

From: Veronica Lebron <Veronica@robertsilversteinlaw.com>
Sent time: 10/15/2020 04:48:14 PM
To: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; jeanne.min@lacity.org; mindy.nguyen@lacity.org; vince.bertoni@lacity.org
Cc: Dan Wright <Dan@robertsilversteinlaw.com>; Esther Kornfeld <Esther@robertsilversteinlaw.com>; Robert Silverstein <Robert@robertsilversteinlaw.com>
Subject: The Silverstein Law Firm | California Public Records Act Requests re the Hollywood Center Project; Case Nos. ENV-2018-2116-EIR, CPC-2018-2114-DB-MCUP-SPR, CPC-2018-2115-DA, and VTT-82152 ; SCH 2018051002
Attachments: 10-15-20 [SCAN] CPRA Request to CD 13 (O'Farrell) re 10-11-20 CD 13 Letter.PDF

All: Please see attached. Please confirm receipt.

Ms. Nguyen: Please include the attached and all responses into the record of the above-referenced matter. Thank you.

Veronica Lebron
The Silverstein Law Firm, APC
215 North Marengo Avenue, 3rd Floor
Pasadena, CA 91101-1504
Telephone: (626) 449-4200
Facsimile: (626) 449-4205
Email: Veronica@RobertSilversteinLaw.com
Website: www.RobertSilversteinLaw.com

=====
The information contained in this electronic mail message is confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above, and may be privileged. The information herein may also be protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC Sections 2510-2521. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone (626-449-4200), and delete the original message. Thank you.

=====

THE SILVERSTEIN LAW FIRM

A Professional Corporation

215 NORTH MARENGO AVENUE, 3RD FLOOR
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91101-1504

PHONE: (626) 449-4200 FAX: (626) 449-4205

ROBERT@ROBERTSILVERSTEINLAW.COM
WWW.ROBERTSILVERSTEINLAW.COM

October 15, 2020

VIA EMAIL

councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org

jeanne.min@lacity.org

Mitch O'Farrell, Councilmember
Jeanne Min, Chief of Staff
Council District 13
200 N. Spring St., Room 480
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: California Public Records Act Requests re the Hollywood Center Project;
Case Nos. ENV-2018-2116-EIR, CPC-2018-2114-DB-MCUP-SPR,
CPC-2018-2115-DA, and VTT-82152 ; SCH 2018051002

Dear Councilmember O'Farrell:

Please include this letter and your responses in the Hollywood Center running administrative record.

We request that the Hollywood Center Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") process **not** be completed, and that no Final EIR be scheduled for certification, until the City has produced all of the documents requested herein, and we have had reasonable time to review them following complete production.

These requests are made under the California Public Records Act pursuant to Government Code § 6250, et seq. Please provide copies of the following from the City (as "City" is defined below).

For ease of reference in this document, please refer to the following **defined terms**:

The "City" shall refer to the City of Los Angeles, its City Council, the Mayor and all members of the City Council, including Councilman Mitch O'Farrell, his Council District 13 office, staff and employees, all members, officials, employees,

Mitch O'Farrell, Councilmember
Council District 13
October 15, 2020
Page 2

consultants and agents of the City commissions, boards, offices, departments, divisions, the City Attorney's office and any and all in-house and outside counsel for the City.

"Project" shall refer to the "Hollywood Center Project", Environmental Case No. ENV-2018-2116-EIR, State Clearinghouse No. 2018051002, and generally located on, at or near 1720-1770 North Vine Street, 1746-1760 North Ivar Avenue, 1733 and 1741 Argyle Avenue, and 6236, 6270, and 6334 West Yucca Street, Los Angeles, CA 90028.

"CGS" shall refer to the California Geological Survey, all members, officials, employees, consultants, and agents, and any and all in-house and outside counsel retained by CGS.

"Developer" shall refer to any principal, owner, employee, agent, consultant or attorney representing the owners or applicants of the Hollywood Center project site, including but not limited to MCAF Vine LLC, 1750 North Vine LLC, 1749 North Vine Street LLC, 1770 Ivar LLC, 1733 North Argyle LLC, and 1720 North Vine LLC, and any of their members, partners, employees, agents, consultants and/or lobbyists, including but not limited to:

(a) Millennium Partners, Millennium Hollywood Partners, Argent Ventures, and all principals, officers, partners, members, employees, attorneys, agents and/or consultants of such firms, including but not limited to Christopher Jeffries, Philip Aarons, Mario Palumbo, Phillip Lovett, Michael Gargano.

(b) Platinum Advisors, LLC, and their officers, partners, members, employees, attorneys, agents and/or consultants, including but not limited to Darius Anderson, Tim Lynch, Martha Miller, Beau C. Biller, Marisol Lopez, Joseph Devine, Charles Fina, Nick Garcia, Brian Lungren, Danny Offer, Steven Wallauch, and Kelly Hitt.

(c) Marathon Communications, and their officers, partners, members, employees, attorneys, agents and/or consultants.

(d) Attorneys for MCAF Vine LLC and/or related entities noted above, including Millennium Partners, and including the law firm of Sheppard, Mullin, including but not limited to Jerold/Jerry Neuman, Alfred Fraijo and

Mitch O'Farrell, Councilmember
Council District 13
October 15, 2020
Page 3

Jeremy Chan, the law firm of Cox, Castle & Nicholson, including but not limited to David Waite, Michael Zischke, and Alexander DeGood, the Liner Law Firm, the law firm of Mayer Brown, including but not limited to Edgar Khalatian and Jeremy Chan.

(e) All consultants for MCAF Vine LLC and/or related entities noted above, including Millennium Partners, and including but not limited to Group Delta and Michael Reader.

“Email” includes, but is not limited to, correspondence to or from any email account through which any City business is being conducted, including but not limited to email accounts assigned by the City’s Information Technology Agency to City officials, employees or consultants, and consistent with City of San Jose v. Superior Court of Santa Clara County, each and every personal email account outside the City’s email system upon which any City business has been conducted.

“Text messages” includes, but is not limited to, correspondence to or from any communications device of the City or a City official, employee or consultant’s personal communications device over which text messages may have been sent or received and stored which are City business.

“Meeting Notes” includes, but is not limited to any personal handwritten or electronic notes maintained by any City employee, contractor, or agent, regardless of the ownership of the media.

“Exchanged between” shall mean the passing of a document from one person to another by any means of transmission or delivery.

“Document,” as defined in Govt. Code § 6252(g), shall mean any handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing, photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail, message texting or facsimile, and every other means of recording upon any tangible thing any form of communication or representation, including letters, words, pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless of the manner in which the record has been stored.

Mitch O'Farrell, Councilmember
Council District 13
October 15, 2020
Page 4

“Working files” includes, but is not limited to, any paper or electronic file maintained by any official or employee of your office related to the Project such as a desk reference folder containing documents related to the Project, or an electronic file stored on a personal computer, laptop, internet cloud account, or City shared server location holding any documents related to the Project at the time of this request. Under no circumstances may the City delete, destroy or spoliolate any working file which is the subject of this request, and anticipated to contain records relevant to any future litigation filed over the Project.

Please note that Documents and Emails includes, but is not limited to, correspondence to or from any email account through which any public business is conducted, including but not limited to **personal or otherwise private email accounts belonging to government officials, employees or consultants**, pursuant to the California Supreme Court’s decision in City of San Jose v. Superior Court (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608. This also includes text messages on any public or private device on which discussions about the Project and other public matters was discussed. **Please ensure that you have secured and produced all such personal or otherwise private emails and texts.** Therefore, we are also requesting that all relevant officials, employees and agents **preserve intact under a litigation hold** all such “personal” and official emails and text messages, and not to destroy, delete, allow to be automatically purged, or otherwise to engage in or permit spoliation of such evidence. To the extent that such emails or texts have been deleted, purged or otherwise spoliolate, we demand that the holders of these devices immediately be informed that they must take all efforts to retrieve any deleted or otherwise purged emails and texts, and make all efforts to retrieve and preserve them. **Please confirm that you will do so.**

The public records requests include:

- (1) All documents from September 1, 2020 through the date of your compliance with this request which refer, relate to, or have informed the statement in Councilman O'Farrell's October 11, 2020 letter (attached at **Exhibit 1**) that “[a]dditional seismic review should occur before this project advances any further in the entitlement process”, including but not limited to any and all staff reports, including drafts and documents in “working files,” studies, photographs, memoranda and internal memoranda, agenda items, agenda statements, correspondence, emails, attachments to emails, texts, notes, photos, and audio and/or video recordings, and further including but not limited to all documents and communications with other

Mitch O'Farrell, Councilmember
Council District 13
October 15, 2020
Page 5

agencies and officials and personnel of those other agencies, including but not limited to the California Geological Survey.

Please note that communications between the City and the Developer, and/or their respective counsel, are not privileged and must be produced. Citizens for Ceres v. Superior Court (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 889, 922. Accordingly, you may not withhold from the Project's administrative record, delete or otherwise destroy or spoliage any documents exchanged between, among, to/from or including the City and the Developer or their respective counsel.¹ **If you disagree with this proposition, please promptly provide any legal grounds for your position that any documents exchanged between the City and Developer (both as broadly defined above) are or could be privileged and not required to be included in the administrative record. Please also describe with specificity the categories of such documents you claim would be subject to any privilege or exemption to production.**

I draw your attention to Government Code § 6253.1, which requires a public agency to assist the public in making a focused and effective request by: (1) identifying records and information responsive to the request; (2) describing the information technology and physical location of the records; and (3) providing suggestions for overcoming any practical basis for denying access to the records or information sought.

If you determine that any information is exempt from disclosure, I ask that you reconsider that determination in view of Proposition 59 which amended the State Constitution to require that all exemptions be "narrowly construed." Proposition 59 may modify or overturn authorities on which the City has relied in the past.

If you determine that any requested records are subject to a still-valid exemption, I request that you exercise its discretion to disclose some or all of the records notwithstanding the exemption and with respect to records containing both exempt and non-exempt content, you redact the exempt content and disclose the rest. Should you deny any part of this request, you are required to provide a written response describing

¹ This principle and admonition applies to ALL documents and communications between the City, as broadly defined above, and the Developer, as broadly defined above. No pre-Project-approval documents to, from, between, among, or including them may be withheld. This applies to all of the requests contained in this letter. Please confirm that you are not withholding or redacting any such documents and/or communications, or parts of such documents and/or communications.

Mitch O'Farrell, Councilmember
Council District 13
October 15, 2020
Page 6

the legal authority on which you rely.

Please be advised that Government Code § 6253(c) states in pertinent part that the agency “shall promptly notify the person making the request of the determination **and the reasons therefore.**” (Emphasis added.) Section 6253(d) further states that nothing in this chapter “shall be construed to permit an agency to delay or obstruct the inspection or copying of public records. The **notification of denial** of any request for records required by Section 6255 shall set forth the names and titles or positions of each person responsible for the denial.”

Additionally, Government Code § 6255(a) states that the “agency shall justify withholding **any record by demonstrating that the record in question** is exempt under expressed provisions of this chapter or that on the facts of the particular case the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record.” (Emphasis added.) This provision makes clear that the agency is required to justify withholding any record **with particularity as to “the record in question.”** (Emphasis added.)

Please clearly state in writing pursuant to Section 6255(b): (1) if you are withholding any documents; (2) if you are redacting any documents; (3) what documents you are so withholding and/or redacting; and (4) the alleged legal bases for withholding and/or redacting as to the particular documents. It should also be noted that to the extent documents are being withheld, should those documents also contain material that is not subject to any applicable exemption to disclosure, then the disclosable portions of the documents must be segregated and produced.

Govt. Code § 6253.9(a) requires that the agency provide documents in their native format, when requested. Pursuant to that code section, please also provide the requested documents, including all applications, in their native and electronic format.

We request that you preserve intact all documents and computer communications and attachments thereto, including but not limited to all emails and computer files, wherever originated, received or copied, regarding the subject matter of the above-referenced cases, including archives thereof preserved on tape, hard drive, disc, or any other archival medium, and including also any printouts, blowbacks, or other reproduction of any such computer communications. Pursuant to, *inter alia*, Pub. Res. Code Section 21167.6(e), the documents requested herein must be retained – notwithstanding any contrary City document or email retention policies.

Mitch O'Farrell, Councilmember
Council District 13
October 15, 2020
Page 7

If the documents exist in electronic form, we ask that you provide copies on a disk or flashdrive at cost. For any non-electronic documents, if the copy costs for those documents do not exceed \$500, please make the copies and bill this office. If the copy costs exceed \$500, please contact me in advance to arrange a time and place where we can inspect the records. However, in light of COVID, and consistent with the remote/electronic/telephonic protocols that have been imposed on the public by the City, we ask that as to any documents (should there be any) that are only in paper form, that all such documents also be made available electronically.

As required by Government Code § 6253, please respond to this request within ten days. Because I am emailing this request on October 15, 2020, please ensure that your response is provided to me by no later than **October 25, 2020**. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Robert Silverstein

ROBERT P. SILVERSTEIN

FOR

THE SILVERSTEIN LAW FIRM, APC

RPS:vl

Encls.

Cc: Vince Bertoni, Planning Director (via email vince.bertoni@lacity.org)
Mindy Nguyen, City Planner (via email mindy.nguyen@lacity.org)

The Silverstein Law Firm

October 15, 2020

**California Public Records Act Requests re the Hollywood Center
Project; Case Nos. ENV-2018-2116-EIR, CPC-2018-2114-DB-MCUP-
SPR, CPC-2018-2115-DA, and VTT-82152; SCH 2018051002**

EXHIBIT 1



COUNCILMEMBER
MITCH O'FARRELL
LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL ★ 13TH DISTRICT

October 11, 2020

Ms. Samantha Millman, President
Los Angeles City Planning Commission
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring Street, 5th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Commissioner Millman:

I hope this letter finds you, your family and fellow commissioners healthy and safe!

I am requesting that the City Planning Commission continue the Hollywood Center Project (CPC-2018-2114-DB-CU-MCUP-SPR / CPC-2018-2115-DA) to a date uncertain at its October 15th meeting. Additional seismic review should occur before this project advances any further in the entitlement process.

Thank you for your consideration.

With kind regards,

MITCH O'FARRELL
Councilmember, 13th District
City of Los Angeles
Los Angeles City Council

CC: Los Angeles City Planning Commission
Vince Bertoni, Director, Department of City Planning