Law Offices

WGP POYER

of DOUGLAS W. OTTO

Landmark Square 111 W. Ocean Blvd., Suite 1300 P.O. Box 2210 Long Beach, California 90801-2210 (562) 491-1191 FAX (562) 590-7909 24501 Jeremiah Drive Dana Point, California 92629 (714) 547-1246

March 21, 2005

SENT VIA FACSIMILE TO (562) 570-6538

Mayor Beverly O'Neill City of Long Beach 333 W. Ocean Blvd. Long Beach, CA 90802

SENT VIA FACSIMILE TO (562) 570-6954

Councilwoman Tonya Reyes-Uranga Council District 7 City of Long Beach 333 W. Ocean Blvd. Long Beach, CA 90802

Re:

Request to Re-Order the Agenda of the Long Beach City Council to Reschedule Agenda Item No. 1 – The Appeal of the City Planning Commission's Approval of A Conditional Use Permit and Certification of A Negative Mitigation Declaration for An Asphalt and Concrete Recycling Operation Located at 1630-1660 E. 32nd Street Case No. 0405-26 (District 7)

Dear Mayor O'Neill and Councilwoman Reyes-Uranga:

This letter is a formal follow-up to my oral request left with your office last Friday to postpone the public hearing on Agenda Item No. 1 concerning the appeal of Hanson Aggregates' application for a conditional use permit and certification of environmental documents for approximately two hours until 7:00 PM on Tuesday, March 22nd. My grounds for requesting this brief delay are as follows:

1. As you know, I represent District 4 of the Long Beach Community College District which is comprised of approximately 100,000 Long Beach, Catalina Island, and Signal Hill residents. On Tuesday, March 22nd, at 5:00 PM there is a Board of Trustees meeting for the Community College District at Cabrillo High School in West Long Beach. The Board of Trustees meeting presents a

Mayor Beverly O'Neill Councilwoman Tonya Reyes-Uranga Page 2 March 21, 2005

conflict with my representation of the Appellants at the public hearing for Agenda Item No. 1, also set for 5:00 PM before the Long Beach City Council.

I have discussed my request to re-order the public hearing on Agenda Item No. 1 until approximately 7:00 PM with my clients and witnesses who we anticipate will be testifying at the public hearing. Each and every one has agreed that commencing the public hearing at 7:00 PM would not be an inconvenience or a burden. While I cannot speak for all potential witnesses, given the number of witnesses for the Applicant at the Planning Commission meeting, I do not think that re-ordering the agenda, as requested, will result in much of an inconvenience to anyone.

As a fellow elected official, I am sure you can appreciate my dilemma. I would appreciate hearing back from you as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

Douglas W Otto

DWO:map