Spertus, Landes & Umhofer, LLP TELEPHONE 310-826-4700; FACSIMILE 310-826-4711

Case No. 2:20-cv-02291 DOC (KES) STATEMENT IN RESPONSE TO LACAN AND LACW'S EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR INTERVENTION AND Date: March 19, 2020 Ctrm: 350 W. 1st Street Los Angeles, CA 90012 Courtroom 1 TO THE HONORABLE COURT, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR Plaintiffs hereby submit the following memorandum in response to Los Angeles Community Action Network ("LA CAN") and Los Angeles Catholic Worker ("LACW")'s ex parte application for intervention and appearance: STATEMENT IN RESPONSE TO LACAN AND LACW'S EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR INTERVENTION AND APPEARANCE

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The LA Alliance for Human Rights is a broad-based coalition of stakeholders who understand that our homeless crisis requires urgent and dramatic action. The Alliance includes non-profits, service providers, small business owners, residents, and community members who are saddened by the suffering on our streets and fed up with excuses about the status quo.

Homelessness in Los Angeles is a tragic and deteriorating crisis. There are thousands of people living on our streets in medieval conditions. The City, County, and State are expending record amounts to address homelessness, but progress is incremental at best. City leaders face the challenges of out-of-date state laws, legal settlements and decisions that limit their options (including the *Mitchell* settlement), and neighborhoods that are skeptical about how this crisis is impacting their well-being. These obstacles cannot be excuses when so many lives—and the future of the City and County—are at stake. The City and County must act with urgency and imagination to address this crisis immediately.

Plaintiffs support and stand with any organization advocating for bringing our unsheltered neighbors inside in an expeditious and economically feasible manner. Intervenors LA CAN and LACW have a proven track record of fighting for and winning, either through court order or capitulation by the City, limitations on enforcement of certain quality-of-life laws, such as prohibiting sleeping on the sidewalk or limiting the amount of property accumulated by a person in a public area. These orders and settlements have ended certain enforcement practices but have triggered unintended consequences that ultimately have made things worse in Skid Row and elsewhere.1

¹ See, e.g. The Times Editorial Board, Editorial: A court decision letting homeless people keep all their belongings helps no one, Los Angeles Times (May 31, 2019, 3:10 AM), https://www.latimes.com/opinion/editorials/la-ed-mitchell-homeless-settlement-20190531-story.html_("But the sidewalks of skid row, already crowded with thousands of homeless people, are also inundated with their bags, tents, shorping corts and trash. A decision that sats no limits on those bags, tents, shopping carts and trash. A decision that sets no limits on those belongings isn't helping anyone — not homeless people crammed together on

1	Plaintiffs do not seek to invalidate <i>Mitchell</i> , and this this case is not about
2	Mitchell—this case is about the common ground in the homelessness crisis:
3	sheltering the unsheltered. Plaintiffs seek thousands of beds immediately in order
4	to put an end to the status quo of human beings living and dying on the streets.
5	Plaintiffs stand ready and willing to work with all stakeholders to reach a swift
6	agreement so solutions may begin.
7	
8	Dated: March 18, 2020 /s/ Matthew Donald Umhofer
9	SPERTUS, LANDES & UMHOFER, LLP Matthew Donald Umhofer (SBN 206607)
10	Elizabeth A. Mitchell (SBN 251139)
11	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	these streets and not the downtown residents and workers who must threed their
28	these streets and not the downtown residents and workers who must thread their way through grimy streets choked with tent encampments.").

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 617 West 7th Street, Suite 200, Los Angeles, CA 90017.

On March 18, 2020, I served the foregoing document described as:

STATEMENT IN RESPONSE TO LACAN AND LACW'S EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR INTERVENTION AND APPEARANCE

on the interested parties in this action, addressed as follows:

County of Los Angeles c/o Lawrence Hafetz 500 W. Temple Street, 6th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90012 Telephone: 213-974-7546 lhafetz@counsel.lacounty.gov

[X] ELECTRONIC MAIL: I personally transmitted to the person(s) named in the attached service list. who has/have previously consented in writing to receive documents via electronic mail to the e-mail address(es) shown on the service list, delivered on the date listed below, originating from an electronic e-mail address affiliated with Spertus, Landes & Umhofer. A true and correct copy of the above-described document(s) was transmitted by electronic transmission through the Spertus, Landes & Umhofer LLP mail server, which did not report any error in sending the transmission.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of American and the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on March 18, 2020 at Los Angeles, California.

Jon E. Powell