community serving purposes.

Jack Neff  
P.O. Box 491272  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

## Google Groups

**Fw: Council File Number 16-1411-S1**

Jack Neff

Mar 7, 2017 1:11 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

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

Council File Number 16-1411-S1

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

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 originally proposed by the developer. This contradicts the fact the FEIR herein is for a larger operational footprint with the new plans). Applicant )has no studies nor statistics to back up this truck 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.

The South Central Farm is securing pledges with partners who are ready to step up with funding if PIMA becomes a willing seller.

There is no need for applicant's project. There are abandoned warehouses in the vicinity that should be repurposed for PIMA's project instead of taking up precious open space that should be a neighborhood and regional resource. The closed American Apparel operation about a mile north of the farm site is a case in point.

The land is only vacant and "underutilized" because the City bulldozed the land in 2006, effectively stripping the South Central Farm of their crops, labor, food source, environmental resources, community open space, and neighbor networking center. This theft has never been constructively addressed nor has the damage been healed.

The surrounding area is not exclusively industrial. There is a food bank immediately south, a grocery store not far away and single family homes to the west, just one block south. This area of the city is particularly deficient and underserved in open space and it would serve environmental justice to establish a community farm/food hub there.

The Metro Blue Line is not incompatible with a community farm/food hub. The Metro Expo Line is adjacent to Expo Park and numerous museums, thus setting a precedent.

Please exercise the political will to return the land to community serving purposes.

Jack Neff  
P.O. Box 491272  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

## Google Groups

---

**Re: Council File Number 16-1411-S1**

---

**Zina Cheng**

Mar 7, 2017 1:39 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Please be aware that the correct email address for your written response is [clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org)

On Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 12:41 PM, Rosa Romero <[romera.rosa@gmail.com](mailto:romera.rosa@gmail.com)> wrote:

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

Please accept the attached letter on behalf of the Hunger Action Los Angeles to the PLUM Committee in opposition to the FEIR for the parcel at 4015 S. Alameda, submitted by the PIMA Corporation.

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

Thank you.

Rosa (Sent on behalf of Frank Tamberello, Executive Director of Hunger Action LA)



## Google Groups

---

**Re: South Central Farm**

---

neelam sharma

Mar 7, 2017 1:53 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Thanks so much, very appreciated!

---

**From:** Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>**Date:** Tuesday, March 7, 2017 at 1:44 PM**To:** neelam sharma <neelam@csuinc.org>, Clerk-PLUM-Committee <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>**Cc:** Edwin Grover <edwin.grover@lacity.org>, Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, Heather Fenney Alexander <heather@csuinc.org>**Subject:** Re: South Central Farm

Please be aware that the correct email address for your written response is [clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org)

On Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 1:24 PM, neelam sharma <neelam@csuinc.org> wrote:

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

Sincerely,

Neelam Sharma  
Executive Director  
Community Services Unlimited Inc.

[www.csuinc.org](http://www.csuinc.org)

(213) 746-1216

Facebook @CSUINC

Twitter @CSUINCLA

Instagram @csuinc

*"I am deliberate and afraid of nothing"* Audre Lorde

## Google Groups

### Fwd: South Central Farm

Sharon Dickinson

Mar 7, 2017 9:32 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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: L P <laurapalomares13@yahoo.com>

Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 12:49 AM

Subject: re: South Central Farm

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*

## Google Groups

---

**Re: South Central Farm**

---

**Zina Cheng**

Mar 7, 2017 9:04 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Please be aware that the correct email address for your written response is [clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org)

On Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 12:49 AM, L P <[laurapalomares13@yahoo.com](mailto:laurapalomares13@yahoo.com)> wrote:

To: [plum.committee@lacity.org](mailto:plum.committee@lacity.org), [edwin.grover@lacity.org](mailto:edwin.grover@lacity.org), [zina.cheng@lacity.org](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org),  
[sharon.dickinson@lacity.org](mailto: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*

## Google Groups

---

### 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

---

Zina Cheng

Mar 7, 2017 1:44 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Please be aware that the correct email address for your written response is [clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org)

On Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 1:37 PM, nirvan <[nirvan@nirvan.com](mailto:nirvan@nirvan.com)> wrote:

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

I'm writing as a 17 year resident to 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).

As a filmmaker behind viral movies like "Caine's Arcade", and as a board member of CicLAvia, I have seen the power a local story can have, to transform the way we think of our city, and to inspire others around the world. I see similar potential in how the story of this parcel is told.

I want to emphasize that the rich, deep, and complex history of this parcel gives it a unique and powerful potential to shape the future story of Los Angeles in a very positive way (as a farm). But it can also become a negative story, and that of a monumental and mismanaged opportunity that doesn't take into account the full environmental impact of PIMA's proposal.

Your decision on the FEIR will forever impact how this story is written.

Many are paying attention now, but even more will be paying attention during the next chapter, so it is important that we all do our part to make sure that this story is written properly.

The FEIR needs to properly address the environmental impact, and the viable potential alternative use of this parcel to create open space and a community food hub for South Central, also must be considered.

Currently, this is not the case, and so I'm joining the call to oppose the FEIR, specifically due to 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,  
Nirvan Mullick

Filmmaker, Caine's Arcade  
Founder, Imagination.org  
Board Member, CicLAvia

Los Angeles, CA 90013

--

nirvan.com

Director, Caine's Arcade  
Founder, Imagination.org

## Google Groups

### Fwd: 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

Sharon Dickinson

Mar 7, 2017 9:30 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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: **Sarah Nolan** <sarah@theabundanttable.org>

Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 8:46 AM

Subject: 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

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

---

## Google Groups

# Fwd: 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

Sharon Dickinson

Mar 7, 2017 9:29 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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: **Ivonne Rodriguez - NAI** <ivonne.rodriguez.usc@gmail.com>  
Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 8:16 AM  
Subject: 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  
To: edwin.grover@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

*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

## Google Groups

# Fwd: 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

Sharon Dickinson

Mar 7, 2017 9:28 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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: **Kristen Jackson** <kristenjacks@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 8:09 AM

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

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

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 are so desperately needed and 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.

Sincerely,  
A concerned and mindful citizen and MTA Employee  
Kristen Jackson  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Kristen Jackson  
Contact:323.509.4794  
kristenjacks@gmail.com

life is but a dream...

## Google Groups

---

### **Fwd: 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**

---

Zina Cheng

Mar 7, 2017 8:57 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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

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

From: **Kristen Jackson** <kristenjacks@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 8:09 AM

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

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

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 are so desperately needed and 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.

Sincerely,  
A concerned and mindful citizen and MTA Employee  
Kristen Jackson  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Kristen Jackson  
Contact:323.509.4794  
kristenjacks@gmail.com

life is but a dream...

## Google Groups

---

### **Fwd: 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**

---

**Zina Cheng**

Mar 7, 2017 8:57 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

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

\*\*\*Please Cc [sharon.dickinson@lacity.org](mailto: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](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org)

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

From: **Ivonne Rodriguez - NAI** <[ivonne.rodriguez.usc@gmail.com](mailto:ivonne.rodriguez.usc@gmail.com)>

Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 8:16 AM

Subject: 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

To: [edwin.grover@lacity.org](mailto:edwin.grover@lacity.org), [zina.cheng@lacity.org](mailto:zina.cheng@lacity.org), [sharon.dickinson@lacity.org](mailto:sharon.dickinson@lacity.org)

*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

## Google Groups

---

### **Fwd: 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**

---

Zina Cheng

Mar 7, 2017 8:51 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

\*\*\*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

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

From: **Sarah Nolan** <sarah@theabundanttable.org>

Date: Tue, Mar 7, 2017 at 8:46 AM

Subject: 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

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

---

Google Groups

---

## Comment on Final EIR for warehouse project at 4051 S. Alameda in Los Angeles

---

**Mike Feinstein**

Mar 7, 2017 1:55 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

To whom it may concern

The Final EIR should have studied the alternative nearby location that came open during the initial study period as an alternative mitigation. Given that funds are available to purchase the last at 4051 S. Alameda, relocating the warehouse to a nearby location would mitigate the negative air quality and traffic congestion issues of the project, by effectively cutting in half the amount of air pollution and traffic congestion by developing/re-developing only one of two sites.

Concurrently such analysis would have given public policy makers the opportunity to consider an alternative that would simultaneously help the City of Los Angeles to take advantage of this once-in-a-lifetime contiguous 14 acre open space in South Los Angeles, to meet the following goals in the City's Open Space Element.

Given that this analysis did not occur, no statement of overriding considerations should be approved and the project should be return for further analysis.

Sincerely

Michael Feinstein  
Former Mayor and City Council  
City of Santa Monica

<http://cityplanning.lacity.org/Cwd/Framwk/chapters/06/06.htm>

Chapter 6  
Open Space and Conservation

6.1.6 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. (P70)

6.4.2 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 (As amended in 1972). (P1, P2, P54)

6.4.5 Provide public open space in a manner that is responsive to the needs and wishes of the residents of the City's neighborhoods through the involvement of local residents in the selection and design of local parks. In addition to publicly-owned and operated open space, management mechanisms may take the form of locally run private/non-profit management groups, and should allow for the private acquisition of land with a commitment for maintenance and public access. (P2, P58,P59)

6.4.7 Consider as part of the City's open space inventory of pedestrian streets, community gardens, shared school playfields, and privately-owned commercial open spaces that 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 (see the Recreation and Parks section in Chapter 9: Infrastructure and Public Services). (P2)

6.4.8a. Encourage the development of public plazas, forested streets, farmers markets, residential commons, rooftop spaces, and other places that function like open space in urbanized areas of the City with deficiencies of natural open space, especially in targeted growth areas.

- b. Encourage the improvement of open space, both on public and private property, as opportunities arise.
- 6.4.10 Provide for the joint use of open space with existing and future public facilities, where feasible.
- 6.4.11 Seek opportunities to site open space adjacent to existing public facilities, such as schools, and encourage the establishment of mutually beneficial development agreements that make privately-owned open space accessible to the public. (P2, P16)