September 14, 2026

SENT VIA USPS PRIORITY MAIL AND EMAIL

Ana Maria Quintana, Mayor
Email: amquintana@Cityofbell.gov
Michael L. Antwine, City Manager
Email: mantwine@Cityofbell.org
Javier Ochiqui, Assistant City Manager
Email: jochiqui@Cityofbell.org
Angela Bustamante, City Clerk
Email: abustamante@Cityofbell.gov
City of Bell City Council
Bell Community Housing Authority,
6330 Pine Ave, Bell, CA 90201

Re: Preliminary Comments on Bell Mobile Home Park Relocation Impact Report dated July 2026 (Released August 5, 2026).

Dear Mayor, City Manager, Assistant City Manager, and City Council:

The Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles ("LAFLA") and the Public Interest Law Project ("PILP") represent Unidos por Bell Mobile Home Park ("Unidos"), an unincorporated association of residents of the Bell Mobile Home Park located at 4874 E Gage Ave, Bell, CA 90210. Unidos members are united in their advocacy before the City of Bell ("City") and the Bell Community Housing Authority ("BCHA") to preserve their homes, protect their rights, and ensure long-term stability for their community.

On behalf of Unidos, we submit these preliminary comments regarding the Relocation Impact Report ("RIR"), released on August 5, 2026, for the proposed closure of Bell Mobile Home Park. Unidos has serious concerns regarding the RIR. On behalf of Unidos, we urge that BCHA and the City not to approve this RIR or otherwise proceed with efforts to close the Bell Mobile Home Park until BCHA remedies the deficiencies discussed below and considers less harmful alternatives to closing the park.

449 15th Street, Suite 301
Oakland, California 94612
Telephone: (510) 891-9794
Fax: (510) 891-9727
www.pilpca.org

7000 S. Broadway
Los Angeles, CA 90003
213-640-3950
213-640-3988 fax
www.lafla.org

Sincerely,

Brenda Martin
Attorney
Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles

Melissa A. Morris
Staff Attorney
Public Interest Law Project

cc: OPC (via email only: mharry@gftinc.com and eAbrica@gftinc.com)

Table of Contents

EXHIBIT LIST

1	LAFLA/PILP Letter on behalf of Unidos por Bell to BCHA dated Aug. 21, 2026
2	Robert A. Rizzo, Memorandum, February 21, 1995
3	Excerpts Memorandum Approval of Three Resolution of BCHA declaring public need and necessity dated April 17, 1995
4	BCHA Resolution No. 95-23 HA
5	BCHA Resolution No. 95-42 HA
6	BCHA Resolution No. 95-25 HA
7	Minutes from June 26, 1995, Joint Meeting of the Bell City Council, Bell Community Redevelopment Agency, Bell Community Housing Authority, and Bell Public Finance Authority
8	BCHA Resolution 95-37 HA
9	BCHA Resolution 95-38 HA
10	Bell Community Redevelopment Agency Resolution 95-41 CRA
11	Bell City Council Resolution 95-46
12	1995A and 1995 Bonds
13	BCHA Resolution No. 2005-37
14	2005 Revenue Bonds
15	October 1, 2005, Lease and Sublease Agreements
16	October 1, 2005, Indenture
17	Bell Mobile Home Park Relocation Impact Report dated Nov. 24, 2020
18	California Center Cooperative Development (CCCD) emails to City of Bell, 2019-2022
19	Agenda Packet Meeting November 1, 2021
20	UCI Community Economic Development Clinic (UCI) letter to City of Bell dated April 5, 2023
21	CCCD letter to the City of Bell, sent August 4, 2022
22	City of Bell Letter to HCD, dated February 5, 2025
23	Surplus Land Act Letter, dated June 10, 2024
24	Email from CCCD sent to City of Bell re Community Surveys, April 22, 2026
25	Los Angeles County Supervisor Janice Han Letter to the City Mayor of Bell dated, January 21, 2026
26	Senator Lena Gonzalez, Social Media Facebook post, dated December 01, 2025
27	LAFLA/PILP letter sent on behalf La Union to the City of Bell, dated December 11, 2025
28	Email from the City Denying Relocation Assistance and Posted Notice Prohibiting sale of Mobilehomes
29	LAFLA/PILP Letter sent on behalf of La Union to the City of Bell, dated May 22, 2026
30	Excerpt of State of Los Angeles County Housing and Neighborhoods 2026, by USC Lusk Center for Real Estate
31	Excerpt of Pre-Certified Local Housing Data for Bell 2021, p. 10

32	Mobilehomes Search for the City of Bell from HCD website, last visited Sept. 9, 2026
33	Appraisal letter where Mobilehome is valued as TBD, dated March 31, 2026
34	Resident Appraisals
35	60-Day Notice of Public Hearing dated Aug. 5, 2026
36	Resolutions 2012-15 and 2012-17
37	HCD's Letter of Technical Assistance re: Mobilehome Parks - Protection from Conversion, dated Nov. 18, 2024
38	LCD Letter of Interest
39	SLA Compliance Letter from City of Bell to HCD
40	Email from City of Bell to Kosmont Company
41	City of Bell Flyer
42	Notices from City of Bell prohibiting Sales of Mobilehomes
43	City of Bell's 2021-2029 Housing Element

I. Introduction

Bell Community Housing Authority (BCHA) and the City of Bell seek to close Bell Mobile Home Park, home to 115 Bell families and a critical source of deeply affordable housing in the City of Bell. Any conversion of this publicly owned Mobile Home Park to another use would be subject to a variety of state laws requiring BCHA to compensate resident homeowners for the loss of their homes, provide relocation assistance, and replace demolished housing units.

Previously, Unidos por Bell Mobile Home Park ("Unidos") sent a letter dated August 21, 2026, to the City and BCHA; the letter explained how the City's contractor OPC had developed the RIR without the legally required resident and community participation, and how the City and BCHA have failed to comply with a variety of laws regarding adequate notice and compensation to residents. (Exhibit 1: LAFLA/PILP Letter on behalf of Unidos por Bell to BCHA dated Aug. 21, 2026). Due to these deficiencies, Unidos requested that the hearing noticed for October 14, 2026, in front of BCHA Board, be postponed. However, as of this writing, the City and BCHA have not responded to Unidos' letter, nor have they addressed the identified deficiencies and concerns. The approval of the RIR by BCHA board and/or Bell City Council[1] would be illegal on a number of grounds, many of which are discussed in greater detail below, and it would expose BCHA and the City to potential liability. The mitigation measures outlined in the RIR are inadequate to allow displaced residents to relocate to comparable replacement housing, and they fall far short of BCHA's state law obligations both as a public entity and as a mobilehome park owner. Further, the proposed closure of Bell Mobile Home Park would cause a disproportionate displacement of seniors, people with disabilities, and lower-income households and would materially contribute to the shortage of affordable housing in the City of Bell. As such, approval of the RIR would violate federal and state fair housing laws and would be inconsistent with both the City's Housing Element and its duty to affirmatively further fair housing.

Unidos urges BCHA board and the Bell City Council to reject the RIR and requests, again, that BCHA and the City halt their efforts to close the Park. Rather than continuing to expend public resources on a flawed and discriminatory closure, BCHA and the City should work with residents, reputable nonprofits, and other interested stakeholders to explore a preservation purchase of the Park that would allow over 100 families to remain in their homes and preserve the Park as a source of long-term affordable housing for the Bell community.

II. Summary of Relevant Facts

a. Profile of the Bell Mobile Home Park and its Residents.

Bell Mobile Home Park is a long-established residential community on approximately 8.56 acres, with 15 mobilehome spaces, 115 of which were occupied as of December 2025.

[1] City documents are inconsistent as to whether October 14, 2026, hearing will be before the City Council, the BCHA Board, or both.

Many of the Park's homeowner families have lived in their homes for 40 years or more. The resident population includes families with children, seniors, and people with disabilities; all or nearly all households are lower-income. According to the RIR, among the 59 households interviewed, there were 122 adults and 58 children, including 46 known seniors and 34 residents who reported disabilities. Most interviewed households are Spanish-speaking, and the RIR notes that many residents are elderly, disabled, and/or living on fixed incomes. Of the households for which income information was reported, 30 were Extremely Low Income, meaning their household income is less than 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI), 11 were Very Low Income (less than 50% of AMI), and 5 were Low Income (80% AMI). None of the households interviewed had an income above 80% of Area Median Income. The RIR also identified income as unknown for 69 households, reflecting the incomplete information available for the Park's full population. (RIR, p. 6–8.)

The RIR further documents the residents' longstanding ties to the Park and the surrounding community. The interviewed households had lived in the Park for an average of 21 years, with some residents having lived there for as long as 61 years. Many residents expressed a need to remain near medical facilities, family, schools, and employment, and residents with disabilities reported concerns about finding accessible replacement housing. These facts demonstrate that displacement would affect more than residents' physical location; it could disrupt established family, healthcare, educational, employment, and community support networks. (See RIR, p. 8, 12.)

Monthly space rents range from $492.83 to $800, with an average rent of $613.81. These relatively low rents provide a rare and critical supply of deeply affordable housing in a region where replacement options are significantly more costly. (RIR, p. 5–8, 11–13.)

The RIR identifies the loss of affordable housing as the residents' primary concern. It recognizes that finding replacement spaces for older mobilehomes will be challenging to impossible and that residents will almost certainly face substantially higher housing costs if required to move to another park or conventional rental housing. The RIR also identifies accessibility needs and the financial limitations of many residents. Taken together, these facts demonstrate that closure of Bell Mobile Home Park would displace a community that relies on the Park not only for affordable housing, but also for stability, accessibility, and proximity to essential family and community resources. (RIR, p. 12–13.)

b. <u>The acquisition, ownership, and financing of the Bell Mobile Home Park.</u>

Bell Mobile Home Park is one of two mobilehome parks owned by BCHA. (The second is Florence Village Mobile Home Park.) The City established BCHA by Resolution No. 95-14 on February 21, 1995, pursuant to the state Housing Authorities Law (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 34310 – 34335) to address the shortage of affordable, safe, and sanitary housing available to low-income people in the City. (Exhibit 2: Robert A. Rizzo, Memorandum, February 21, 1995, (declaring a need for BCHA)). In addition to its role as a housing authority for the City, BCHA also serves as the housing successor agency to the former Bell Community Redevelopment Agency ("Redevelopment Agency").

In 1995, BCHA acquired the Bell Mobile Home Park, Del Rio Mobile Home Park, and Mizpah Mobile Home Park[2] as part of the Mobilehome Parks Acquisition Project. The acquisition was undertaken to increase and provide low-income housing and was expressly found to be in the public interest and necessary to promote the public good. (Exhibit 3: Excerpts of Memorandum approval of three BCHA resolutions declaring public need and necessity dated April 17, 1995). To finance the purchase and operation of the parks, BCHA issued two revenue bonds; it also used tax increment financing pursuant to a Housing Assistance Pledge Agreement[3] among BCHA, the City of Bell, and the Redevelopment Agency. (See, e.g., Exhibit 4: BCHA Resolution No. 95-23 HA; Exhibit 5: BCHA Resolution No. 95-42 HA; Exhibit 6: BCHA Resolution No. 95-25 HA; Exhibit 7, Minutes from June 26, 1995, Joint Meeting of the Bell City Council, Bell Community Redevelopment Agency, Bell Community Housing Authority, and Bell Public Finance Authority; Exhibit 8: BCHA Resolution No. 95-37 HA; Exhibit 9: BCHA Resolution 95-38 HA; Exhibit 10: Bell Community Redevelopment Agency Resolution 95-41 CRA; Exhibit 11: Bell City Council Resolution No. 95-46; Exhibit 12: Bond1995A and Bond 1995B.)

In 2005, BCHA refinanced the outstanding bond debt associated with the acquisition by issuing housing revenue bonds secured by Bell Mobile Home Park, Florence Village Mobile Home Park and other public properties. (Exhibit 13: BCHA Resolution No. 2005-37.) The stated purpose of the refinancing was to preserve and improve low- and moderate-income housing in the City. (Exhibit 14: 2005 Revenue Bonds.) The 2005 bonds replaced the outstanding 1995 bonds and related housing revenue notes, and BCHA and the City established a new lease and sublease structure governing the parks. (Exhibit 15: October 1, 2005, Lease and Sublease Agreements) Under that structure, revenues associated with the parks support the lease payments used to service the bonds. (Exhibit 16: October 1, 2005 Indenture.)

The 2005 bonds remain outstanding, with the final payment scheduled for 2036. (Exhibit 14: 2005 Revenue Bonds.) The lease and sublease agreements also place ongoing responsibilities and duties on BCHA for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the mobile home parks. (BCHA's continuing obligations under these agreements, together with the financing structure established for the acquisition and refinancing of the parks, reflect the public and affordable housing purpose. (Exhibit 15: October 1, 2005, Lease and Sublease Agreements.)

---

[2] Mizpah and Del Rio were later combined to form the park that is now Florence Village.

[3] The Housing Assistance Pledge Agreement is referenced in multiple City, BCHA, and Redevelopment Agency documents but is not available on the City's online public archive. Counsel for Unidos have requested a copy of the agreement from the City on multiple occasions, but the City has not provided it.

c. <u>The 2020 Relocation Impact Report and Deferred Maintenance Issue.</u>

The City's and BCHA's efforts to close Bell Mobile Home Park and Florence Village have been ongoing for years. In 2020, the City prepared a Relocation Impact Report ("2020 RIR," Exhibit 17: Bell Mobile Home Park Relocation Impact Report dated Nov. 24, 2020) for the closure of the Bell Mobile Home Park. They also developed an RIR for the closure of Florence Village. The 2020 RIR stated that it complied with the City's obligations under the Mobilehome Residency Law ("MRL") and included only a brief, limited analysis of relocation assistance benefits; it did not acknowledge BCHA's obligations as a public entity bound by the California Relocation Assistance Act or any of the other legal duties associated with the proposed park closure. (2020 RIR, p. 3-4). The 2020 RIR stated that BCHA sought approval of the RIR "in anticipation of selling the Park" and that a future buyer could either continue operating the property as a mobilehome park or close it and redevelop the property. (2020 RIR, p. 7.) The RIR described the number and characteristics of occupied spaces, residents' income and household characteristics, as well as proposed relocation assistance. (2020 RIR, pp. 7–15.) Although the 2020 RIR acknowledged that most Park households were extremely low-, very low-, or low-income and recognized the potential financial impact of losing the Park's affordable rents, it did not evaluate whether the replacement housing identified in the report would be affordable or otherwise accessible to . (2020 RIR, pp. 7–10, 12.) It proposed almost no rental assistance for displaced residents: two months' rent and security deposit for residents whose homes could be moved and a maximum of $7,020 for residents whose homes could not be moved. (2020 RIR, p.14.) The RIR likewise did not analyze any potential future use of the site, the impacts of the loss of the park as affordable housing, or alternatives to closure or sale that would preserve the Park or its affordability.

The 2020 RIR highlighted the deferred maintenance issues present at Bell Mobile Home Park. According to its own records, BCHA, the owner of the Park for twenty-two years, had spent an average of $265,719 annually on repairs and maintenance across its entire portfolio, which includes 349 mobile home spaces as well as 61 apartments and houses. (2020 RIR, p. 2-3.) The 2020 RIR states that approximately $5 million was needed to address the deferred maintenance for all properties, with about $2 million required for the Bell Mobile Home Park alone. However, the report does not provide specific details about the maintenance work needed and the associated $2 million repair cost.

The 2020 RIR further states that BCHA had not increased rents at the Park during the previous five years. Thus, during the same period in which BCHA identified substantial deferred maintenance needs, BCHA had also elected not to increase rents at the Park. The 2020 RIR does not explain why BCHA chose not to adjust rents during that period, or how its rental policies factored into the financial condition of the Park or the projected cost of addressing maintenance.

No sale or closure happened after the 2020 RIR was approved.

d. Preservation purchase efforts and rebuffs

For years, residents, nonprofits, and public officials have attempted to engage with the City and BCHA regarding a potential preservation purchase of the Bell Mobile Home Park. Since 2019, the California Center for Cooperative Development ("CCCD"), on behalf of residents of the Bell Mobile Home Park and Florence Village Mobile Home Park, has attempted to engage in formal discussions with the City regarding a potential preservation purchase. CCCD gave presentations and provided education to the City, Gateway Cities, and residents to support a potential purchase that would preserve the Parks and benefit both the City and residents. (Exhibit 18: CCCD emails to the City of Bell, 2019-2022.)

On November 1, 2021, the City held a special "study session," featuring a presentation from CCCD and CaliROC/ROC USA (a non-profit organization, that offers specialized financing and long-term support for resident-owned cooperatives) educating the City about resident-owned communities (Exhibit 19: Agenda Packet Meeting November 1, 2021.) At that time, CCCD aimed to involve the City in discussing a financial plan for residents to purchase their parks, offering legal support from the UCI Community Economic Development Clinic ("UCI") (Exhibit 20: UCI letter to City of Bell, dated April 5, 2023.) The City showed interest in an offer from residents and CCCD, leading UCI to establish, The Dawn of Bell, a 501(c)(3) non-profit homeowner association representing residents from Bell Mobile Home Park and Florence Village, to negotiate and purchase the parks. For over a year, residents and organizations sought financial details and clarity to develop a purchase proposal beneficial to residents of both parks and the larger Bell community. However, the discussions ended when the City refused to provide critical financial information needed to determine a fair sale price. Ultimately, the discussions about potential purchase were not successful; the City informed CCCD and residents that it planned to go through the Surplus Land Act process for disposition of the parks and told them that residents might be ineligible to purchase the parks through that process (Exhibit 21: CCCD letter to City of Bell, sent August 4, 2022.)

On March 13, 2024, BCHA designated both the Bell Mobile Home Park site and the Florence Village site as surplus land pursuant to the state Surplus Land Act by adopting Resolution No. 2024-06. In July 2024, BCHA issued a Notice of Availability ("NOA") for the sites. According to public records we reviewed, several interested parties responded, but no final decision regarding the sale or transfer of the properties has been made. According to correspondence between the City and Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD"), the City selected and entered negotiations with LCD Capital, Inc., for the disposition of both mobile home park sites (Exhibit 22: City of Bell Letter to HCD, dated February 5,2025.) HCD has not issued findings regarding the City's Surplus Land Disposition for the APNs within the Bell Mobile Home Park, no Determination Letter confirming compliance with the SLA has been issued, and a necessary affordability covenant has not been recorded. (Exhibit 23: NOA Surplus Land Act Letter dated June 10, 2024; more details about technical assistance and enforcement letters by HCD are available to the public. at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-andresearch/public-lands/surplus-land/outcomes.) Notably, Lewis Retail Centers, a company affiliated with LCD Capital, is already advertising retail spaces at a 100% commercial development that is apparently planned for the Florence Village stie. (See https://lewisretailcenters.com/property/bell-retail/, last accessed Sept. 9, 2026.)

In fall 2025, the City renewed efforts to close Bell Mobile Home Park and Florence Village. The City's resumption of the park closures reignited residents' interest in purchasing the parks. Between December 2025 and March 2026, CCCD surveyed the residents, from both parks, to gauge their interest in purchasing the Parks. One hundred and nineteen residents completed the survey and 102 out of 119 expressed interest in a resident purchase. In April 2026, CCCD contacted the City directly to share the survey results and emphasize that a resident purchase is feasible, based on CCCD's experience and the extensive network of technical assistance providers affiliated with ROC USA. (Exhibit 24: Email from CCCD sent to City of Bell re Community Surveys, April 22, 2026.) To date, the City has not replied to or expressed any interest in discussing a resident purchase.

The proposed closures of Bell Mobile Home Park and Florence Village have raised serious concerns, not only among residents, but also among local and state leaders, who have called on the City to consider alternatives that would avoid displacing families. Elected officials outside City government have voiced their desire and support for the City to preserve its local mobilehome parks and prevent resident displacement. On January 21, 2026, Los Angeles County Supervisor Janice Hahn wrote to the City Mayor Ali Saleh, asking the City to stop its plan to sell Bell Mobile Home Park and Florence Village Mobile Home Park to developers, which would displace 350 families. (Exhibit 25: Los Angeles County Supervisor Janice Han Letter to City Mayor of Bell dated, Jan. 21, 2026.) Supervisor Hahn stressed that mobilehome parks are a vital source of affordable housing and encouraged the City to find solutions that let residents stay in their homes. She also offered to connect the City with the Los Angeles County Affordable Housing Solutions Agency ("LACAHSA") to find resources and strategies to save the parks and keep residents from being displaced. California Senator Lena Gonzalez has also supported Bell's mobilehome residents by directly communicating with them and encouraging their participation in efforts to protect the parks from closing. She has publicly highlighted the importance of residents organizing and standing up for their rights as the City considers closing and redeveloping the parks. (Exhibit 26: Senator Lena Gonzalez, Social Media Facebook post, December 1, 2025)

e. Current Closure Process

In fall 2025, the City renewed efforts to close both Bell Mobile Home Park and Florence Village by hosting community meetings and re-starting the interview and appraisal process. The City claims this initiative is part of the City's Strategic Plan to promote new housing developments, affordable housing, restaurants and other entertainment options, but has not disclosed any future plans for either of the mobilehome park sites. (See Bell Relocation Plan website https://www.bellrelocationplan.com/.)

The renewed process for the new and updated RIR has been plagued by confusion due to inconsistent information, poor communication, and a lack of trust in the City; these factors have substantially hindered the residents' participation in interviews and appraisals. Notably, many residents distrusted the City before the process even began, given its long history of corruption, the manner the City handled the 2020 RIR, and its refusal to engage regarding a potential resident purchase. Furthermore, many residents were unclear about the purpose of the interviews, the difference between interior and exterior appraisals, and how their involvement could affect relocation benefits. Notices also failed to clearly inform residents of their legal rights. Notices were confusing and contradictory, describing interviews as voluntary while simultaneously warning that non-participation could lead to losing benefits; many residents perceived these notices as coercive and fostered fear. Short and limited timelines to access appraisal services further hindered participation, especially for elderly residents and monolingual Spanish speakers. For example, several monolingual Spanish-speaking residents who attempted to communicate with the appraiser to schedule appointments were unable to do so due to a lack of interpretation services. As a result, the process has further eroded residents' trust and raised questions about the fairness and accuracy of the information collected.

On December 11, 2025, LAFLA, on behalf of La Union Hace La Fuerza ("La Union"), an unincorporated association comprised of residents from the Bell Mobile Home Park and Florence Village Mobile Home Park, sent a letter to the City requesting that the City and its contractor OPC extend the deadlines for the interior appraisals and interviews and provide evening and weekend availability to facilitate resident participation. (Exhibit 27: LAFLA letter sent, on behalf La Union, to the City on December 11, 2025.) LAFLA also requested written clarification that participation is voluntary and that residents are not required to allow interviewers or appraisers into their homes. The City did not reply to this letter, but it did extend the interview and appraisal deadlines until February 2026. However, OPC did not provide any additional availability for interviews outside of business days and hours.

As the City and BCHA continued in their efforts to close Bell Mobile Home Park and Florence Village, MGR Real Estate took over management of the parks in February 2026. Since MGR Real Estate has started to manage the parks, residents have seen an increase in three-day notices for alleged rule violations and unpaid rent. At the same time, the City has told residents that they are prohibited from selling their mobilehomes in place. (Exhibit 28: Email from the City Denying Relocation Assistance; Exhibit 42: Posted Notice prohibiting sale of Mobilehomes.) The City has also refused to accept rental assistance on behalf of residents with outstanding rent balances, restricting residents' options for resolving arrears. On May 22, 2026, LAFLA and PILP, on behalf of La Union, submitted a letter requesting that the City (1) rescind all eviction notices issued to residents at the mobilehome parks; (2) refrain from pursuing unlawful detainer actions against residents who have received such notices; and (3) accept rental assistance payments for any residents with rental arrears. To date, the City has not replied to this letter. (Exhibit 29: LAFLA/PILP Letter sent on behalf of La Union to the City on May 22, 2026.)

These actions by the City and its management company to destabilize residents' immediate housing stability have compounded the fear, stress, and distrust that residents were already experiencing due to the ongoing closure process.

The updated RIR for the proposed closure of Bell Mobile Home Park and its hearing notice was released on August 5, 2026. The notice provided to residents identified an October 14, 2026, hearing before BCHA Board and stated that comments should be submitted to OPC by September 10, 2026, "to ensure consideration before the hearing." (Exhibit 35) The RIR materials also included information concerning the appraised values of residents' mobilehomes. While some residents received appraisals identifying a specific value for their homes, others received appraisals listing the value as "TBD." (Exhibit 33) The RIR does not include individualized appraisal values; it only states that appraised values range from $1,820 to $197,000. (RIR p.14) The notice to residents also instructed them to submit comments by September 10, an arbitrary deadline that is not reflected in the City's public-facing communications about the proposed closure. LAFLA and PILP raised these and other process concerns in their August 21, 2026, letter and requested clarification regarding the comment deadline and hearing process, asking for a response by August 28, 2026. The City and BCHA have not responded. (Exhibit 1.)

The hearing notice and public materials on the relocation website also create ambiguity regarding the respective roles of the City and BCHA in the proposed closure. The hearing notice identifies the October 14 hearing as a hearing before BCHA Board, (Exhibit 35) while the City's relocation website says, "The City Council of the City of Bell will consider approval of the Report at a public hearing on October 14, 2026." (See at: https://www.bellrelocationplan.com/home#faq)) The information given to the public and the residents do not clearly identify whether BCHA or the City is proposing the closure, which entity will make the final decision, whether BCHA Board's October 14 action will be final or advisory, or whether the City Council will consider the RIR separately. LAFLA and PILP specifically requested clarification of these issues in their August 21 letter, including whether the City Council would hold a separate hearing, but have received no response.

f. Shortage of Affordable Housing in Bell

Bell Mobile Home Park, along with Florence Village, serves as a critical source of deeply affordable housing in a community where such housing is desperately needed. According to the City's 2021-2029 Sixth Cycle Housing Element, 60% of renter households in Bell spend more than 30% of their income on rent; nearly a third of all renter households spend more than half their income on rent each month. (Housing Element, 66; see also Exhibit 30: Excerpt of State of Los Angeles County Housing and Neighborhoods 2026, by USC Lusk Center for Real Estate; see more at: https://map.myneighborhooddata.org/ (maps showing 60-67% of renters paying more than 30% of income in 2024, 34-43% of renters paying more than 50% of income in 2024).) In 2021, the City´s vacancy rate was 2.6%, lower than the vacancy rate was in 1995 when the City declared the need to form BCHA and purchase the park (Exhibit 31: Excerpt of

Pre-Certified Local Housing Data for Bell 2021, p. 10 (available at https://scag.ca.gov/sites/default/files/old/file-attachments/bell-he-0421.pdf?1620801113=); see also Exhibit 2: Rizzo 2/21/2025 Memorandum (3.95% vacancy rate).)

The City's Housing Element formally acknowledges a significant and worsening shortage of affordable housing within the City. The Housing Element characterizes Bell's affordability crisis as acute, noting that housing costs are increasing at a rate that outpaces household income growth. It further identifies overcrowding as a persistent issue that exacerbates housing insecurity and contributes to adverse health and economic outcomes. (Exhibit 43: Housing Element, p. 1–2.) The Housing Element states that Bell Mobile Home Park contains 122 spaces and Florence Village contains 152 spaces, establishing these parks as a critical source of existing housing in a City with limited affordable options. Mobile homes comprise 4.2% of the City's total housing stock. (Exhibit 43: Housing Element, p. 34–35, 53.)

In this context, the proposed closure of Bell Mobile Home Park would result in the loss of over 100 housing units whose rents are affordable to extremely low- and very low-income households. Meanwhile, the City has not produced a single very low-income unit in the 2021-2029 Sixth Cycle planning period. (Data available at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/housing-open-data-tools/apr-dashboard.) Closing Bell Mobile Home Park would, therefore, diminish the City's relatively affordable housing stock at a time when affordability and housing availability are acknowledged as significant and worsening challenges.

III. Approval of the RIR would violate the California Relocation Assistance Act.

As the RIR acknowledges, any effort by BCHA and/or the City to close Bell Mobile Home Park is subject to the California Relocation Assistance Act ("CRAA"), Government Code section 7260 et seq. (and its implementing regulations, California Code of Regulations, title 25, section 6000 et seq. (the "Guidelines"). (See RIR, p. 1.)

Together, the CRAA and the Guidelines function as a protective framework "intended for the benefit of displaced persons, to ensure that such persons receive fair and equitable treatment and do not suffer disproportionate injuries" by government actions. (*Garcia v. Anthony* (1989) 211 Cal.App.3d 467, 472.)

As part of these protections, a project that will displace residents is required to provide comparable replacement housing. If not sufficiently available, the public entity must provide or create such housing. Furthermore, the displacing agency must develop a relocation plan that addresses the aggregate needs of displaced persons, such available housing resources, advisory services, relocation payments and funding. Failure to meet these requirements will not allow the project to proceed.

The relocation process must also provide displaced residents, neighborhood groups, and the relocation committee with a meaningful opportunity to participate in reviewing the relocation plan and monitoring the relocation assistance program. It must be submitted to the relocation committee for review at least 30 days before submission to the legislative body for approval. These requirements ensure the relocation plan is based on an actual assessment of residents' housing needs and available replacement resources.

Here, the RIR acknowledges that it is bound by the CRAA but fails to meet the requirements of that law.

a. <u>The RIR does not provide adequate relocation assistance to secure comparable replacement housing for the residents.</u>

1. *The RIR does not provide a rent differential for displaced homeowners who will rent spaces in other mobilehome parks*.

Under the CRAA, a displaced mobilehome owner who rents a space in a mobilehome park is eligible for replacement payments calculated according to sections 6102 (replacement housing payments for homeowners) *and* 6104 (replacement housing payments for tenants) of the Guidelines. (25 C.C.R. § 6112(c)(5).) In other words, if BCHA displaces Bell Mobile Home Park resident homeowners whose homes cannot be moved to another park, BCHA must pay, in addition to other moving expenses: (1) compensation for the loss of the home, (2) any differential necessary to facilitate the purchase of a new home, and (3) a 42-month rent differential for the space rent in the new park.

The RIR acknowledges that likely none of the resident homeowners will be able to move their existing homes to another park. (RIR, p. 9-10 ("[I]t is a reasonable assumption that none of the Park mobile homes with associated fixed accessory equipment may be relocated to a comparable mobile home park within the immediate vicinity. . . .").) Therefore, any homeowner who relocates to another mobilehome park will likely need to both purchase a new mobilehome and pay a higher rent in the new park. For such residents, the RIR proposes a price differential for the purchase of a new home and an "incidental expense payment," but it does not include any rent differential to help them afford their new space rent. (RIR, p. 17-18, 23-24.) Under the RIR's framework, the only way for a displaced homeowner whose home cannot be relocated to another park to secure a 42-month rent differential is to forego owning their own home. (RIR, p. 18 ("Alternative: Rental Assistance Option"), 24 (rent differential only available "For owner-occupants who elect to rent rather than purchase replacement housing.")

This framework, which would apply to nearly all of the park's residents, directly conflicts with the CRAA's implementing Guidelines for such situations, which require:

A person who owns a manufactured home or mobilehome which is acquired and rents the site shall be provided payment as follows: (A) If a manufactured home or mobilehome, as appropriate, is not available the amount required to purchase a conventional replacement dwelling (in accordance with section 6102); (B) The amount necessary to purchase a replacement manufactured home or mobilehome (in accordance with section 6102) *plus the amount necessary to lease, rent or make a downpayment on a replacement site (in accordance with section 6104)*;

or (C) If he elects to rent a replacement manufactured home or mobilehome and site, the amount required to do so in accordance with section 6104. In calculating this payment, the average monthly rental shall equal the economic rent for the manufactured home or mobilehome plus the actual rent for the site.

(25 C.C.R. § 6112(c)(5).) The amount required in section 6104 to rent a space in a new mobilehome park is a 42-month rent differential based on the difference between the replacement rent and the lower of the resident's current rent and 30% of their income. (25 C.C.R. § 6104.) Because the RIR does not include payment of a rent differential for displaced homeowners who opt to purchase a new mobilehome and rent a mobilehome space in a new park, its approval would violate the CRAA.

2. *The RIR does not include adequate information about, nor provision for, last resort housing.*

The CRAA includes specific "criteria and procedures for assuring that if the action of a public entity results, or will result in displacement, and comparable replacement housing will not be available as needed, the public entity shall use its funds or funds authorized for the project to provide such housing." (25 C.C.R. § 6120.) A public entity must provide an eligible person comparable replacement housing. (25 C.C.R. § 6054(a)). If the relocation analysis cannot assure such housing, the public entity may not proceed with any phase of a project or other activity that will result in displacement unless it provides such housing. (25 C.C.R. § 6054(b); see also 25 C.C.R. § 6010(a)(4).)

If the displacing agency cannot demonstrate the availability of adequate comparable replacement housing for all displaced households, "the head of the public entity shall determine whether to use the public entity's funds or the funds authorized for the project to provide such necessary replacement housing or to modify, suspend or terminate the project or undertaking." (25 C.C.R. § 6122) Where the displacement is from "last resort housing"--i.e., housing for which no comparable replacement housing exists—the displacing agency must prepare a replacement housing plan. (25 C.C.R. § 6124 (a)) Where the project will create a need for 25 units or more of last resort housing, the displacing entity must form a replacement housing committee to review and approve the replacement housing plan. (25 C.C.R. § 6124 (a).)

Further, whenever displacement is from last resort housing, the relocation assistance that the displacing agency must provide is not limited by the caps set forth in Government Code sections 7263 and 7264. (25 C.C.R. § 6139(a).) In other words, for displaced homeowners, the relocation payment to purchase a comparable replacement dwelling will be as much as is necessary to secure such a dwelling, even if it exceeds $22,500. (25 C.C.R. § 6139(a), (b)(1); Gov. Code, § 7263) Similarly, for renters displaced from last resort housing, the 42-month rent differential is not limited by the $5,250 cap in Government Code section 7264. (25 C.C.R. § 6139(a), (b)(1).)

However, the RIR neither analyzes or nor accommodates the need for last resort housing that would be caused by the Park's closure.

The RIR acknowledges that "comparable replacement dwellings may not be available within the monetary limit described [in the RIR] for many households." (RIR, p. 21) And it provides lists of housing options within various distances from the Park. (See RIR, pp. 65-92) However, it does not analyze whether any of the identified housing options would qualify as comparable replacement housing under the CRAA. Comparable Replacement Dwellings are defined as decent, safe, and sanitary; located in areas not subjected to unreasonable adverse environmental conditions; in compliance with Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968; and <u>within the financial means</u> of the displaced person. (25 C.C.R. § 6008(c) (emphasis added).)[4]

As noted above, over half of resident households interviewed are extremely low-income, and all households with known income levels fall within lower-income categories. (RIR, p. 8.) Income status for the remaining 69 households is unknown. (RIR, p. 8.) This data indicates that most residents—if not all—residents will be unable to secure and afford comparable replacement housing in the existing market, as discussed in greater detail below. Accordingly, most—if not all—of the Park's 117 resident households are facing displacement from housing of last resort.

Because the Park's closure will displace individuals and families from housing of last resort, BCHA must develop a replacement housing plan using "surveys and analyses which satisfy the requirements of section 6048 and 6052" to quantify and accommodate the need for last resort housing. (25 C.C.R. § 6122.) In order to complete the required analysis in the replacement housing plan, "the head of the displacing agency shall develop or cause to be developed a replacement housing plan to produce a sufficient number of comparable replacement dwellings." (25 C.C.R. § 6124(a)(1); see also 25 C.C.R. §6038(b)(8) (requiring "[a] detailed plan by which any last resort housing . . . is to be built and financed").)

> The plan shall specify how, when and where the housing will be provided, how it will be financed and the amount of funds to be diverted to such housing, the prices at which it will be rented or sold to the families and individuals to be displaced, the arrangements for housing management and social services as appropriate, the suitability of the location and environmental impact of the proposed housing, the arrangements for maintaining rent levels appropriate for the persons to be rehoused, and the disposition of proceeds from rental, sale, or resale of such housing. If a referendum requirement or zoning presents an obstacle, the issue shall be addressed.

[4] A replacement dwelling is within a displaced person's financial means if the monthly rental cost (including utilities and other reasonable recurring expenses), minus any available replacement housing payment, does not exceed thirty percent (30%) of the person's average monthly income (25 C.C.R. § 6008(c)(5)(A)). For homeowners, a replacement dwelling is within financial means if the purchase price, including increased interest costs and other reasonable expenses such as closing costs, does not exceed the total amount of just compensation for the acquired dwelling plus the available replacement housing payment (25 C.C.R. § 6008(c)(5)(B)).

(25 C.C.R. §6124 (a) (1).) However, the RIR includes no such plan.It does not specify how, when, or where the required housing will be provided, nor does it disclose at what rate the replacement housing will be rented or sold to displaced residents.

It does not explain how the replacement housing will be financed; it merely states, without analysis or itemization, that the projected cost of relocating residents is $40 million. (RIR, p. 32.) Omitting a replacement housing plan from the RIR undermines the core objectives of the CRAA, which is intended to mitigate the harm and instability faced by displaced individuals. Without this information and a commitment to ensuring adequate replacement housing is available, BCHA and the City cannot lawfully approve the RIR.

3. *There is no analysis or description of the locational characteristics of the survey area neighborhoods*

Public entities must conduct a detailed assessment to determine and timely address the specific needs and preferences of displaced people. (Gov. Code, § 7261(c)(1)) The assessment must also identify the distinct requirements and necessary facilities needed to serve elderly and disabled households, ensuring replacement housing accommodates specialized access and functional needs. (25 C.C.R. § 6048(d))

To ensure replacement housing is genuinely comparable and prevents residents from being disadvantaged by the move, the analysis must thoroughly describe the neighborhood and locational characteristics of both the displacement and survey areas. (25 C.C.R. §§ 6048(d), 6052.) This analysis requires evaluating proximity to key community resources, including primary sources of employment (or potential employers if agreed to by the displaced person), medical care, recreational facilities, parks, community centers, shopping districts, public transportation, and schools. (25 C.C.R. § 6052.) Documenting access to these relevant amenities guarantees that displaced residents maintain essential life support systems and daily conveniences in their new location. (25 C.C.R. § 6052.)

The RIR states, “Many interviewed residents expressed the need to remain close to their medical facilities, family, schools, and employment” (RIR, p.12.) Table 1 of the RIR also notes that there are 46 senior residents and 34 disabled residents among the 59 households interviewed. (RIR, p. 7.) However, the RIR fails to evaluate residents’ proximity to key community resources and merely notes their desire to remain close to employment, schools, or medical facilities. Assessing these factors is essential to ensure that displaced residents can maintain access to employment, medical care, and education. For example, if a resident works in or around Bell, relocating them to Orange County may not be a viable alternative. Furthermore, the RIR does not analyze the neighborhoods to which residents may be displaced, which is a requirement under the CRAA.

Additionally, while the RIR notes the presence of 46 senior residents and 34 disabled residents, it does not assess the necessary facilities to serve these populations. Merely listing them as needing additional support is inadequate; the report should provide clear information on how those needs will be addressed. As a result, the RIR fails to adequately consider residents' needs related to employment, education, disabilities, and services for the elderly.

4. *The information available in the RIR indicates a lack of comparable replacement housing in the community.*

Further, what information the RIR does include about the availability of replacement housing indicates that the housing market in Bell and the surrounding area does not have a sufficient number of comparable replacement units to which residents could be relocated. As noted above, over half of resident households interviewed are extremely low income. (RIR, p. 8.) According to Exhibit E to the RIR, residents in this category have incomes ranging from $35,000 to $66,000.

The table below outlines what constitutes affordable rent payments under the Los Angeles County Affordable Housing Program. For an extremely low-income individual renting a one-bedroom home, an affordable rent would be $640. For a household of four, an affordable rent would be $863.

Department of Regional Planning
Los Angeles County Affordable Housing Program
AFFORDABLE RENT/HOUSING COST LIMITS
Effective 5/12/2025

Monthly Affordable Rent/Housing Cost Limits					
Number of Bedrooms	0 studio (1 person)	1 bedroom (2 persons)	2 bedrooms (3 persons)	3 bedrooms (4 persons)	4 bedrooms (5 persons)
Renter-Occupied					
Acutely Low Income (Maximum 15% AMI)	$ 280	$ 320	$ 360	$ 400	$ 432
Extremely Low Income (Maximum 30% AMI)	$ 560	$ 640	$ 720	$ 800	$ 863
Very Low Income (Maximum 50% AMI)	$ 933	$ 1,066	$ 1,199	$ 1,333	$ 1,439
Lower Income (Maximum 80% AMI)	$ 1,119	$ 1,279	$ 1,439	$ 1,599	$ 1,727
Moderate Income (Maximum 120% AMI)	$ 2,052	$ 2,345	$ 2,638	$ 2,932	$ 3,166

(See low income chart chrome extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://planning.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Income-Limits-2025.pdf)

According to the RIR, average mobilehome rents within a 60-mile radius of the park average $1,265 per month, the least expensive rent for a one-bedroom[5] apartment is $1,550 per month (RIR, pp. 9, 11.) This means that, of the 227 apartments surveyed, none would be within the financial means of any of the 30 extremely low-income households, even with a $5,250 rent differential payment. Mobilehome space rents are likewise out of reach; as discussed above, the RIR fails to provide any rent differential to displaced homeowners who will purchase

[5] This analysis does not consider studio apartments because the smallest unit size at the Park is one-bedroom, and a comparable replacement unit must be "not lesser in rooms or living space." 25 C.C.R. 6008 (c)(1).

mobilehomes and rent spaces in other mobilehome parks. BCHA would likely have to utilize last-resort housing payments to make rents affordable for all—or nearly all—displaced residents.

The RIR likewise demonstrates a lack of affordable homeownership options for displaced homeowners. The least expensive conventional homeownership unit identified in the RIR is $260,000 for a one-bedroom unit (RIR, p. 11.) However, the appraised values for the Park units range from $1,820 to $197,000 (RIR, p. 14.) Based on this information, all proposed conventional homes are outside the range of financial feasibility, even with an additional payment of $22,500. (See Gov. Code, § 7263(b) ($22,500 standard cap).) Subtracting the highest appraised Park unit value ($197,000) from the lowest available unit price ($260,000) yields a minimum gap of $63,000. And many resident households will require larger units, whose prices vary from $358,000 to $1.3 million well outside the financial means of the residents. Similarly, the average mobilehome purchase price identified in the RIR's survey was $220,000, higher than the appraised value of any mobilehome in the park. (See RIR, 10.) Accordingly, BCHA would need to exceed the CRAA's $22,500 statutory cap to render any homeownership options—whether mobilehomes or conventional housing—affordable to displaced residents.

Lastly, even if all displaced residents receive relocation assistance in excess of the $5,250 and $22,500 statutory caps, the RIR fails to demonstrate the availability of adequate replacement housing, especially replacement housing in mobilehome parks. Looking at Exhibit G, there are only 49 available mobilehome units available in a 60-mile radius. (RIR, p. 9.) This means that there are not enough units available for all 115 displaced households. This is also without looking at whether these 49 available units are truly comparable. For example, the RIR fails to examine the proximity of these homes to work, school, and other community resources and amenities, as previously discussed.

For example, none of the mobilehomes identified as possible replacement housing can serve as affordable replacements units for extremely low-income residents. (RIR, p. 55-82.)[6] This means at least 30 units of last resort housing would likely be needed and this analysis does not even look at the other 80 households that would be displaced in the mobilehome park nor their proximity to work, school and medical facility as discussed above.

Given Park residents' incomes, the relatively low values that BCHA's appraiser assigned to their homes, the high cost of housing in the region, and the limited stock of mobilehome housing the RIR fails to demonstrate the availability of sufficient comparable replacement housing for all households who would be displaced by the Park's closure. Accordingly, approval

[6]This conclusion is based on an analysis of all available homes in Exhibit G, ensuring that the mobilehomes are within the financial means of residents classified as extremely low income. Both the rent and purchase price were evaluated in accordance with legal requirements under 25 C.C.R. §102 and 25 C.C.R. §104. This analysis assumes that extremely low-income residents receive the maximum compensation for their home, set at $197,000, and applies the affordable rent chart for extremely low-income households to determine if replacement options are within their means.

of the RIR would be inconsistent with BCHA's and the City's obligations under the CRAA.d. <u>BCHA has failed to comply with the CRAA's participation requirements</u>.

b. <u>BCHA did not effectively engage individual residents in the development of the RIR.</u>

The CRAA requires BCHA to carry out a comprehensive survey to evaluate the housing, counseling, and assistance needs of all eligible displaced residents. (25 C.C.R. § 6048 (a)(1).) Additionally, BCHA is obligated to coordinate these surveys with other local and social service organizations operating in the area. (25 C.C.R. § 6048 (a)(2).) The survey process should identify household income, family size, job and school locations, neighborhood preferences, and any special needs of elderly or disabled residents. (25 C.C.R. § 6048(c))

BCHA surveyed residents and conducted appraisals in February 2026. However, as previously mentioned, there were issues with notice, limited availability of appraisal and language access services. Furthermore, the survey process failed to coordinate with local and social service entities within the area. The RIR also does not reflect any effort to identify residents' current employment and school locations, their neighborhood amenities, or special needs of elderly or disabled residents. (25 C.C.R. § 6048(c).) Accordingly, the RIR fails to adequately include resident participation and input as required by the CRAA.

1. *BCHA did not convene or receive input from the community at large as required under statute.*

Under the CRAA, public entities that displace residents are required to encourage displaced individuals, neighborhood groups, and local organizations to meaningfully participate in monitoring the relocation program and reviewing relocation plans. (25 C.C.R. § 6012(a)-(b).) To ensure community involvement, public entities must actively support forming a dedicated relocation committee, including owner-occupants, tenants, and local business owners, when a substantial number of residents are displaced. (25 C.C.R. § 6012(b); see also 25 C.C.R. § 6038(b)(12).) Also, under 25 C.C.R. § 6038(b)(14), the relocation committee's comments must be included in the RIR. However, the City and BCHA never convened a relocation committee, and the RIR does not reflect any review by or input from Park residents or other members of the community.

Furthermore, when more than 25 households will be displaced from last resort housing, the head of the displacing public entity must establish an advisory committee to consult on and assist in developing a replacement housing plan for the project. (25 C.C.R. § 6124(b)(1)) The committee must include appointed representatives from the displacing entity and from residents to be displaced, with residents constituting at least one-third of the committee membership and holding no less than one-half of the total committee votes. (25 C.C.R. § 6124(b)(1)-(2)) Because, as discussed above, adequate comparable replacement housing is not available in the existing market, the proposed closure will result in the loss of over 100 units of housing of last resort, and BCHA was required to prepare a replacement housing plan and seek that plan's approval by a replacement housing committee. (25 C.C.R. §§ 6122-6124.) "The plan must be approved by the vote of a simple majority of the committee membership." (25 C.C.R § 6124 (b)(2).) In the event the committee fails to approve the plan, the local governing body may substitute its approval. (*Id*.) However, the CRRA makes clear that the committee must be established, and this vote must take place prior to approval of the RIR by the local governing body. BCHA and the City has failed to establish such a committee, despite our request by letter of August 21, 2026. Accordingly, approval of the RIR would be inconsistent with BCHA's and the City''s mandatory duties under the CRAA.

c. <u>The RIR does not include information to support its $40 million cost estimate, nor information about the source of funds from which BCHA and/or the City intend to pay relocation.</u>

A relocation plan pursuant to the CRAA must include a cost estimate for carrying out the plan, identify the source of funds to implement the project, and provide a "written determination by the public entity that the necessary resources will be available." (25 C.C.R. §6038(b)(7) (15))

The RIR only states, "[t]he total cost estimated to acquire all non-owner-owned dwellings and to relocate all Park households is $40,000,000.00, including a 20% contingency." (RIR, p. 32) It further emphasizes that this "is merely an estimate . . . and shall not be construed to create any right or entitlement of the Park residents collectively to receive this amount." (*Id.*)

The RIR does not explain how its authors arrived at the $40 million cost estimate and does not identify the source of funds to provide the required statutory benefits. This estimate is not supported by any per-household calculations. Although the RIR lists various potential benefits—such as acquisition of mobilehomes at in-place market value, moving and transportation costs, Replacement Housing Payments, rental assistance, Last Resort Housing, down payment assistance, park entrance fees, and disposal costs for mobilehomes conveyed to BCHA (RIR, p. 21)—none of these items are individually quantified within the total estimate. As a result, community members cannot assess whether the proposed budget is adequate or reasonable because the methodology and cost breakdown are unclear.

Furthermore, the RIR fails to identify the funding source for the $40 million cost estimate, which directly violates the CRAA. It does not even disclose whether mitigation measures will be paid from BCHA's budget or the City's. Disclosing funding sources is essential because it allows residents and the broader community to understand whether diverting funds to this project could affect public services or other critical City functions. Transparency in the use of public resources is also key, as it enables community members to identify potential conflicts of interest and voice concerns.

Therefore, the lack of itemization and failure to identify the funding source do not comply with CRAA requirements. To ensure meaningful review and accountability, the RIR must provide a clear, detailed breakdown of the relocation plan's costs, rather than a single lump sum, and must identify the funding source.

III. Approval of the RIR would violate Government Code section 65863.7.

Government Code section 65863.7 establishes minimum requirements for the conversion of a mobilehome park to another use. It requires notice to residents, the preparation of a relocation impact report, a public hearing, and a right to appeal to the applicable legislative body. It also sets forth requirements for the contents of the relocation impact report, which "shall include a replacement and relocation plan that adequately mitigates the impact upon the ability of the displaced residents of the mobilehome park to be converted or closed to find adequate housing in a mobilehome park." (Gov. Code, § 65863.7 (a)(1)(A).) In evaluating the relocation impact report, the City Council or advisory agency must not only review the adequacy of the replacement and relocation plan; it must also "[m]ake a finding as to whether or not approval of the park closure and the park's conversion into its intended new use, taking into consideration both the impact report as a whole and the overall housing availability within the local jurisdiction, will result in or materially contribute to a shortage of housing opportunities and choices for low- and moderate-income households within the local jurisdiction." (Gov. Code § 65863.7(e)(1)(B)) The RIR does not meet the minimum requirements set forth in Government Code section 65863.7, as discussed below.

a. <u>The RIR does not provide sufficient relocation assistance to mitigate the proposed closure's impact on displaced residents' ability to find adequate housing in a mobilehome park.</u>

The relocation assistance set forth in the RIR will not "adequately mitigate [] the impact upon the ability of the displaced residents of the mobilehome park to be converted or closed to find adequate housing in a mobilehome park." (Gov. Code, § 65863.7 (a)(1)(A)) As noted above, most, if not all, of the residents of the park are lower-income and the market supply of mobilehome spaces is very limited. The proposed relocation assistance is not sufficient for residents to secure comparable replacement housing in another mobilehome park.

The RIR asserts that "[t]here is ample available housing in the City of Bell and other nearby communities for the residents of the Park," but it contains no analysis of the availability of other mobilehome park housing within the City or even within Southeast Los Angeles County. (RIR, p. 25.) The RIR indicates that, in a survey of mobilehome parks in a 60 mile radius, only 49 spaces were available, none of which was within the City. (RIR, p. 9.) Among the parks surveyed, average rents are over twice the average rent paid by residents at Bell Mobile Home Park. (RIR, pp. 5 (average rents in the park=$613.81) 9 (average rents in parks surveyed=$1265))

As noted in the RIR, many residents need to remain in or near Bell in order to be near jobs, schools, medical appointments, and family members. (See RIR, p. 12 ("Many interviewed residents expressed the need to remain close to their medical facilities, family, schools and employment.”).) But the City lacks adequate mobilehome housing to accommodate them. According to the City’s Sixth Cycle Housing Element, there are currently only 388 mobilehome spaces in the City, and the proposed closure of Bell Mobile Home Park would eliminate 151 of those spaces. (See Exhibit 43: Housing Element 2021-2029, p. 54-55) Additionally, the City and BCHA have already stated their intent to close Florence Village Mobile Home Park, which would eliminate an additional 152 mobilehome spaces. HCD’s website indicates that there are only 80 non-BCHA-owned mobilehome spaces in the City. (Exhibit 32, Mobilehomes Search for the City of Bell from HCD website, last visited Sept. 9, 2026).) And, Exhibit G to the RIR indicates that OPC’s survey identified zero available mobilehome spaces within the City. (RIR, p. 65.)

Moreover, the absence from the RIR of any rent differential to help displaced homeowners afford rent at a new mobilehome park not only violates the CRAA, as discussed above; it also renders the relocation assistance inadequate under Government Code section 65863.7. Any displaced resident who buys a home in another mobilehome park will be responsible for paying rent—which will almost certainly be higher than their current rent—but the RIR does not include any rental assistance to aid them in paying a new, higher rent at a different mobilehome park. As such, the proposed relocation assistance is insufficient to allow displaced homeowners replacement housing in another mobilehome park and is, therefore, inadequate under Government Code section 65863.7.

b. The RIR does not provide for payment of in-place market value to residents whose homes cannot be moved.

Government Code section 65863.7 (a)(2)(A) requires: “If a displaced resident cannot obtain adequate housing in another mobilehome park, the person or entity proposing the change of use shall pay to the displaced resident the in-place market value of the displaced resident’s mobilehome.” In-place market value must be determined by an experienced, state-certified appraiser, and it must “be based upon the current in-place location of the mobilehome and shall assume the continuation of the mobilehome park.” (Gov. Code, § 65863.7 (a)(2)(B)) To be valid, the RIR must include these appraisals. (Gov. Code, § 65863.7 (a)(2)(C))

The RIR acknowledges that “it is a reasonable assumption that none of the Park mobile homes with associated fixed accessory equipment may be relocated to a comparable mobile home park within the immediate vicinity.” (RIR, p. 9-10.) However, the RIR does not include appraisals for any of the 117 homes in the park. This omission renders the RIR inadequate pursuant to Government Code section 65863.7. Unidos raised this deficiency with the City and BCHA previously in its letter of August 21, 2026, but the City and BCHA have yet to correct it. (See Exhibit 1.)

Additionally, even the Park's residents have not received complete appraisals of their homes. Residents received boilerplate letters that state an "Opinion of Value" but do not describe how the appraiser applied the conditions and adjustments summarized in the Master Appraisal document. And some of these letters, such as the one included as Exhibit 33 to these comments, include an appraised value of "TBD." (Exhibit 33, Appraisal letter where Mobilehome is valued as TBD, dated March 31, 2026; See also Exhibit 34, Resident Appraisals.)

Finally, while the Master Appraisal includes the Hypothetical Condition that the "no municipal action, acquisition, or relocation program is currently being contemplated, discussed, or enacted by the City of Bell regarding the manufactured housing units within the Bell Mobile Home Park," it does not include any Hypothetical Condition or Extraordinary Assumption of an *in-place* sale as required by Government Code section 65863.7 (a)(2)(A). Indeed, the Master Appraisal indicates reliance on NADA appraisal guides for both manufactured homes and RVs, but these guides do not take into account the in-place value of homes. (See Master Appraisal, p. 26; see also Kenneth Baar, *Protections of (Im)mobile Home Owners from the Consequences of (Im)mobile Home park Closures,* Penn State Law Review, vol. 128:3 (2024), 812, fn. 159 ("NADA values do not take into account the in-place value of mobile homes."), available at https://insight.dickinsonlaw.psu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=pslr; see also National Consumer Lawa Center, *Manufactured Housing Resource Guide: Protecting Fundamental Freedoms in Communities* (Jan. 2015), 7 ("The NADA Manufactured Housing Appraisal Guide is a publication of the National Automobile Dealers Association and is similar to the 'blue book' used to value used cars. The NADA guide has built-in depreciation assumptions and denies the homeowner the 'as sited' value of the home."), available at https://perma.cc/5RQC-9HPC.)

c. The RIR is ambiguous as to which entity is proposing the change in use

Government Code section 65863.7(i) provides:

> This section is applicable when the closure, cessation, or change of use is the result of a decision by a local governmental entity or planning agency not to renew a conditional use permit or zoning variance under which the mobilehome park has operated, or as a result of any other zoning or planning decision, action, or inaction. In this case, the local governmental agency is the person proposing the change in use for the purposes of preparing the impact report required by this section and is required to take steps to mitigate the adverse impact of the change as may be required in subdivision (e).

Here, BCHA and the City are distinct legal entities with their own budgets, but their respective roles in the operation and proposed closure of the park are unclear. For example, the RIR identifies BCHA as the entity closing the park (See RIR, p. 1), but the 60-Day Notice of Public Hearing provided to park residents (Exhibit 35, 60-Day Notice of Public Hearing dated Aug. 5, 2026) states that the RIR has been prepared for the City. And, as discussed above, the RIR does not specify which entity intends to pay for relocation assistance. Until the RIR clarifies

BCHA's and the City's respective roles in the proposed conversion, it will be inconsistent with the requirements of Government Code section 65863.7.

d. The RIR does not include information about the future use of the site, nor about the provision of replacement housing.

The RIR must include a "*replacement* and relocation plan," meaning it must discuss whether and how the park owner will replace the mobilehome units that will be lost as a result of the conversion. (Gov. Code, § 65863.7 (a)(1)(A) (emphasis added)) Further, before the City Council or an advisory agency or legislative body can approve the RIR, it must:

> Make a finding as to whether or not approval of the park closure and the park's conversion into its intended new use, taking into consideration both the impact report as a whole and the overall housing availability within the local jurisdiction, will result in or materially contribute to a shortage of housing opportunities and choices for low- and moderate-income households within the local jurisdiction. (Gov. Code, § 65863.7(e)(1)(B))

(Gov. Code, § 65863.7(e)(1)(B))

However, the RIR does not include any information about any planned future use of the site, nor about plans for replacement units. (See, RIR, 1 ("Future development plans for the site have not been approved and are not known at this time.").) Without this information, it is impossible to make a comprehensive assessment of the impact of the park's closure on the availability of affordable housing in Bell. If anything, the absence of any information about plans for replacement units implies that BCHA and the City intend to permanently remove over 150 deeply affordable housing units from the City's housing stock without replacing them, exacerbating an already dire lack of affordable housing in the community. (See, e.g., Exhibit 43: Housing Element, p. 13 (56% of Bell renters overpay for housing; 91% of ELI households overpay for housing; 29% of renter households are overcrowded).)

Closing the park would materially contribute to the shortage of affordable housing in Bell. Bell's multifamily housing stock and mobilehome stock have both declined over the last 20 years. (Exhibit 43: Housing Element, *supra*, p. 54-55.) As of the Housing Element's adoption in 2022, there were only 388 mobilehomes remaining in Bell. (*Id.*) Closing the park would, therefore, eliminate nearly 40 percent of the City's remaining mobilehome stock. According to the RIR, space rents in the park "range from $492.83 - $800.00 per month with an average rental rate of $613.81." (RIR, p. 5.) Closure of the park will, therefore, eliminate 151 units that are affordable to extremely low-income households from the City's housing stock. Moreover, BCHA has a statutory obligation to maintain affordable rents at the parks over time. (See, e.g., Health & Saf. Code, §§ 34312 (h) (mobilehome parks), 34312.3 (c) (bond-funded housing).) And, as noted above, Bell has not permitted a single unit affordable to very low- or extremely low-income households since the Sixth Cycle planning period began in 2021. (Data available at HCD's webpage on Annual Progress Reports, https://www.hcd.ca.gov/housing-open-data-tools/apr-dashboard.) Closure of the park would result in a significant reduction in the City's affordable housing stock. BCHA should reject the RIR and, instead, engage with the residents and potential preservation purchasers regarding options to preserve the park.) Further, the absence of a defined future use also prevents BCHA from properly evaluating what mitigation measures may be necessary. The adequacy of replacement housing, the extent of the housing loss, and the measures needed to mitigate resident displacement necessarily depend on the proposed use of the property after closure. BCHA therefore cannot fully evaluate the consequences of the proposed conversion or determine whether the replacement and relocation plan satisfies section 65863.7 based on an RIR that expressly leaves the site's future use unknown. For these reasons, the RIR does not meet the requirements of Government Code section 65863.7, and approval of the RIR would violate BCHA's and the City's mandatory duties under state law.

IV. Approval of the RIR would be inconsistent with the City's Housing Element.

The City's 2021-2029 Sixth Cycle Housing Element, adopted by the City Council on or about October 12, 2022, includes Program 14, which requires: "The City of Bell will agree upon and execute a plan to preserve fiscal solvency *and maximize affordable housing* at the sites of the two City-owned mobile home parks. Any agreements *shall ensure that existing residents are adequately protected or compensated as appropriate*." (Exhibit 43: Housing Element, p. 211-212.) The City has a mandatory duty to implement Program 14, and state law prohibits it from making land use decisions that are inconsistent with this program. (See Gov. Code, §§ 65583 (h), 65587 (d)(2); *Families Unafraid to Uphold Rural El Dorado County v. El Dorado County Board of Supervisors* (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 1332 (enjoining land use approval on basis of inconsistency with general plan).) Based on the information provided in the RIR, the conversion would eliminate over 150 mobilehome spaces affordable to lower-income households without creating a single new affordable unit. Therefore, the closure, as proposed by the RIR, will not maximize affordable housing at the site. Further, the RIR's proposed relocation assistance does not adequately protect or compensate the park's residents, as discussed in greater detail above. Approval of the RIR, would, therefore, be an action inconsistent with the City's Housing Element, subjecting it not only to potential litigation by park residents or other persons who are beneficially interested in the City's compliance with Housing Element Law but also to potential enforcement by HCD. (See Gov. Code, §§ 65583 (h) (action to enforce Housing Element program actions), 65585 (i)(1)(A) (HCD review of failure to implement), 65587 (d)(2) (action to compel compliance with Housing Element program deadlines).)

V. Approval of the RIR would be inconsistent with BCHA's obligations under the Community Redevelopment Law.

In June 1995, the Bell City Council authorized the Redevelopment Agency to enter into a Housing Assistance Pledge Agreement for the Park with BCHA, providing for the pledge by the Agency of available tax increment revenues from the Bell Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution 95-46, June 26, 1995). Thus, the acquisition of the Park, facilitated by the pledge of tax increment funds by the Redevelopment Agency, was subject to the Community Redevelopment Law, California Health and Safety Code section 33000 et seq. ("CRL").

Upon dissolution of all California redevelopment agencies in 2012, the Bell City Council elected to become the successor to the former Redevelopment Agency ("Successor Agency") and the City Council also assigned the housing assets and functions of the former Redevelopment Agency to BCHA ("Housing Successor Agency"). (Exhibit 36: Resolutions 2012-15 and 2012-17.) Among the obligations of the Successor Agency and the Housing Successor Agency are to ensure compliance with Health and Safety Code section 33413's requirement to replace 100% of all units removed from the low- and moderate-income housing market and to annually report on progress towards meeting these and other obligations. (Health & Saf. Code § 34176.1(f)(9)) This provision of the CRL also required that the Successor Agency "shall include in the report posted to its internet website the implementation plans of the former redevelopment agency." (*Id*.) Following a diligent search of the City's website, we do not find any report pursuant to section 34176.1, nor section 33413, as required by the CRL.

The RIR proposes to remove "dwelling units housing persons and families of low or moderate income" from the low and moderate-income housing market. (Health & Saf. Code § 33413(a).) As the Successor Agency and the Housing Successor Agency, the City and BCHA are required to develop "an equal number of replacement dwelling units that have an equal number of bedrooms as those destroyed or removed units at affordable housing costs" within four years of destruction or removal of the units. (*Id*.) Furthermore, the CRL requires adoption of a replacement housing plan, that would include "an adequate means of financing" the replacement housing. (Health & Saf. Code § 33413.5.) The CRL directs that, when replacement housing is required by section 33413, any housing unit that is subject to the replacement housing obligation "but for which no replacement housing plan has been prepared, shall not be destroyed or removed from the low- and moderate-income housing market until the agency has by resolution adopted a replacement housing plan." (*Id*.)

The RIR proposes to close the Park, which would eliminate 151 mobilehome spaces, of which 115 are currently occupied by low- and moderate-income families. (RIR, p. 5 and Exhibit C.) The obligation to replace these units that are being destroyed or removed from the low- and moderate-income housing market in Bell will require a substantial cost to the City, yet there are no identified sources of funding in the RIR. In fact, there are no plans to develop any replacement housing that would restore the low and moderate-income housing market as a result of the actions of the Successor Agency and Housing Successor Agency, as required by the CRL. Accordingly, BCHA may not approve the RIR.

VI. Approval of the RIR would be inconsistent with BCHA's obligations under the Housing Authorities Law and Affordable Housing Preservation Law.

BCHA is a housing authority subject to the state Housing Authorities Law ("HAL") (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 34310-34335.) Housing Authorities like BCHA are responsible for providing housing for low-income and very low-income households within their jurisdictions. (Health & Saf. Code 34312.3 (f).) The powers authorized by HAL are intended to "enhance and supplement the traditional housing authority role of providing housing only for low-income households." (*Id*.) Housing Authorities may own, operate, and manage assisted affordable and mixed-income housing projects, including mobilehome parks. (See Health & Saf. Code §§ 34312, 34312.3.) They may finance the "acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, refinancing, or development of" affordable housing, including through the issuance of bonds. (Health & Saf. Code §§ 34312 (d); see also 34312.3.) Such bond-financed properties must include a percentage of units affordable to low-income households. (See Health & Saf. Code, 34312.3 (c).)

Bond-financed affordable properties like the Park are subject to the notice requirements set forth in the state Affordable Housing Preservation Law, Government Code 65863.10-65863.13 ("AHPL"). (See Health & Saf. Code 34312.6 ("The same notice requirements as specified in Section 65863.10 of the Government Code shall apply to multifamily rental housing that receives financial assistance pursuant to Section 34312.3.").) The purpose of AHPL is to protect, maintain, and upgrade existing low-income housing and prevent the conversion of subsidized low-income housing to market-rate use. AHPL requires an owner of an "assisted housing development" who is proposing the termination of a subsidy or the expiration of rental restriction to provide notice of the proposed change of affordability to each affected tenant household residing in the assisted housing development and to qualified entities that could purchase the development and keep its affordability. (See Gov. Code § 65863.10 et seq.) AHPL requires three-year, one-year, and six-month notices to residents whose homes are at risk of losing their affordability restrictions. (Gov. Code, § 65863.10 (b), (c), (e).) AHPL HCD and to potential preservation purchasers or qualified entities. (Gov. Code, § 65863.10 (b), (c), (e) (HCD); 65863.11 (preservation purchasers).) These requirements serve, not only to provide adequate notice to impacted residents and interested government entities, but also to facilitate the preservation of existing affordable housing through either the extension of affordability agreements or the purchase of the property by a "qualified" entity that will maintain it as affordable housing. (See, e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development, Guide to Affordable Housing Preservation Laws (April 2026 Update), https://www.hcd.ca.gov/sites/default/files/docs/planning-and-community/HAU/guide-to-affordable-housing-preservation-laws.pdf p. 1 ("Maintaining the affordability of these developments ensures both that current tenants can afford to stay in their homes and that future tenants can find an affordable place to live.")

The Park's conversion to another use would eliminate housing authority-owned, bond-funded affordable housing, Therefore, BCHA must comply with AHPL's notice requirements before it proceeds with the conversion. However, BCHA has not yet provided any of the requisite notices to residents, HCD, or qualified entities. BCHA may not proceed with its planned closure of the park without meeting these requirements first.

Bell Mobile Home Park is likely also subject to AHPL as a result of BCHA's use of redevelopment funds to purchase the park. AHPL defines "assisted housing development" as "a multifamily rental housing development of five or more units that receives governmental assistance" under a variety of enumerated programs. (Gov. Code, § 65863.10 (a)(3).) The enumerated programs under AHPL include loans or grants provided using tax increment financing pursuant to the Community Redevelopment Law. As discussed above, BCHA entered into a Housing Assistance Pledge Agreement with the City and the Redevelopment Agency when it purchased the park in 1995. Presumably, that agreement includes affordability covenants, but the City has failed to make available any information about whether and when those covenants expired or will expire. (See Gov. Code, 65863.10 (a)(3)(5) (expiration of rental restrictions).) It is possible that BCHA has already violated AHPL by failing to provide notice of expiring rental restrictions related to BCHA's use of redevelopment funds.

BCHA has not provided any of AHPL's requisite notices and has not made any good-faith attempts to sell to a preservation purchaser even though multiple entities have expressed support for a preservation purchase of the park. Moving forward with the proposed closure of Bell Mobile Home Park in contravention of AHPL's requirements would squander this opportunity to preserve affordable housing in addition to violating BCHA's obligations under state law.

VII. Approval of the RIR would be inconsistent with the City's obligations under the Housing Crisis Act.

BCHA's closure of the Bell Mobile Home Park without any future development plans and/or replacement housing for the site is improper under the Housing Crisis Act of 2019. The Housing Crisis Act prohibits approval of new developments that involve the demolition of housing units, unless the applicant has complied with certain replacement housing and relocation assistance obligations. (See Gov Code §§ 66300.5-66300.6) A change of use that triggers the demolition of a mobilehome park triggers these requirements. (Exhibit 37: HCD's Letter of Technical Assistance re: Mobilehome Parks - Protection from Conversion (dated Nov. 18, 2024))

First, any project subject to the Housing Crisis Act must replace all existing protected units, and any protected units demolished on or after January 1, 2020. (Gov. Code, § 66300.6(b)(1)(A)) If the new use is a housing development project, all replacement units must be provided on-site, and the project must include at least as many residential dwelling units as the greatest number of residential dwelling units that existed on the project site during the preceding five years. (Gov. Code, § 66300.6(b)(2)(A).) Protected units include "units that are or were subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of lower or very low income within the past five years" and "residential dwelling units that are or were rented by lower or very low-income households within the past five years." (Gov. Code § 66300.5(h)(1), (3)) At least 20% of spaces at the park are required to be affordable pursuant to statute; and, based on survey data included in the RIR, all or nearly all units are occupied by lower-income households. (See Health & Saf. Code §§ 34312 (h) (20% affordability requirement for mobilehome parks); 34312.3 (c) (20% affordability requirement for bond-funded properties); see also RIR, 8 (100% of interviewed residents are lower-income.).) Accordingly, any redevelopment of the site will likely require over 100 deed-restricted affordable housing units that are affordable to low- and/or very low-income households to replace Bell Mobile Home Park's existing protected units (See Gov. Code §§ 66300.5 (i) (definition of "replace"), 66300.6 (b)(1)-(2) (replacement requirement).)

However, the RIR does not include information about whether or how BCHA intends to replace the protected units that would be demolished as the result of the proposed closure of Bell Mobile Home Park. (See RIR, p. 14 (referencing "removal and disposal" of homes).) As noted above, the RIR does not include any information about the intended future use of the park, despite repeated public statements by City officials regarding their desire to redevelop Bell Mobile Home Park and Florence Village as other uses. (See, e.g., Bell Mobile Parks Relocation Assistance, *Frequently Asked Questions, What is Happening to the Parks?* https://www.bellrelocationplan.com/home#faq (last accessed on Sept. 14, 2026)(the City "assessing the feasibility of closing the existing mobile home parks as part of the City's Strategic Plan to facilitate new Housing Developments, Affordable Housing, and Entertainment and Restaurants for the City.")) And, while the RIR uses the term "replacement unit" to refer to existing housing units where displaced residents might be relocated, it does not include any plans for the construction of new affordable housing units to replace the protected units that will be lost via the demolition of those residents' current homes. (See, e.g., RIR, p. 8 (discussing replacement housing needs and replacement units).) Accordingly, approval of the RIR would be inconsistent with BCHA's and the City's replacement housing obligations under the Housing Crisis Act.

In addition, where protected units are occupied by lower-income households, the Housing Crisis Act requires the project applicant to provide relocation benefits equivalent to those required of public entities under the CRAA. (Gov. Code, § 66300.6(b)(4)(A)) The project applicant must also provide such lower-income occupants a right of first refusal for a comparable unit in the new housing development, or in required replacement housing associated with a non-housing development project, at an affordable rent or affordable housing cost, subject to the statutory exceptions. (Gov. Code, § 66300.6(b)(4)(B).) As discussed at length above, the relocation assistance proposed by the RIR falls far short of the amount required by the CRAA;

the proposed relocation assistance, therefore, fails to comply with the Housing Crisis Act. The RIR also fails to explain how BCHA would give eligible residents the right of first refusal for comparable units in the required replacement housing.

Therefore, the RIR lacks the necessary information to demonstrate how BCHA would comply with the Housing Crisis Act if the Park is demolished, redeveloped, or repurposed. BCHA's obligations for replacement housing, relocation, and residents' right of first refusal depend on the specifics of any future project. Without a clear plan for the Park's future use, BCHA cannot determine or demonstrate compliance with the statute. Accordingly, BCHA Board should not approve the RIR.

VIII. Approval of the RIR without information about or environmental review of any proposed future use raises significant concerns under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

a. <u>The RIR approval and intended new use of the Park site by BCHA is capable of causing a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment and therefore should be subject to a CEQA analysis at this time.</u>

The RIR states that BCHA's approval is not subject to CEQA because it is not a "project" and does not commit BCHA to any specific action or eliminate other options. (RIR, p. 3.) However, the proposed park closure has the indicia of a project under CEQA, and the City should analyze its potential environmental impacts. According to Pub. Resources Code § 21065, a "Project" is an activity that is (1) directly undertaken, funded, or requiring approval by a public agency, and (2) may cause a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change to the environment. (*Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.* (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 376; *Union of Med. Marijuana Patients, Inc. v. City of San Diego* (2019) 7 Cal.5th 1171.) "A proposed activity is a CEQA project if, by its general nature, the activity is capable of causing a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment. This determination is made without considering whether, under the specific circumstances in which the proposed activity will be carried out, these effects will occur." (*Union of Med. Marijuana Patients,* 7 Cal. 5th at 1197.) "If the proposed activity can cause direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect effects on the environment, environmental review is justified, and the activity must be deemed a project. CEQA analysis then evaluates the likelihood and nature of potential impacts to determine the scope of environmental review." (*Id*. at 1198.)

BCHA's approval of the RIR may result in direct or indirect physical changes, including through the closure of an occupied mobilehome park, removal of mobilehomes and site improvements, displacement of residents, and preparation of the site for redevelopment. Future redevelopment for housing, commercial, entertainment, or other uses could also increase traffic, noise, pollution, and other physical impacts, particularly in an already burdened area. The absence of a finalized development plan does not eliminate the CEQA threshold issue where physical changes are reasonably foreseeable.

Accordingly, BCHA's approval of the RIR should not be considered separate from the proposed future development of the site. The Park's closure, removal of mobilehomes, site preparation, and future development are interrelated steps in the contemplated future use and disposition of the property. BCHA should therefore evaluate the RIR together with the proposed future development and undertake the appropriate CEQA review before approving an action that would facilitate the Park's closure, disposition, and/or redevelopment.

b. <u>BCHA cannot approve the RIR in a manner that commits the Agency to the project before CEQA review is complete.</u>

BCHA may not approve the RIR or take actions such as closing, relocating residents, removing mobilehomes, or redeveloping the Park without first thoroughly assessing environmental impacts and alternatives as mandated by CEQA. CEQA prohibits public agencies from committing to a project's action before evaluating its environmental consequences. (*Save Tara v. City of West Hollywood* (2008) 45 Cal. 4th 116.) The California Supreme Court in *Save Tara* identified two important legislative policies governing the timing of CEQA review: "(1) that CEQA not be interpreted to require an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) before the project is well enough defined to allow for meaningful environmental evaluation; and (2) that CEQA not be interpreted as allowing an EIR to be delayed beyond the time when it can, as a practical matter, serve its intended function of informing and guiding decision makers." (*Save Tara v. City of West Hollywood* (2008) 45 Cal. 4th 116, 130.)

CEQA review must occur early enough to meaningfully contribute to public decision-making. (*Id.*at 135-136.) The environmental review process cannot be reduced to producing an EIR after the essential decisions have already been made, "a process whose result will be largely to generate paper, to produce an EIR that describes a journey whose destination is already predetermined." (*Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 268, 271 (cited in *Save Tara*, 45 Cal. 4th at 135-136).) In this context, the RIR should not be evaluated solely based on its formal label as a relocation or administrative report. BCHA's approval of the RIR as written could streamline the project while skipping the usual consideration of alternatives and mitigation measures required under CEQA. The proposed closure involves relocating residents and removing their mobile homes; this is not just a background detail but a core part of the proposed action. Therefore, BCHA must ensure that approving the RIR does not prematurely advance the project or eliminate viable alternatives and mitigation options before completing the environmental review.

BCHA is taking steps to dispose of the park site and is making efforts to redevelop the property in the future, including declaring it surplus and considering mobilehome removal in the RIR. In addition, the City and BCHA have discussed and are negotiating with LDC Capital about the park's potential future. (Exhibit 38: LDC Capital letter of interest; Exhibit 39: SLA compliance letter from City of Bell to HCD; Exhibit 40: email from City to Kosmont Company.) These actions show the RIR is part of a broader plan, not just an administrative matter.

If the RIR approval leads to displacement and site prep before environmental review, it risks undermining CEQA's effectiveness. Timing is crucial; once residents are displaced and mobilehomes removed, alternative solutions may no longer be feasible. BCHA should not delay CEQA review or approve actions that commit to park closure or redevelopment before thoroughly evaluating environmental impacts, alternatives, and mitigation, as CEQA requires.

IX. Approval of the RIR would violate state and federal fair housing laws.

a. Approval of the RIR would violate Government Code section 65008's prohibition against discrimination on the basis of source of financing and lower-income status.

According to Government Code Section 65008, local government action that denies residence, landownership, tenancy, or land use based on protected characteristics, financing methods, or target occupancy (e.g., low-, moderate-, or middle-income families) is illegal. Local agencies, like BCHA and the City, cannot discriminate against residential developments based on financing methods, protected characteristics, or the lawful occupation of intended occupants or owners. BCHA and Bell also cannot discriminate against developments that are occupied by lower- or middle-income households.

The City has made clear its intent to discriminate against Bell Mobile Home Park on the basis of its bond financing and against the park's residents based on their lower-income status. For example, the City published an inflammatory flier asserting that "the City of Bell—and taxpayers—are carrying OVER $10 MILLION IN DEBT on [Bell Mobile Home Park and Florence Village]." (Exhibit 41, City of Bell Flyer (emphasis in original).) This flier is a very public attempt to get the constituency of Bell to side with the closure of the park and vilify the low-income residents. The flier carries a discriminatory subtext that the park's low-income residents are a financial burden to the City and their neighbors. It also expresses an intent to close Bell Mobile Home Park and Florence Village because of the outstanding debt related to the parks' bond financing. Approval of the RIR and closure of Bell Mobile Home Park would, therefore, constitute illegal discrimination on the basis of lower-income status and source of financing in violation of Government Code section 65008.

b. Approval of the RIR would have a Discriminatory Effect on the Basis of Age and Disability.

Federal and state fair housing laws prohibit BCHA and the City from discrimination in housing and land use decisions on the basis of disability. (See 42 U.S.C. 3604 (Fair Housing Act); Gov. Code 12955 (Fair Employment and Housing Act); see also 42 U.S.C. 12131 (prohibiting disability discrimination in state and local programs); Gov. Code 11135 (prohibiting discrimination in state and state-funded programs). State law also prohibits discrimination on the basis of age. (See Gov. Code 11135 (a) (discrimination in state- and state-funded programs); 2 C.C.R. § 12005 (aa) (FEHA protected bases))

Closure of Bell Mobile Home Park would have a discriminatory effect on seniors and people with disabilities. According to the RIR, the 59 survey respondents identified 46 seniors and 34 people with disabilities living in their households. (RIR, p. 7.) In contrast, Bell's general population is relatively young. The median age in Bell is 30.7, lower than the median age for Los Angeles County (36.5). (Exhibit 43: Housing Element, p. 47.) Only 11.4 of Bell residents are over the age of 65. (See Census data available at https://data.census.gov/profile/Bell_City,_California?g=160XX00US0604870#populations-and-people.) Similarly, only 10.7% of Bell residents have disabilities. (Census data available at https://data.census.gov/profile/Bell_City,_California?g=160XX00US0604870#health.)

Accordingly, closure of the park—especially closure without adequate relocation assistance to secure comparable replacement housing—would "actually or predictably result[] in a disparate impact" on seniors and people with disabilities." (2 C.C.R. § 12060 (b)) Further, senior residents and residents with disabilities will be disproportionately harmed by the closure of the park as a result of their unique housing needs. The RIR acknowledges that "[m]any of the residents are elderly, disabled, and/or on fixed incomes..." (RIR, p. 12.) It goes on to state:

> Some Park residents require ramps and rails and are concerned with their ability to relocate to an accessible unit. Resident owners with disability and mobility challenges, including the need for wheelchair access, creates the need for these owners to secure replacement housing capable of accommodating the physical disabilities.

(RIR, p. 12.) And it notes that many residents expressed a need to be near medical facilities and family. (*Id.*) However, it does not include any information about or analysis of the individualized housing needs of the park's senior and disabled residents. It also does not include any analysis of whether and to what extent the RIR's identified replacement options will meet those needs. For example, despite identifying a generalized need for physically accessible housing, the RIR does not indicate whether any of the identified replacement housing options has accessibility features, nor does it provide any information about the prevalence of affordable, accessible housing options in the local housing market generally. The City's Housing Element indicates a dearth of accessible units in Bell: "Approximately 5.4% of Bell's housing stock was built after 1990, which is the year when many regulations went into place mandating the building and inclusion of accessible housing units. Therefore, there are a limited number of accessible units in Bell for disabled residents." (Exhibit 43: Housing Element, p. 290.) Bell Mobile Home Park's senior and disabled residents are likely facing displacement from their homes with even fewer, farther, and more expensive replacement housing options than their non-senior and non-disabled neighbors. As such, these senior and disabled. residents will experience the harm of the park closure more acutely on the basis of their membership in groups protected by federal and state fair housing laws. BCHA does not have a legally sufficient justification for closing Bell Mobile Home Park. Where, as here, the entity whose actions have a discriminatory effect on members of a protected group is not a business establishment, it must prove:

> (1) The practice is necessary to achieve one or more substantial, legitimate, nondiscriminatory purposes of the non-business establishment;
> (2) The practice effectively carries out the identified purpose;
> (3) The identified purpose is sufficiently compelling to override the discriminatory effect; and
> (4) There is no feasible alternative practice that would equally or better accomplish the identified purpose with a less discriminatory effect.

(2 C.C.R. § 12062 (b).) BCHA exists to provide affordable housing in the City of Bell. But closure of Bell Mobile Home Park under the conditions set forth in the RIR would cause the loss of over 150 affordable homes in the City, an outcome that would directly contravene BCHA's central purpose.

Further, while the City and BCHA have asserted that the continued operation of Bell Mobile Home Park is costly and that they hope to close the park in order to save money (See, e.g., Exhibit 41, City Flyer), the RIR fails to account for the full range of costs associated with closing the park. As discussed above, the RIR's unsubstantiated $40 million cost estimate for closing the park likely does not take into account significant necessary costs, including the payment of a 42-month rent differential to displaced homeowners who purchase homes in other mobilehome parks and the construction of deed-restricted affordable units to replace the protected units that would be eliminated as a result of the park's closure. Accordingly, BCHA and the City have not demonstrated that closing Bell Mobile Home Park *would* save them money, much less that those hypothetical savings would be sufficiently compelling to override the discriminatory effect of closing the park.

Finally, there is a less discriminatory alternative to closing the park: the City could sell the park to a preservation purchaser that would maintain it as affordable housing. Such a purchase would alleviate the alleged financial strain on the City and BCHA while allowing Bell Mobile Home Park's disproportionately senior and disabled residents to remain in their homes. In its Housing Element, the City identified the transfers of ownership to nonprofit developers and housing organizations as a method to minimize displacement as part of its stated Housing Element Policy #4. (Exhibit 43: Housing Element, p. 168-169.) However, for years, interested preservation purchasers have approached BCHA and the City and stated their intention in a purchase, but BCHA and the City have not demonstrated an intent to seriously consider this option.

Because closing the park would have a discriminatory effect on seniors and people with disabilities, approving the RIR could expose BCHA and the City to liability under the Fair Employment and Housing Act and other fair housing laws.

c. Approval of the RIR would be materially inconsistent with the City's Duty to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing.

Under state law, all public agencies must administer their programs and activities in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing. (Gov. Code, 8899.50.) The City and BCHA must take meaningful actions "that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics." (Gov. Code § 8899.50 (a)(1).) Such protected characteristics include age, disability, and lower-income status. (See California Department of Housing and Community Development, *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing: Guidance for All Public Entities and for Housing Elements* (April 2021 Update), 14, available at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/affh/docs/AFFH_Document_Final_4-27-2021.pdf (protected characteristics).) The City and BCHA must take "meaningful actions that, taken together, address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity, replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity, and fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws." (Gov. Code § 8899.50 (a)(1).) And they are prohibited from taking any action that is materially inconsistent with the duty to affirmatively further fair housing. (Gov. Code § 8899.50 (b)(1).) Approving the RIR and the closure of the Park would force lower-income seniors, families, and individuals with disabilities out of their homes and exacerbate the local shortage of affordable housing. As such, the approval would be materially inconsistent with the City's duty to affirmatively further fair housing. The RIR indicates that individuals and families displaced from the park will face a dearth of replacement housing options and will likely have to leave the City of Bell if the Park closes. Exhibit G does not include a single available mobilehome space within the City; Exhibit H includes only 6 conventional homes within Bell, the least expensive of which is listed at $499,000; Exhibit I's least expensive apartment within Bell is a one-bedroom apartment listed at $1,649 per month. (RIR, p. 67-93.) Because residents of the park are disproportionately seniors and people with disabilities and exclusively—or almost exclusively—lower-income, closure of the park will materially contribute to segregation, isolation, and exclusion of members of these protected groups. (See California Department of Housing and Community Development, *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing: Guidance for All Public Entities and for Housing Elements* (April 2021 Update), 40, available at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/affh/docs/AFFH_Document_Final_4-27-2021.pdf (discussing the relationship between displacement and segregation).)

Further, the City's Housing Element explicitly identifies Program 14, Mobile Home Program, as essential to multiple fair housing goals, including: "Diverse housing solutions that provide affordable options for all income groups while avoiding displacement of low income households;" "Fair and nondiscriminatory housing programs that protect low-income households from eviction, foreclosure, or economic displacement;" and "Housing options and support services for seniors, people with disabilities, young adults, and those needing emergency, transitional, or supportive housing." (Exhibit 43: Housing Element, p. 21, 23, 24.) As discussed above, approval of the closure of Bell Mobile Home Park on the conditions set forth in the RIR would be inconsistent with Program 14. As such, it would also be materially inconsistent with the City's duty to affirmatively further fair housing.

X. Conclusion

The proposed closure of Bell Mobile Home Park would displace individuals and families who have lived in the park for years or even decades, and it would eliminate a critical source of housing serving lower-income households in the City of Bell. If the park were to close under the terms set forth in the RIR, the closure would force lower-income residents from their homes without access to comparable replacement housing; it would deprive homeowners of their property without adequate compensation; and it would destroy over 150 units of deeply affordable housing without replacing them. It would also violate federal and state fair housing laws that prohibit discrimination on the basis of age, disability, lower-income status, and source of financing; and it would be materially inconsistent with both the City's duty to affirmatively further fair housing and its own Housing Element. Further, the RIR reflects a lack of notice pursuant to the Housing Authorities Law and the Affordable Housing Preservation Law, a failure to meaningfully engage residents and the community in the development of the relocation plan or a replacement housing plan, and a rejection of the duty to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed closure. Therefore, approval of the RIR would violate numerous state and federal laws, as discussed in detail throughout these comments.

In light of the foregoing, and in the interest of preserving Bell Mobile Home Park as a source of affordable housing for its members, their families, and the larger Bell community, Unidos respectfully urges BCHA Board and the City Council to reject the RIR and to direct staff to engage with them, CCCD, and others regarding a potential preservation purchase of the park.