



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
35.		Favor	Nella McOsker	



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

35.		Oppose	Alan J Ray	<p>Dear County Board of Supervisors,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed purchase of the Gas Company Tower. This decision stands in stark contrast to our community's priorities as outlined in the recently approved 2024-2025 budget, particularly regarding public safety and fiscal responsibility.</p> <p>//</p> <p>The budget includes significant allocations for essential projects: \$4,646,000 earmarked for the "Countywide Seismic Assessment for County Buildings" (CP 87606) and a substantial \$62,071,000 designated for the seismic retrofits of the Hahn Hall of Administration Building (CP 87599). These initiatives are critical to ensuring the safety and integrity of our public infrastructure in the face of potential seismic events.</p> <p>//</p> <p>Investing in the Gas Company Tower, a luxury high-rise, diverts necessary resources away from pressing public safety projects that uplift our tireless county workers and community at large. It sends a concerning message about our priorities: rather than enhancing the safety of ALL county buildings (including the hazardous County Jail that has seen no measurable process per your last meeting), we are committing taxpayer funds to acquire a luxury property that serves only the privileged executive offices of this body.</p> <p>//</p> <p>The purchase of the Gas Company Tower raises questions about its alignment with the county's long-term strategic vision. Are we prepared to prioritize the acquisition of luxury, high-cost real estate over the safety of our other public assets and investments into program that serve the people? The potential risks associated with neglecting our seismic assessments and retrofitting projects are not just financial; they pose a tangible threat to the safety and well-being of our residents.</p> <p>In light of these considerations, I urge you to reconsider the proposed purchase of the Gas Company Tower. Instead, we must focus our efforts and resources on fulfilling the commitments made in the 2024-2025 budget, or publicly rescinding those decisions and explaining what the plan forward is – one that serves the ENTIRE community, not just the privileged few.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter. I hope to see our county leaders prioritize the safety and welfare of our residents above all else.</p> <p>//</p> <p>Sincerely, Alan Joseph Ray</p>
-----	--	---------------	------------	---



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
35.		Oppose	Alan J Ray	
			Barbara De Souza	<p>Subject:</p> <p>Objection to the Purchase of 555 W 5th Street, Los Angeles 90017 (Gas Company Tower)</p> <p>Dear Supervisor's,</p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed purchase of the property located at 555 W 5th Street, Los Angeles, commonly known as the (Gas Company Tower), by Los Angeles County.</p> <p>My objection is based on critical concerns regarding the county's financial priorities and obligations.</p> <p>**Homelessness Funding and Receivership Concerns:**</p> <p>The County of Los Angeles and the City of Los Angeles are currently facing significant challenges in addressing homelessness, with substantial funds already allocated to this critical issue.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns about the effective use of these funds, and both the county and city are at risk of receivership by a federal court judge for non-compliance with mandated homelessness solutions.</p> <p>Diverting financial resources to purchase the Gas Company Tower could further complicate these efforts and undermine the county's ability to address homelessness effectively.</p> <p>According to recent reports, while Los Angeles City and County did purchase motels with the intention of converting them into housing for the homeless through the "Project Homekey" program, a significant portion of these purchased properties remain largely undeveloped and vacant, meaning little to no progress has been made on refurbishing them for homeless housing despite the initial purchases.</p> <p>**Key Points About the Situation**:</p> <p>- **Large Number of Vacant Units**: Investigations have found that a large percentage of the motel rooms bought by LA County through Project Homekey are still unoccupied, raising concerns about the effectiveness of the program.</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			<p>- **Reasons for Delays**:</p> <p>Issues like complex renovation needs, funding challenges, and difficulties finding appropriate service providers to manage the housing units are cited as potential reasons for the delays.</p> <p>- **Criticisms and Concerns**:</p> <p>Critics point out that the lack of progress on these projects leaves many homeless individuals still without adequate housing while significant public funds remain tied up in unutilized properties.</p> <p>Given the urgency and importance of addressing homelessness, it is imperative that the county prioritizes its financial resources towards fulfilling its obligations and avoiding potential receivership.</p> <p>The purchase of the Gas Company Tower at this time could detract from these critical efforts and exacerbate existing challenges.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my objection. I look forward to your response and further discussion on this matter.</p> <p>Sincerely, Barbara De Souza</p>
		Daniel White	Why wasn't an RFP used for this process? What other properties were considered? Why is Gas Company Tower the best choice? The postings in relation to this agenda item do not make this clear.
		Jessica Potter	Why is the county spending \$200 million tax dollars to buy a fancy building when telework would save the county billions in the long run? Use the existing facilities for the unhoused and for the disabled! hall of administration alone is huge and central and can be equipped to provide direct services to the underserved in this community. You have floors dedicated to office space when they should be dedicated to those suffering from poverty. If you're going to declare a homeless emergency then shouldn't your facilities be the first to provide actual shelter, food, and help instead of comfortable office space for people who have jobs and homes already and who can work from those homes instead?
		Judith Shearer	<p>Please do not forget that the Hall of Administration is a renowned historic building and part of a greater master plan for the surrounding area. Here is an excerpt from the LA Conservancy, of which I am a long-standing member:</p> <p>laconservancy.org/learn/historic-places/kenneth-hahn-hall-of-administration-los-angeles-county-hall-of-administration/</p> <p>Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration / Los Angeles County Hall of</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	<p>Administration Conceived as part of the 1947 Civic Center Master Plan, the Los Angeles County Hall of Administration, along with the adjacent Los Angeles County Courthouse, were designed simultaneously by a team of noted, local architects and artists of the period.</p> <p>Paul R. Williams, Austin, Field & Fry, Stanton & Stockwell, Adrian Wilson</p> <p>The Los Angeles County Hall of Administration, along with the adjacent Los Angeles County Courthouse, were designed simultaneously by a team of noted, local architects and artists of the period. Both buildings were conceived as part of the 1947 Civic Center Master Plan, a monumental plan that transformed a large portion of Bunker Hill through the westward expansion of the Civic Center and created the east-west axis of government buildings that frame today's Grand Park.</p> <p>The County Hall of Administration was completed in 1960 and serves as the seat of the county government. Prior to its construction, the Board of Supervisors and other administrative and legal functions of the county government had been housed in the former 1911 Hall of Records. At the time of its completion, the Hall of Administration was noted for its lavishly appointed interior, which was critiqued by some at the time, including former Supervisor Kenneth Hahn. The Hall of Administration was in later years renamed in his honor.</p>
Maria Salazar	Please see attached comments.
Maria Salazar	<p>My apologies - the spacing of my letter is not showing up accurately. I tried to attach a file but it does not reflect on the public record.</p> <p>To the Honorable Board of Supervisors,</p> <p>I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed sale of the Gas Company Tower and the World Trade Center Parking Lot. There are significant concerns regarding the financial implications of this sale, the lack of transparency in the process, and the absence of a competitive bidding approach that could better serve our community.</p> <p>Lack of Transparency in Costs First and foremost, it is troubling that the county has not disclosed the comprehensive costs associated with deferred maintenance, seismic retrofits, and necessary tenant improvements for these properties. Without this critical financial information, the community cannot fully assess the implications of the sale. How can we confidently proceed with the sale of these valuable assets when we do not have a clear understanding of the ongoing expenses</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

involved? The fact that the World Trade Center has been flagged by the City of Los Angeles as a seismic hazard is concerning enough, especially given the fact that news articles reference County's staff to purchase these properties as an alternative to costly seismic retrofits of existing buildings.

Concerns Over Tax Dollar Utilization

Furthermore, it appears that the seller may be attempting to navigate around the use of tax dollars, as highlighted in the county's appraisal summary by Valbridge Property Advisors. This raises serious questions about the intentions behind the sale and the potential impact on our public finances. It is essential that we protect taxpayer interests and ensure that any decisions made are in the best long-term interests of our community.

Questionable Process and Decision-Making

It is also alarming that this proposal seems to stem from a pre-arranged plan involving commercial real estate brokers and county staff. In the commercial real estate industry, it is not standard practice to reduce fees when a property is purchased by the county or city—this typically occurs only when a buyer is already identified. The absence of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for all available county assets denies our community the opportunity for competitive bidding, which could result in better financial returns and broader community engagement.

The selection process for the Gas Company Tower appears to lack transparency and fairness. Understanding the rationale behind why this property was chosen over others is critical, especially given the current economic challenges we face. The process, as run by the County Executive, raises significant concerns that merit further investigation.

In conclusion, I urge you to halt the sale of the Gas Company Tower and the World Trade Center Parking Lot until a thorough and transparent evaluation can be conducted. It is imperative that we prioritize the interests of our community, ensure responsible financial management, and engage in a fair process that allows for competitive bidding on our public assets.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. I look forward to your discussion tomorrow, and hope you take your community's concerns to heart.

Sincerely Yours,



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	Maria Salazar
Maria Salazar	
MICHAEL J POLK	<p>Objection to the Purchase of 555 W 5th Street, Los Angeles (Gas Company Tower)</p> <p>Dear Supervisors,</p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed purchase of the property located at 555 W 5th Street, Los Angeles 90017 commonly known as the Gas Company Tower, by Los Angeles County. My objection is based on several key points related to the financial, operational, and safety implications of this acquisition.</p> <p>**1. Loss of Property Tax Revenue:**</p> <p>The Gas Company Tower is currently a privately-owned property that contributes significantly to the local tax base.</p> <p>If acquired by LA County, the property will become tax-exempt, resulting in a substantial loss of property tax revenue. This revenue is crucial for funding essential public services such as education, public safety, and infrastructure maintenance.</p> <p>**2. Possessory Interest Taxation Concerns:**</p> <p>While it is understood that leasing parts of the property to private entities could generate possessory interest taxes, this approach may not fully compensate for the loss of direct property tax revenue. The complexities and administrative burdens associated with assessing and collecting possessory interest taxes could further strain county resources.</p> <p>**3. Earthquake Performance and Safety Concerns:**</p> <p>Recent research conducted by the county has highlighted concerns regarding the earthquake performance of the Gas Company Tower. Given Los Angeles' seismic activity, it is imperative to ensure that any new acquisitions meet stringent safety standards. Additionally, the county currently owns 33 buildings that require earthquake retrofitting. Adding another potentially vulnerable building to this list could divert resources and attention from addressing existing safety priorities.</p> <p>**4. Financial Impact on County Operations:**</p> <p>The purchase and subsequent tax exemption of such a high-value property could have long-term financial repercussions for the county. It is imperative to consider whether the potential benefits of this acquisition outweigh the financial costs and the impact on the county's budget and fiscal health.</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			<p>**5. Tenant Improvements and Operational Costs:**</p> <p>Acquiring the Gas Company Tower will likely necessitate significant tenant improvements to meet the needs of county operations and new leasehold tenants. These improvements can be costly and time-consuming, potentially leading to budget overruns and delays in occupancy. The county must carefully evaluate these additional expenses and their impact on overall project feasibility.</p> <p>**6. Alternative Solutions:**</p> <p>Before proceeding with the purchase, I urge the county to explore alternative solutions that could achieve the intended goals without compromising the tax base or safety standards.</p> <p>Public-private partnerships or other collaborative models might offer a more balanced approach, allowing the county to benefit from the property while maintaining its tax contributions and ensuring safety.</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly recommend a thorough evaluation of the financial, operational, and safety impacts of this acquisition.</p> <p>It is essential to ensure that any decision made is in the best interest of the county's fiscal health and the well-being of its residents.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my objection. I look forward to your response and further discussion on this matter.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Polk Properties</p> <p>Michael J Polk</p>
		<p style="text-align: center;">Steve Smith</p>	<p>I am responding to Nella McOsker's letter. Can the Board of Supervisors have a discussion on why we should move foot traffic out of Civic Center and INTO Bunker Hill? Seems like we are playing a game of whack-a-mole without a bigger discussion of the role of government in revitalizing the Civic Center/Downtown area. Spending hundreds of millions of dollars and not having a discussion on the 33 other county buildings that desperately need structural retrofits is not a wise use of taxpayer dollars. These buildings include libraries that attract children, medical centers that serve the neediest of our county residents, and the Coroner's office. Are they moving to Gas Company Tower? Doubtful.</p> <p>Show taxpayers how this supports the previously budgeted and approved programs.</p> <p>Show us a plan.</p>

		Other	Teddy Gibson	<p>All of this just seems a bit odd. There has been little information shared about this process and the county's bigger plan for downtown. What I have read in the news and online seems like \$200,000,000 is just where it begins. When the county is finished fixing aged equipment, making necessary structural upgrades, and completes the interior fixtures and finishes, tax payers could be looking at a bill of more than a half billion dollars?</p> <p>My question is why don't we slow down and rent space while a bigger plan is put in place? A half billion dollars on a single office building seems like a bad idea and too big to sweep under the rug.</p>
		Item Total	13	
Grand Total			13	

To the Honorable Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed sale of the Gas Company Tower and the World Trade Center Parking Lot. There are significant concerns regarding the financial implications of this sale, the lack of transparency in the process, and the absence of a competitive bidding approach that could better serve our community.

Lack of Transparency in Costs

First and foremost, it is troubling that the county has not disclosed the comprehensive costs associated with deferred maintenance, seismic retrofits, and necessary tenant improvements for these properties. Without this critical financial information, the community cannot fully assess the implications of the sale. How can we confidently proceed with the sale of these valuable assets when we do not have a clear understanding of the ongoing expenses involved? The fact that the World Trade Center has been flagged by the City of Los Angeles as a seismic hazard is concerning enough, especially given the fact that news articles reference County's staff to purchase these properties as an alternative to costly seismic retrofits of existing buildings.

Concerns Over Tax Dollar Utilization

Furthermore, it appears that the seller may be attempting to navigate around the use of tax dollars, as highlighted in the county's appraisal summary by Valbridge Property Advisors. This raises serious questions about the intentions behind the sale and the potential impact on our public finances. It is essential that we protect taxpayer interests and ensure that any decisions made are in the best long-term interests of our community.

Questionable Process and Decision-Making

It is also alarming that this proposal seems to stem from a pre-arranged plan involving commercial real estate brokers and county staff. In the commercial real estate industry, it is not standard practice to reduce fees when a property is purchased by the county or city—this typically occurs only when a buyer is already identified. The absence of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for all available county assets denies our community the opportunity for competitive bidding, which could result in better financial returns and broader community engagement.

The selection process for the Gas Company Tower appears to lack transparency and fairness. Understanding the rationale behind why this property was chosen over others is critical, especially given the current economic challenges we face. The process, as run by the County Executive, raises significant concerns that merit further investigation.

In conclusion, I urge you to halt the sale of the Gas Company Tower and the World Trade Center Parking Lot until a thorough and transparent evaluation can be conducted. It is imperative that we prioritize the interests of our community, ensure responsible financial management, and engage in a fair process that allows for competitive bidding on our public assets.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. I look forward to your discussion tomorrow, and hope you take your community's concerns to heart.

Sincerely Yours,
Maria Salazar

To the Honorable Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed sale of the Gas Company Tower and the World Trade Center Parking Lot. There are significant concerns regarding the financial implications of this sale, the lack of transparency in the process, and the absence of a competitive bidding approach that could better serve our community.

Lack of Transparency in Costs

First and foremost, it is troubling that the county has not disclosed the comprehensive costs associated with deferred maintenance, seismic retrofits, and necessary tenant improvements for these properties. Without this critical financial information, the community cannot fully assess the implications of the sale. How can we confidently proceed with the sale of these valuable assets when we do not have a clear understanding of the ongoing expenses involved? The fact that the World Trade Center has been flagged by the City of Los Angeles as a seismic hazard is concerning enough, especially given the fact that news articles reference County's staff to purchase these properties as an alternative to costly seismic retrofits of existing buildings.

Concerns Over Tax Dollar Utilization

Furthermore, it appears that the seller may be attempting to navigate around the use of tax dollars, as highlighted in the county's appraisal summary by Valbridge Property Advisors. This raises serious questions about the intentions behind the sale and the potential impact on our public finances. It is essential that we protect taxpayer interests and ensure that any decisions made are in the best long-term interests of our community.

Questionable Process and Decision-Making

It is also alarming that this proposal seems to stem from a pre-arranged plan involving commercial real estate brokers and county staff. In the commercial real estate industry, it is not standard practice to reduce fees when a property is purchased by the county or city—this typically occurs only when a buyer is already identified. The absence of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for all available county assets denies our community the opportunity for competitive bidding, which could result in better financial returns and broader community engagement.

The selection process for the Gas Company Tower appears to lack transparency and fairness. Understanding the rationale behind why this property was chosen over others is critical, especially given the current economic challenges we face. The process, as run by the County Executive, raises significant concerns that merit further investigation.

In conclusion, I urge you to halt the sale of the Gas Company Tower and the World Trade Center Parking Lot until a thorough and transparent evaluation can be conducted. It is imperative that we prioritize the interests of our community, ensure responsible financial management, and engage in a fair process that allows for competitive bidding on our public assets.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. I look forward to your discussion tomorrow, and hope you take your community's concerns to heart.

Sincerely Yours,
Maria Salazar

Dear County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed purchase of the Gas Company Tower. This decision stands in stark contrast to our community's priorities as outlined in the recently approved 2024-2025 budget, particularly regarding public safety and fiscal responsibility.

The budget includes significant allocations for essential projects: \$4,646,000 earmarked for the "Countywide Seismic Assessment for County Buildings" (CP 87606) and a substantial \$62,071,000 designated for the seismic retrofits of the Hahn Hall of Administration Building (CP 87599). These initiatives are critical to ensuring the safety and integrity of our public infrastructure in the face of potential seismic events.

Investing in the Gas Company Tower, a luxury high-rise, diverts necessary resources away from pressing public safety projects that uplift our tireless county workers and community at large. It sends a concerning message about our priorities: rather than enhancing the safety of ALL county buildings (including the hazardous County Jail that has seen no measurable process per your last meeting), we are committing taxpayer funds to acquire a luxury property that serves only the privileged executive offices of this body.

The purchase of the Gas Company Tower raises questions about its alignment with the county's long-term strategic vision. Are we prepared to prioritize the acquisition of luxury, high-cost real estate over the safety of our other public assets and investments into program that serve the people? The potential risks associated with neglecting our seismic assessments and retrofitting projects are not just financial; they pose a tangible threat to the safety and well-being of our residents.

In light of these considerations, I urge you to reconsider the proposed purchase of the Gas Company Tower. Instead, we must focus our efforts and resources on fulfilling the commitments made in the 2024-2025 budget, or publicly rescinding those decisions and explaining what the plan forward is – one that serves the ENTIRE community, not just the privileged few.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter. I hope to see our county leaders prioritize the safety and welfare of our residents above all else.

Sincerely,

Alan Joseph Ray



October 7, 2024

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 383
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Item 35 – Support for Acquisition of 555 West 5th Street (Gas Company Tower)

Dear County Supervisors,

Established in 1924, Central City Association (CCA) is committed to advancing policies and projects that enhance Downtown Los Angeles' (DTLA) vibrancy and increase opportunity in the region. We are a membership organization representing over 300 members including businesses, nonprofits and trade associations that have played a leading role in transforming DTLA into a dynamic mixed-use 24/7 urban environment. We are writing in support of the County's acquisition of 555 West 5th Street, known as the Gas Company Tower.

CCA is pleased to see County government thinking strategically and acting proactively on DTLA's real estate. The Gas Company Tower is a marquee office building in DTLA in a prominent location in the middle of the Financial District. With fewer workers in offices day-to-day with the rise of remote and hybrid work, hosting government operations and services in the Gas Company Tower will help bring increased foot traffic and activity in the heart of Downtown. Moreover, it would enable the County to assess the potential of the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, including opportunities for seismic retrofit and other options that could benefit DTLA and the public.

We encourage the County to advance discussions to purchase 555 W 5th Street. Beyond this building, we are also hopeful for an all-hands-on-deck approach with our government partners to find solutions—including adaptive reuse incentives—for other challenged office buildings to bolster the economic vitality of our city center. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Nella McOsker
President & CEO
Central City Association

To the Honorable Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed sale of the Gas Company Tower and the World Trade Center Parking Lot. There are significant concerns regarding the financial implications of this sale, the lack of transparency in the process, and the absence of a competitive bidding approach that could better serve our community.

Lack of Transparency in Costs

First and foremost, it is troubling that the county has not disclosed the comprehensive costs associated with deferred maintenance, seismic retrofits, and necessary tenant improvements for these properties. Without this critical financial information, the community cannot fully assess the implications of the sale. How can we confidently proceed with the sale of these valuable assets when we do not have a clear understanding of the ongoing expenses involved? The fact that the World Trade Center has been flagged by the City of Los Angeles as a seismic hazard is concerning enough, especially given the fact that news articles reference County's staff to purchase these properties as an alternative to costly seismic retrofits of existing buildings.

Concerns Over Tax Dollar Utilization

Furthermore, it appears that the seller may be attempting to navigate around the use of tax dollars, as highlighted in the county's appraisal summary by Valbridge Property Advisors. This raises serious questions about the intentions behind the sale and the potential impact on our public finances. It is essential that we protect taxpayer interests and ensure that any decisions made are in the best long-term interests of our community.

Questionable Process and Decision-Making

It is also alarming that this proposal seems to stem from a pre-arranged plan involving commercial real estate brokers and county staff. In the commercial real estate industry, it is not standard practice to reduce fees when a property is purchased by the county or city—this typically occurs only when a buyer is already identified. The absence of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for all available county assets denies our community the opportunity for competitive bidding, which could result in better financial returns and broader community engagement.

The selection process for the Gas Company Tower appears to lack transparency and fairness. Understanding the rationale behind why this property was chosen over others is critical, especially given the current economic challenges we face. The process, as run by the County Executive, raises significant concerns that merit further investigation.

In conclusion, I urge you to halt the sale of the Gas Company Tower and the World Trade Center Parking Lot until a thorough and transparent evaluation can be conducted. It is imperative that we prioritize the interests of our community, ensure responsible financial management, and engage in a fair process that allows for competitive bidding on our public assets.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. I look forward to your discussion tomorrow, and hope you take your community's concerns to heart.

Sincerely Yours,
Maria Salazar

Dear County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed purchase of the Gas Company Tower. This decision stands in stark contrast to our community's priorities as outlined in the recently approved 2024-2025 budget, particularly regarding public safety and fiscal responsibility.

The budget includes significant allocations for essential projects: \$4,646,000 earmarked for the "Countywide Seismic Assessment for County Buildings" (CP 87606) and a substantial \$62,071,000 designated for the seismic retrofits of the Hahn Hall of Administration Building (CP 87599). These initiatives are critical to ensuring the safety and integrity of our public infrastructure in the face of potential seismic events.

Investing in the Gas Company Tower, a luxury high-rise, diverts necessary resources away from pressing public safety projects that uplift our tireless county workers and community at large. It sends a concerning message about our priorities: rather than enhancing the safety of ALL county buildings (including the hazardous County Jail that has seen no measurable process per your last meeting), we are committing taxpayer funds to acquire a luxury property that serves only the privileged executive offices of this body.

The purchase of the Gas Company Tower raises questions about its alignment with the county's long-term strategic vision. Are we prepared to prioritize the acquisition of luxury, high-cost real estate over the safety of our other public assets and investments into program that serve the people? The potential risks associated with neglecting our seismic assessments and retrofiting projects are not just financial; they pose a tangible threat to the safety and well-being of our residents.

In light of these considerations, I urge you to reconsider the proposed purchase of the Gas Company Tower. Instead, we must focus our efforts and resources on fulfilling the commitments made in the 2024-2025 budget, or publicly rescinding those decisions and explaining what the plan forward is – one that serves the ENTIRE community, not just the privileged few.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter. I hope to see our county leaders prioritize the safety and welfare of our residents above all else.

Sincerely,

Alan Joseph Ray

Stephanie Mardesich
Deborah Mardesich
2205 W. 25th Street, Unit 3 ~ San Pedro, California 90732
Telephone: 310/519-0756

October 7, 2024

Los Angeles County (LAC) Board of Supervisors
Kathryn Barger, District 5
Janice Hahn, District 4
Lindsay Horvath, District 3
Holly J. Mitchell, District 2
Hilda Solis, District 1

Via email to staff representatives

Re: Opposition /Protest Agenda item 35 October 8 board meeting Approval of the Publication of a Notice of Intention for County to Purchase Properties Located in Los Angeles Item 35.

Recommendation: Approve a Notice of Intention to purchase approximately a 1,500,000 sq ft, 54-story commercial office building located at 555 West 5th Street in Los Angeles, and airspace parcels located at 335 South Flower Street in Los Angeles (Property), from Wilmington Trust, National Association, as Trustee for the Benefit of the Registered Holders of GCT Commercial Mortgage Trust 2021-GCT, Commercial Mortgage Pass-Through Certificates, Series 2021-GCT (Seller), for a purchase price not to exceed \$200,000,000, including \$100 as independent consideration, and identifies the Property and the Seller; advertise and set November 6, 2024 to receive comments and consummate the proposed acquisition of the Property; and find that the proposed actions are not a project under the California Environmental Quality Act. (24-4494)

To the LAC Board of Supervisors:

We are not able to attend the meeting October 8 nor telephone so we are submitting comments in writing.

It came to our attention only yesterday, Sunday, October 6, that the future of the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration (HOA) is in jeopardy. Apparently there is allegedly some potential real estate “deal” that could cost the LAC tax payers \$56 million and the historic esteemed HOA with all Supervisors and staff possibly moved from the venerable building. This is a heinous notion and totally disrespects the history of the building, the dauntless efforts of staff over the decades, the public access to the beautifully designed (Paul A. Williams, architect) building that is deeply entrenched in Los Angeles history and culture; and location with regard to City Hall and all of the surrounding public buildings is inherent .

The Item 35 description from the agenda is deceptive and the opposite of the buzz word of the day “transparent”. Who has fostered and promoted this idea, some real estate agent who will earn a very large commission? Why have the people not been informed.

This is an act of heresy and should absolutely not be approved. There needs to be a through vetting and reveal of what is intended and a “cease and desist” for any action until then.

Cordially,
Stephanie Mardesich
Deborah Mardesich
Constituents and property owners District 4