Chair David W. Louie and Commissioners
Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission
320 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Agenda Item 6 – Project # 2017-000213
   Art in Private Development Ordinance – Oppose

Dear Chair Louie and Commissioners:

NAIOP, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association, is the leading national organization of developers, owners, and related professionals in office, industrial and mixed-use real estate. NAIOP advances responsible commercial real estate development, researches trends and innovations, provides educational programs, and advocates for effective public policy. The NAIOP SoCal Chapter serves Los Angeles and Orange Counties, and is the third largest chapter in the United States with a membership of over 1,000 members.

We greatly appreciate the fact the Commissioners directed staff to meet with us, and having had the ability to participate in the two meetings that did occur in December and January. Unfortunately, no further meetings have taken place since January and there remain numerous issues that need further discussions. Since more discussion is needed, NAIOP SoCal cannot support this item today, and request the Planning Commission direct staff to continue meeting with us.

All information Needs to be Presented and Remain In the Record

Additionally, we are becoming concerned about whether the Planning Commission is being provided all the information you need to fully understand and address the issue before you. For example. NAIOP SoCal has sent three letters to the Commission, yet only one can be found in the entire record. We provided letters dated July 27, 2018, October 30, 2018, and November 26, 2019. Yet, only the October 30 letter can be found in the record and none are included with today’s agenda. These letters raise various issues, and you cannot analyze those issues if the letters, and other information, have not been provided to you.

All three of the above-referenced letters should have been provided to you for your review and been made part of the formal record on this matter. Therefore, NAIOP SoCal is specifically indicating we are admitting this letter and the three others into the formal record and they must appear in that record for any future reference as is required by law.

Lack of Proven Nexus between “Fee” and New Development

The Resolution before you today once again makes the unsubstantiated claim, with no facts provided, that: “The purpose of the civic art requirement is to mitigate the added
demand on the arts that will result from additional residential, commercial, industrial and public developments; (emphasis added)

What is this claim based upon? Nowhere are there any facts, any analysis, nothing to support such a claim. There isn’t even a reference to what civic art exists currently, what might be needed in the future, or where it might be needed, among many other questions and facts that are typically studied in a nexus report that is needed to support this as a “fee”.

The original draft ordinance set out that 5 different accounts would be set up, one for each supervisorial district. That has been removed and the current draft says there will be one fund and any money that goes into the fund can be used anywhere in the county. This also goes to prove this program is not designed to “mitigate” the impact of development. A development at one end of this very large county does not impact the opposite end of the county. Yet, as written, the ordinance would now require a developer to pay for projects far from the area where the development occurs. And, once again, there are no facts or analysis to prove a development has an impact at the opposite end of the county that needs to be mitigated.

Additionally, when the County pushed for funding for parks in 2016, they initially did an analysis of the parks that exist, what might be needed in the future and many other points that resulted in a lengthy report. That has not been done here. Why not? How does anyone know what the art deficit currently is, if any, and what might be needed in the future. Since a mitigation fee cannot pay for existing conditions, it is important to know both the current status and what may be needed in the future.

This not only is important to show this may be an impact “fee” versus a tax, but it also goes to how much the ”fee” needs to be. The staff is currently proposing a 1% fee. How does anyone know if that high a fee is needed to “mitigate” new developments alleged and unproven impact on art. Would ½%, or less, be enough? No one knows.

The only answer staff has given to date is other jurisdictions use 1%. Are any of those similar to Los Angeles County? No. Is whatever the need was in the other jurisdictions the same for Los Angeles County? Who knows since there are no facts, no analysis to support the 1% fee.

Furthermore, in our meetings with staff we questioned the requirement of having to hire an artist that is approved by the now Department of Arts and Culture. Not only does this further burden a complicated development process and increase costs, we were advised one purpose of this requirement was designed to increase the hiring of artists. Is new development responsible to assure artists have jobs? Is new development to be an artists full employment act? How is that mitigation for any impact new development might have on a community?

Additional information on the nexus issue was set forth in our letter of October 30, and we will not repeat all of that and we merely incorporate it by reference herein. What has become clear from all the information before the Planning Commission is the arts “fee” proposal needs far more study and discussion on the mitigation issue, as well as other questions. Therefore, we do recommend this item be continued so the appropriate nexus study, data collection and review can occur.

Many Other issues Remain Unresolved
We do appreciate staff recommending the arts program apply to developments of $750,000 or more, instead of $500,000. Yet, we also believe the $750,000 cut off figure should be indexed to the inflation rate for development costs.
As staff noted in their decision to increase the amount, they looked to see what inflation had done to costs from when the $500,00 number had been used. They found that just due to inflation the number should be increased to $750,000. That inflationary impact will continue to occur as construction costs continue to escalate. So, the very same analysis staff used in looking at past inflation to increase the cut off number should also be used looking forward.

Our prior letters and other members of the development community have raised several other issues that have not been resolved, such as the added burden this program places on an already difficult approval process, the harm this will cause to small business, the piling on of more and more regulations and costs, is this a “fee” or a tax due to it being for the general public benefit, to name a few. In light of all these unanswered questions and the nexus issue discussed above, NAIOP SoCal respectfully requests this matter be continued to get the needed studies and analysis done and to continue the discussions with staff.

Sincerely,

Peter Herzog
Assistant Director of Legislative Affairs
Chair David W. Louie and Commissioners
Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission
320 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Sent via Email

Re: Agenda Item 7 – Project # 2017-000213
Art in Private Development Ordinance – Oppose

Dear Chair Louie and Commissioners,

NAIOP, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association, is the leading national organization of developers, owners, and related professionals in office, industrial and mixed-use real estate. NAIOP advances responsible commercial real estate development, researches trends and innovations, provides educational programs, and advocates for effective public policy. The NAIOP SoCal Chapter serves Los Angeles and Orange Counties, and is the third largest chapter in the United States with a membership of over 1,000 members. We submit this letter to express our opposition to this proposal.

This is an Illegal Tax, Not a Fee
The documents before this Commission admit this proposed “fee” is solely designed to provide a general public benefit. For example, the staff report on page 2 states;

“The art and cultural services provided by the proposed ordinance will create additional public access to the arts, contribute toward realizing cultural equity and inclusion, and create opportunities for artists in underserved communities…”

The Ordinance itself clearly states in Section 1;

“A. That artistic and cultural resources enhance the quality of life for individuals living in, working in, and visiting the unincorporated area of the county;

And most telling is the Overview document prepared by the Arts Commission, the proponent of this proposal, on May 15, 2018, which states;

The intent of the ordinance is to expand the County’s artistic and cultural resources by enhancing the environment and quality of life; and supporting the vital network of arts professionals… the guiding principles of the… Art Ordinance is to achieve a high quality of artwork and art experiences, to be innovative, facilitate art that is site-specific and encourage community participation and civil engagement; to transform people, places and communities.” (emphasis added)

The law in California is clear that any charge for a public benefit is a tax, not a fee such as is allowed under the Mitigation Fee Act. Any tax in California cannot be adopted through an ordinance/resolution passed by a local agency. Any such “fee” must also have a sufficient nexus to the development project. Furthermore, the California Constitution specifically states:

“The local government bears the burden of proving by a
preponderance of the evidence that a levy, charge, or other exaction is not a tax, that the amount is no more than necessary to cover the reasonable costs of the government activity, and the manner in which those costs are allocated to the payor bear a fair or reasonable relationship to the payor’s burdens on, or benefits received from, the governmental activity.” (Article XIII C, Section 1(e), emphasis added)

The County has the burden of presenting EVIDENCE, not conclusions, that this proposal is not a tax. No evidence is before this Commission to meet that burden of proof. There are some generalizations mentioned, but no facts, that somehow commercial and industrial development will somehow increase the need/demand for artistic and cultural resources. What is that idea based upon? Where are the facts to indicate how much of such a claimed impact commercial and industrial development might have? Is any such increased need actually from residential development that is excluded from this proposal as too expansive, so the proposal is actually trying to place the art needs on commercial development? What are the art needs of the county? Are they unlimited? There are no studies or facts of any kind before this Commission to answer any of these questions. In fact, there are no facts before the Commission to even indicate where the 1% number came from. So how can you say it is “fair or reasonable”?

Beyond the questionable legality of the proposal, there are several other issues that have not been addressed, or even discussed. For example,

Further Complicates a Difficult Development Process
First, this proposal creates an entirely new mandatory step in the development process solely for commercial and industrial development making it even more difficult to provide LA County with projects that improve communities. To add another major step merely creates an incentive NOT to build in LA County. In fact, any new or redevelopment project with a “building valuation” of $500,000 or more cannot even get a building permit without a fully vetted and approved art project. Furthermore, a completed project cannot get a notice of occupancy until the Arts Commission decides any art project meets their satisfaction, and it is entirely unclear what standard might be used to make that decision. It is already a very difficult and lengthy process to build positive projects, we don’t need to make it worse.

Costly Mandate – Harms Small Businesses
Next, this adds a significant new cost to projects. First is the requirement the developer hire an arts consultant. Then the art project or in lieu charge must have a value of 1% of the building valuation. While paragraph 8 of the resolution claims it is “county policy to promote small business retention”, this proposal does the opposite. It is inferred that the $500,000 limit somehow is good for small business, but in today’s costly construction world, very few projects can be done for under $500,000. Plus, even in projects that have a “building valuation” of over $500,000, who do you think are the main tenants of the buildings; small businesses. So, this proposal will negatively impact small businesses.

It is very telling that paragraph 8 of the Resolution admits applying this new charge to residential property would increase the cost of housing, and so residential is excluded “to reduce residential development costs.” Yet, apparently the county has no such interest in reducing commercial and industrial development costs, and this art proposal indicates it is county policy to increase the cost of bringing quality commercial projects to the county. Such a policy will push new projects out of the county and into other jurisdictions.

Thank you for considering the above issues. For these and other reasons, NAIOP SoCal respectfully request this arts ordinance not be approved.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Peter Harzog
Assistant Director of Legislative Affairs
Chair David W. Louie and Commissioners
Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission
320 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Agenda Item 6 – Project # 2017-000213
Art in Private Development Ordinance – Oppose

Dear Chair Louie and Commissioners

NAIOP, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association, is the leading national organization of developers, owners, and related professionals in office, industrial and mixed-use real estate. NAIOP advances responsible commercial real estate development, researches trends and innovations, provides educational programs, and advocates for effective public policy. The NAIOP SoCal Chapter serves Los Angeles and Orange Counties, and is the third largest chapter in the United States with a membership of over 1,000 members.

We appreciate the subsequent report you have received, yet the fundamental concerns that were raised at the August 1 hearing remain. Thus, we remain opposed to the proposal now before you to mandate art related projects or payment of an in-lieu fee on commercial development. We did summit a letter on July 27, 2018 for the record, yet for some reason it was not included in your agenda packet for the October 31 hearing, so we are attaching it to this letter.

Purpose and Nexus
The Resolution before you says on Page 1, WHEREAS 5, “The purpose of the civic art requirement is to mitigate the added demand on the arts that will result from additional commercial, industrial, and public development.” Yet, all the documents before this Commission contain NO information about what is the art demand in Los Angeles County, how “commercial, industrial”, which is defined, and “public development”, which is not defined, somehow add to the unknown increased art demand, nor what it might cost to meet the unknown increased art demand. No facts or studies of any kind are presented to support the claim in Whereas 5. Thus, it is impossible to evaluate why this proposal is needed or what it would mitigate.

Furthermore, on page 6-7 of the proposed ordinance there is reference to this proposal possibly going to “cultural facilities”, “conservation” of existing private and county owned art, and a list of “artistic and cultural services.” How does new commercial development create any increased demand for any of these items? How does commercial development impact “poetry readings and storytelling”, “training in and about arts and culture,” and on and on including the very vague “Similar arts services as approved by the Arts Commission.”? Again, no facts or studies are presented to evaluate.

It seems the sole purpose of this proposal is to force one small part of the community to pay for a very general public benefit. For example, the July 19 staff
report on page 2 states; “The art and cultural services provided by the proposed ordinance will create additional public access to the arts, contribute toward realizing cultural equity and inclusion, and create opportunities for artists in underserved communities…” How is that public benefit related to or the sole responsibility of commercial development?

The Ordinance itself clearly points out this entire proposal is solely for a general public benefit. In Section 1 the Ordinance says this will “enhance the quality of life for individuals living in, working in, and visiting the unincorporated area of the county;” So, not only for people working in the county, but every resident and tourist that comes to the County. Again, one small segment of LA County should not be singled out to pay for a benefit for all, including tourists.

**Arts Fee/Tax Goes Against “county policy to promote small business retention”**

At the August 1 hearing concerns were raised about this fee/tax applying to all projects of $500,000 or more. We appreciate the staff pointing out the value of the $500,000 adjusted by the CPI from the time the $500,000 was first proposed would equal $750,000. This also indicates the need to allow for inflation adjustments in the future.

Yet, this does not fully address the question asked by the Planning Commission. In particular, it was asked how the fee/tax would impact small businesses. No information is provided. The fact is it would negatively impact small businesses. They operate on very tight margins and, generally, rent their spaces. All cost impacts are passed on to the small business. The more costly it is to build, operate and maintain a building, the higher the rent structure must be to cover those expenses. Thus, the proposal would make it more likely small businesses may not be successful. This is the opposite result from what the Resolution on page 2, number 8, indicates the county policy is to **promote small business retention**. (emphasis added)

The negative financial impact cannot be viewed in a silo. Just since 2016 the County has significantly raised the cost of doing business and is already pushing for more increased costs. In 2016 a new per square foot parcel tax was put in place. Then in 2017 the sales tax was increased. On this November’s ballot is another per square foot parcel tax. The Board of Supervisors have indicated another new tax may be coming in 2020. This continual piling on of additional fees and taxes is not sustainable. This is very clearly not the time to add on to the increased financial burden small businesses are already trying to deal with.

Our letter of July 27, 2018 contains additional concerns, and we incorporate it herein by reference instead of repeating those points. Thank you for considering our concerns, and based upon all the above, NAIOP SoCal respectfully requests the arts ordinance not be approved.

*Sincerely,*

[Signature]

Peter Herzog
Assistant Director of Legislative Affairs
November 26, 2018

Chair David W. Louie and Commissioners
Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission
320 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Agenda Item 5 – Project # 2017-000213
Art in Private Development Ordinance – Oppose

Dear Chair Louie and Commissioners:

NAIOP SoCal has reviewed the materials that were forwarded to you on November 15, as well as all the prior materials that have been contained in your agenda packets, and must respectfully remain opposed to the Art in Private Development Ordinance. We find it extremely unfortunate that there has been no response or analysis of any kind in your agenda reports to the numerous issues that have been raised by several parties to this proposed ordinance. Additionally, I would note this Commission expressly requested an analysis of the Ordinance’s impact on small businesses in LA County, and no such analysis has been provided.

NAIOP SoCal wrote a letter dated July 27, 2018 which has actually been sent to you twice; originally and also attached to our letter of October 30, 2018. Yet, it is still not part of your agenda packet so we send it to you again, which we find very frustrating. Hopefully you receive it this time.

We fully agree with the comments made by the Building Industry Association (BIA) and the California Apartment Association (CAA). The points they make about the increased costs, lack of nexus, lack of any analysis of the impact of the ordinance, increased hoops to get a project built, etc. apply exactly the same to commercial/industrial real estate. To paraphrase the CAA:

“Adding a development fee for art to new (commercial/industrial development) is not only adding another hoop for needed (businesses) to pass through but also places a public benefit that all society enjoys as a responsibility to be paid for by (commercial/industrial) providers. It is inappropriate to increase the cost of (doing business) in the County when it is unclear that there is a nexus between private (commercial/industrial development) and public art. Furthermore, it does not appear an impact study has been commissioned to review the effects on new (commercial/industrial) construction.”

NAIOP’s letters of July 27 and October 30 set out the fact this ordinance would negatively impact small businesses. No analysis or any information has
been given to refute that fact. The Resolution before you specifically states it is “county policy to promote small business retention.” (emphasis added) Imposing a private art fee would do just the opposite, especially with the ever growing list of fees and taxes that threaten their small margins, and now another new parcel tax was just added a few weeks ago. This cumulative impact is a definite threat to the survival of the small business community. Do not violate the county policy to PROMOTE small businesses which would be the result of imposing the public art fee/tax.

In light of all the information that is before you, it is respectfully requested the Planning Commission not approve moving forward with the private art fee/tax.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Peter Herzog
Assistant Director of Legislative Affairs
April 23, 2019

Elvin W. Moon, County Planning Commission, Chair
Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission
320 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SUBJECT: Private Art Development Fee Ordinance (OPPOSE)

To the Honorable Elvin W. Moon and Regional Planning Commissioners;

On behalf of BizFed, a grassroots alliance of more than 180 business organizations that represent 400,000 employers with over 3.5 million employees in LA County, we are writing to express our opposition to the proposed ordinance which will negatively impact both residential and commercial development.

BizFed believes that Los Angeles County is already a difficult and expensive place to live and work. By including multi-family housing as part of the ordinance/fee we are enacting a perpetual cycle that will exacerbate the housing crisis. It will increase the cost of housing and also increase the cost of job creation that occurs as a result of commercial and industrial development. This will further reduce the amount of housing that could have been built and the number of good paying jobs. The end result is that instead of supporting the development needed for achieving a high quality of life for all residents of Los Angeles, you make housing and jobs even more scarce.

We want to thank the Commissioners for directing staff the opportunity to have two roundtable conversations, keeping our members engaged and informed through this process. However, it has come to our attention that significant misinformation has been spread by planning staff and published in the staff report that we are not providing any feedback or insight to the table during these conversations. We want to state for the record that is false.

At our first roundtable conversation on December 19th our members re-iterated one of our original suggestions, first articulated in June 2017 when the Arts Commission first presented to our respective organizations for a fresh look at Architecture as Art as a consideration in lieu of the fee. We wanted to see how to incorporate well designed and aesthetically beautiful projects and communities. Incorporating the very suggestions made by Commissioner Modungo at the November 28th hearing.

The December 19th conversation was fruitful as this roundtable conversation help flesh out our thoughts and hear feedback with the Arts Commission. We pointed out the scale of residential and commercial projects that will be built in Unincorporated LA County are not the larger scale developments cited in the images presented by the Arts Commission.

According to Department of Regional Planning’s own numbers between 2008-2018 nearly 50% of all the residential development in LA County were projects 20 units or less. Within these numbers 60% of these multi-family residential development projects were building between five and nine units of housing. Understanding the scale of how many of the smaller projects will be built in LA County through either the Accessible Dwelling Unit or Compact Lot Subdivision ordinances paints a picture that limits smaller developers the ability to actually provide an in-lieu alternative to the Arts Fee. The smaller housing developers will be stuck paying for it.

At the December roundtable there was an agreement to look at the costs of development and how the increase fee will impact these costs, which will be passed down to the renter/owner, and to include those findings in the next report to the Planning Commission. At our January 23rd Roundtable we presented a breakdown of these costs to help start the cost conversation. Unfortunately, Planning staff response was that they were not going to evaluate the cost issue.
We also raised the issue of the maintenance of any public art. The Arts Commission staff agreed including the maintenance of the murals and art should be part of what the fee covers as a good faith effort to achieve the goals of increasing art in the County.

There were question about the safety of the public in industrial areas. The proposal has called for all public art to be accessible to the public at all times. In industrial areas there is a great deal of heavy equipment and activity that is inconsistent with having the public being in the area. It raises serious safety concerns for the public, and liability issues for the businesses should someone get injured. Many industrial areas are fenced off for the specific purpose of restricting ready access.

Throughout our discussions many other questions arose that require further response by our members; Has an assessment been done in LA County of the Art/Cultural needs of Unincorporated LA County? Where are there deficits in areas of LA County for Public Art? Most importantly how is equity achieved through the implementation of this fee? Will the areas that are projecting to provide the newest housing and commercial development, the 5th District receive a proporionate share and distribution of these funds to pay for their art and cultural facilities in their districts?

BizFed believes that within the cost of the program, we ask is a 1.0% fee too much? We cite conversation presented at the February 14th Planning Deputies meeting, Kristin Skoda, Executive Director of the LA County Arts Commission(now LA County Department of Arts and Culture) stated when asked by the planning deputies that of the proposed funds if approved at a 1% fee, only 10-15% will be needed to administer the program and another 15-20% needed to operate the program, leaving 65-75% of the funds left for a non-specific purpose. The proposed fee at 1% will be too much for the actual needs of the program that will actually hurt smaller property owners who are looking to develop on their own properties through initiatives such as the County's proposed Compact Lot Subdivision Ordinance.

Finally, given this large percentage of funds from this 1% fee will be left for a non-specific purpose, we believe that this remaining amount will pay for the transition and operations of this new LA County Department of Arts and Culture. Based on the BOS report dated November 20, 2018 the current transition cost of this change is budgeted at $2.5 million dollars with nothing stated for the annual projected costs of the operations of this new department. Per the most recent projections based on the memo dated October 18, 2018 to the Planning Commissioners from the Arts Commission when residential development was included in the amount of annual revenue projected will be $2.3 million. With figures closer in line to the projected transition cost and continued operations of this program, we believe this is no longer a fee but a special tax that will require two-thirds voter approval.

When coupled with the policies that LA County leaders are aggressively bringing to the public that will affect businesses in LA County such as the voter approved Stormwater Parcel tax, under consideration parcel taxes for education, libraries and parks; the cumulative impact of these added fees will hurt the very businesses that generate revenues and jobs in our economy and hurt residents who need real physical affordable housing for working families.

Sincerely,

Steve Bullock
BizFed Chair
Cerrell Associates

David Fleming
BizFed Founding Chair

Tracy Hernandez
BizFed Founding CEO
IMPOWER, Inc.

CC: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair of Board of Supervisors, Supervisor Hilda Solis, Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, Supervisor Kathryn Barger
BizFed Association Members

Action Apartment Association
AIA - Los Angeles
Alhambra Chamber
American Beverage Association
American Hotel & Lodging Association
Antelope Valley Board of Trade
Angels Emeralds
Apartment Association, California Southern Cities
Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles
Arcadia Association of Realtors
AREA A North Los Angeles SFV SCV
Asian Business Association
Association of Independent Commercial Producers
Azusa Chamber
Beverly Hills Bar Association
Beverly Hills Chamber
Beverly Hills / Greater LA Association of Realtors
BNI4SUCCESS
Burbank Association of Realtors
Building Industry Association, LA / Ventura Counties
Building Owners & Managers Association, Greater LA
Business & Industry Council for Emergency Planning & Preparedness
CalAsian Chamber
California Apartment Association, Los Angeles
California Asphalt Pavement Association
California Business Roundtable
California Cannabis Industry Association
California Construction Industry and Materials Association
California Contract Cities Association
California Fashion Association
California Gaming Association
California Grocers Association
California Hotel & Lodging Association
California Independent Oil Marketers
California Independent Petroleum Association
California Life Sciences Association
California Metals Coalition
California Restaurant Association
California Small Business Alliance
California Sportfishing League
California Trucking Association
CALInnovates
Carson Chamber of Commerce
Carson Dominguez Employers Alliance
CDC Small Business Finance
Central City Association
Century City Chamber of Commerce
Cerritos Chamber
Citrus Valley Association of Realtors
Commerce Industrial Council/Chamber of Commerce
Construction Industry Air and Water Quality Coalitions
Consumer Healthcare Products Association
Council on Trade and Investment for Filipino Americans
Covina Chamber of Commerce
Culver City Chamber of Commerce
Downey Association of Realtors
Downtown Long Beach Alliance
El Monte/South El Monte Chamber
Employers Group
Engineering Contractor's Association
F.A.S.T.-Fixing Angelenos Stuck In Traffic
FilmlA
Foreign Trade Association
FuturePorts
Gardena Valley Chamber of Commerce
Gateway to LA
Glendale Association of Realtors
Glendale Chamber
Glendora Chamber
Greater Antelope Valley AOR
Greater Lakewood Chamber
Greater Los Angeles African American Chamber
Greater Los Angeles New Car Dealers Association
Harbor Trucking Association
Historic Core Bid
Hollywood Chamber
Hong Kong Trade Development Council
Hospital Association of Southern California
Hotel Association of Los Angeles
Independent Cities Association
Industry Manufacturers Council
International Warehouse Logistics Association
Investing in Place
Irwindale Chamber
Japan Business Association of Southern California
La Canada Flintridge Chamber
LAX Coastal Area Chamber
League of California Cities
Long Beach Area Chamber
Los Angeles Area Chamber
Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator
Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition
Los Angeles County Medical Association
Los Angeles County Waste Management Association
Los Angeles Gateway Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles Gay & Lesbian Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles Latino Chamber
Los Angeles Parking Association
Maple Business Council
Motion Picture Association of America
MoveLA
NAIOP Southern California Chapter
National Association of Royalty Owners
National Association of Tobacco Outlets
National Association of Women Business Owners
National Association of Women Business Women’s Association
National Cannabis Industry Association
Nederlands-Amerika Foundation
Orange County Business Council
Pacific Merchant Shipping Association
Pacific Palisades Chamber
Panorama City Chamber
Paramount Chamber of Commerce
Pasadena Chamber
Pasadena-Foothills Association of Realtors
PFRMA
Planned Parenthood Southern California Affiliates
Pomona Chamber
Rancho Southeast Association of Realtors
Recording Industry Association of America
Regional Black Chamber - San Fernando Valley
Regional San Gabriel Valley Chamber
Rosmead Chamber
San Gabriel Chamber
San Gabriel Valley Civic Alliance
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
Santa Clarita Valley Chamber
Santa Clarita Valley Economic Development Corp.
San Pedro Peninsula Chamber
Santa Monica Chamber
Santa Monica Junior Chamber
Sherman Oaks Chamber of Commerce
South Bay Association of Chambers
South Bay Association of Realtors
Southern California Contractors Association
Southern California Golf Association
Southern California Grantmakers
Southern California Minority Supplier Development Council Inc.
Southern California Water Coalition
Southland Regional Association of Realtors
The Young Professionals at the Petroleum Club
Torrance Area Chamber
Town Hall Los Angeles
Tri-Counties Association of Realtors
United Chambers San Fernando Valley
United States-Mexico Chamber
Unmanned Autonomous Vehicle Systems Association
US Resiliency Council
Valley Economic Alliance
Valley Economic Development Corp.
Valley Industry & Commerce Association
Vernon Chamber
Vietnamese American Chamber
Warner Center Association
West Hollywood Chamber
West Los Angeles Chamber
West San Gabriel Valley Association of Realtors
West Valley/Warner Center Chamber
Western Manufactured Housing Association
Western States Petroleum Association
Westside Council of Chambers
Westwood Village Rotary Club
Wilmington Chamber
World Trade Center
Young Professionals in Energy - LA Chapter