

From: Leslie Gallin missfashion@cs.com 📧
Subject: FW: Wildlife Ordinance #CPC-2022-3413-CA, CPC-2022-3712-ZC
Date: July 18, 2022 at 11:19 AM
To: Travis Longcore tlongcore@babnc.org



Hello Travis,
Thank you and the BABCNC for being pro-active on this issue.

The letter below was sent to all city agencies involved.

The more I think about this issue- it's glaring how the burden of costs on this measure will be placed upon the homeowners in the affected area! I do think we should propose to the city / state to purchase vacant parcels of hillside and ridgeline to ensure they will always be "park". There is also no mention from the city regarding irrigation and fire prevention for the affected areas.

Most of us living within the affected area of this "pilot" program have already had notification from our fire insurance companies regarding non-renewal of our fire homeowner policies!!

Thank you again and I do hope there is a nugget or two you can use from my thoughts.
Best,
Leslie

Leslie Gallin
E: missfashion@cs.com
C: +1-818-398-1336

From: Leslie Gallin <missfashion@cs.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 7:14 AM
To: 'OurLA2040@LAcity.org' <OurLA2040@LAcity.org>; 'CPC@LAcity.org' <CPC@LAcity.org>; 'Lena.Mik@LAcity.org' <Lena.Mik@LAcity.org>; 'Vince.Bertoni@lacity.org' <Vince.Bertoni@lacity.org>; 'OurLA2040@LAcity.org' <OurLA2040@LAcity.org>; 'CPC@LAcity.org' <CPC@LAcity.org>; 'Paul.Koretz@LAcity.org' <Paul.Koretz@LAcity.org>; 'ContactCD4@lacity.org' <ContactCD4@lacity.org>
Subject: Wildlife Ordinance #CPC-2022-3413-CA, CPC-2022-3712-ZC
Importance: High

With all sincere respect to all on this email.

Last night's Open Public Meeting regarding the above issue Wildlife Ridgeline Ordinance while I am sure well-meaning had all of the appearance earmarks of the "fix is in". Allowing the various support agencies to speak **first** (and for longer than 2 minutes) did not set a very good tone for the meeting. Also allowing those who are NOT in the affected areas to comment was also appalling. If Ventura and Malibu want to be the pilot program area then perhaps you should start there.

Next, glaring is the fact the CITY nor STATE have any financial layout in this ordinance!!! The cost/burden of such will reside with the homeowners (STAKEHOLDERS) !!

There has been zero support data provided to us (the public) regarding any studies which would outline exactly which animals and wildlife are being threatened in the “highlighted” area for this PILOT program along with SPECIFIC data around how many of the species live here and how many have died.

Please note and do not forget- ALL OF US WHO LIVE IN THE HILLSIDES BEING OUTLINED LOVE AND RESPECT THE WILDLIFE AROUND US. We are not opposed to doing all that is sensible in order to preserve the biosphere in our area. What we find outrageous is the draconian restrictions around the homes which have been here for decades and are NOT mega mansions most only 2500sf that will NOT be able to rebuild should a disaster strike. The real issue here is the CITY had no business approving building permits for the HOTEL size homes in the hills. It's obvious we too long time residents of these wonderful hillsides also dislike.

Let's not whitewash the issues we as homeowners raise regarding the proposed building restrictions in this ordinance as DEVELOPERS pressure. Nothing is further from the truth. Those of us on the call last night have modest homes in the hills which we have all sunk our life saving into as we prepare for retirement and or family succession plans. We are not the folks looking to take a 2500 sf house to 20,000sf!!!

While I am sure well-meaning it is apparent ZERO of the folks working on this ordinance own property!! If they did they would recognize the burden is being placed upon the homeowner!

Our area is the most highly densely populated , Why select this area for a PILOT project and NOT the areas closest to Griffith Park heading East which would provide a contiguous Wildlife refuge?

Also, why are we not discussing “greenway / bridges” over roads like Beverly Glen and Mulholland to safely drive animals? The only solutions being proposed are draconian.

There needs to be more meetings with the STAKEHOLDERS in the proposed effected areas in order to fully understand the impact and find a better solution to ensure biodiversity in the area.

There is nothing in this ordinance around Fire remediation. As we heard over and over again last night not only do we , the homeowners in the hills pay the highest taxes but we area also now being penalized by the insurance companies who are dropping us regarding fire insurance in our area. This is being done based upon how the CITY has not kept up with the brush clearance.

It is also apparent that the homeowners in the affected areas are NOT even aware of what's going on. We heard over and over again last night how the public is ill informed on this issue. Therefore there must be a postponement to a final decision on this matter. There must be public meetings for the stakeholders to be heard. Not the kangaroo court of last night.

You are pushing this thru at a highly contested political time in our area. It is the summer vacation season whereby most homeowners are away.

I am appalled at the way in which this very important subject matter is being positioned and handled.

Again- where is the data on the building changes which would support protecting the animals. Please know again we the STAKEHOLDERS are not opposed to saving wildlife. Has anyone working on the ordinance or the scientists come into our homes , backyards to actually see that what is being proposed makes no sense and will in fact hurt the animals as drive them to places which would endanger them.

I would like to know exactly what the city / state will be doing to protect the wildlife and the residents other than what appears to be a building restriction disguised as saving wildlife! Stop approving 15,000sf + homes to be built and ease up on the burden you are placing upon long time homeowners who love this area.

Thank you,
Leslie Gallin

Leslie Gallin
E: missfashion@cs.com
C: +1-818-398-1336