
Further review Nov 21 inspection by Fabian Gonzalez and city employee S. Harrison

G Johnson <tainmount@sbcglobal.net>

Sat, Nov 22 at 7:44 PM

Reply-To: G Johnson <tainmount@sbcglobal.net>

To: marke.bridge@lacity.org <marke.bridge@lacity.org>, Vatche Kasumyan <vatche.kasumyan@lacity.org>, Germain Mendoza <germain.mendoza@lacity.org>, Masiss Andriasian <masiss.andriasian@lacity.org>

Cc: councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org <councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org>, councilmember.Nazarian@lacity.org <councilmember.nazarian@lacity.org>, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>, contactCD4@lacity.org <contactcd4@lacity.org>, councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org <councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org>, councilmember.padilla@lacity.org <councilmember.padilla@lacity.org>, councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org <councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org>, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org>, councilmember.price@lacity.org <councilmember.price@lacity.org>, cd10@lacity.org <cd10@lacity.org>, councilmember.park@lacity.org <councilmember.park@lacity.org>, councilmember.Lee@lacity.org <councilmember.lee@lacity.org>, councilmember.soto-martinez@lacity.org <councilmember.soto-martinez@lacity.org>, councilmember.Jurado@lacity.org <councilmember.jurado@lacity.org>, councilmember.mcosker@lacity.org <councilmember.mcosker@lacity.org>, LAHD new <lahd.rso.central@lacity.org>, LAHD REAP <lahd.reap@lacity.org>, Cc: controller.mejia@lacity.org <controller.mejia@lacity.org>, DOD.Contact@lacity.org <dod.contact@lacity.org>, aoa.crsa@aoausa.com <aoa.crsa@aoausa.com>, ARAM.AVEDISIAN@LACITY.ORG <aram.avedisian@lacity.org>, ERIC.BANE@LACITY.ORG <eric.bane@lacity.org>, DORAN.BOBADILLA@LACITY.ORG <doran.bobadilla@lacity.org>, laura.zimmerman@lacity.org <laura.zimmerman@lacity.org>, grant.woods@lacity.org <grant.woods@lacity.org>, sewada.zadoorian@lacity.org <sewada.zadoorian@lacity.org>, jason.wilson@lacity.org <jason.wilson@lacity.org>, kelly.warner@lacity.org <kelly.warner@lacity.org>, mark.wang@lacity.org <mark.wang@lacity.org>, Gavin Newsom <gavin@gavinnewsom.com>, Fabian Gonzalez <fabian.gonzalez@lacity.org>, Thomas Khammar <thomas@powerpropertygrp.com>, frontdesk@powerpropertygrp.com <frontdesk@powerpropertygrp.com>, brent@powerpropertygrp.com <brent@powerpropertygrp.com>, Nisi Walton <nisi@powerpropertygrp.com>, Power Property Management Inc.

<09e41e7459a05677911c@powerpropertygroup.mailer.appfolio.us>, Cynthia Reynoso
<cynthia@powerpropertygrp.com>

To Mayor Karen Bass, Hi Point 1522 LLC, Thomas Khammar and David Diaz, et al:

1. See attached pictures: Stall #2 parking with tenant BMW and dangerous storage of gas cans ; water leak in ceiling unit 9 that has not been properly addressed, picture of Artolier intercom in unit 9 (the clock above is not part of intercom).
2. Two intercom systems exist at this address for unit 9. Artolier in the unit and Akuvox on the outside of the building, neither is connected to each other. City employee Fabian Gonzalez is aware of this November 21 2025.
3. The city housing department knows that it is the owner of the property responsibility to supply housing services. I am not obligated or authorized to supply my own housing services. The building front door key, the apartment door key, the mailbox key, the parking gate clicker are all supplied by the owner with no extra or separate charge to me. Therefore, the owner must supply the parts in order to use the AKUVOX system. The city is aware that the owner has not supplied the parts to use the AKUVOX system.
4. The owner of the property must supply the device monitor or otherwise to make the AKUVOX Intercom function work. Yes, the state California Building Code (CBC) applies to privately owned multifamily housing, with the specific provisions depending on the building's type and the aspects being regulated. For example, Chapters 11A and 11B of the CBC cover accessibility in multifamily buildings, with Chapter 11A generally applying to privately funded projects and Chapter 11B for projects with public funding or public spaces. The California Residential Code (CRC), which is based on the International Residential Code, also applies to certain types of privately owned multifamily structures like townhouses, and the state's Energy Code requirements apply to all new residential construction, including apartments. The only reason the AKUVOX Intercom function is not working is because the City has not ordered the owner to supply the phone, Wi-Fi or indoor monitor to make the system work.

There are two intercom systems

5. Here I give a detailed but indicative, but not all inclusive list of code violation complaints received by the city, including the case number, the date, and how many times the word Intercom or AKUVOX was mentioned. What part of English does Fabian Gonzales not understand? What part of English does Mayor Karen Bass not understand? This list does not include emails or faxes that were sent out during the same time periods. This reflects on the property owner statement as repeated by Fabian Gonzales city employee, that the Intercom system was replaced in 2023. The pictures show and the city employees are evidence that the Artolier system is still in place in the unit and has not been replaced technically. January 25, 2023 case 844729 code violation. The word Intercom is mentioned 19 times. February 8, 2023. Case 846533. The word Intercom is mentioned 28 times. March 17, 2023. Case 851127. The word Intercom is mentioned 29 times. April 27, 2023. City case number 855304. The word Intercom is mentioned 33 times. The word AKUVOX is mentioned two times. June 19, 2023. Case 860747. The word Intercom is mentioned 50 times. The word AKUVOX is mentioned eight times. The complaint mentions no smart phone or Wi-Fi has been provided by the owner. This code complaint was copied to the owner. This is all known to the city code enforcement department. It is disingenuous on the part of the city code enforcement inspector Gonzalez to say that the system has been replaced when he knows that the so-called replacement is not working. July 11, 2023. Case 862993. The word AKUVOX is mentioned 13 times. The word Intercom is mentioned to 73 times.. April 25, 2024. Case 896708. The word Intercom is mentioned 85 times. The word AKUVOX is mentioned 16 times. June 26/ 2024. Case 903410. The word Intercom is mentioned 86 times. The word AKUVOX is mentioned 17 times. The complaint notes push the AKUVOX contacts button and it says network unavailable. It is not working. April 5, 2025. Case 932473. The word Intercom is mentioned two times and the word AKUVOX is mentioned four times. April 23, 2025. Case 934668. July 13, 2025. Case 945381. The word AKUVOX is noted seven times and the word Intercom is mentioned 10 times. August 28, 2025. Case 951327. The word Intercom is mentioned three times and the word AKUVOX is mentioned one time. The complaint notes that AKUVOX says that a

cell phone and Wi-Fi is needed to operate the AKUVOX Intercom function. September 18, 2025. Case 952902. The word Intercom is mentioned two times and AKUVOX mentioned one time. The complaint notes that Artolier is not functioning and AKUVOX is not functioning.

All rights reserved.

Geary Juan Johnson

Phone 323-807-3099

On Friday, November 21, 2025 at 08:45:26 PM PST, G Johnson
<tainmount@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

I note that at the inspection today the employee of Power Property Management's position was that the owner had wrote me in 2023 saying that I needed to use a cell phone and Wifi to access the Akuvox intercom video functions. I did not receive the communication from the owner.

The update to this is that on October 30, 2025, I met with Thomas Khammar of Power Property Mgmt and he said he was willing to supply my unit with an indoor monitor, such interface required by law. The employee today should have mentioned this but did not.

Therefore the owner should have no objection to the City citing the owner to supply the indoor monitor to unit 9 in order for the Akuvox intercom function to work.

It is necessary for the City to cite the owner so this matter can be resolved in a reasonable time frame.

Geary Juan Johnson

Phone 323-807-3099

On Friday, November 21, 2025 at 04:42:10 PM PST, G Johnson
<tainmount@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

To city government and Power Property employees Nisi Walton, Cynthia Reynosa, Brent Parsons, and Thomas Khammar:

This is meant to be indicative but not all inclusive.

1. City inspector Fabian Gonzalez had ruled notice to comply on grounds. At the time of his ruling, he was aware there was a different intercom on the outside of the building called Akuvox and intercom function. Gonzalez was aware on that date that I did not have an interface (indoor monitor) that would connect the Akuvox to my unit. Gonzalez citation "Failure to maintain the existing building, structure, premises, or portion thereof in conformity with the code regulations and department approvals in effect at the time of construction. Sections 91.2.401.6, 91.8104 of the L.A.M.C." 9/29/25 . Case ID: 939638. At the time of the September 29, 2025 inspection, Gonzalez knew that neither of the two intercoms worked. Gonzalez inspection was aimed the box in the unit, called Artolier, but could be construed to apply to the fact there was no "interface" in the unit for the Akuvox system.
2. On November 21, Inspector Gonzalez entered the unit with two other housing employees, one senior inspector named S. Harrison. There was also someone from Power Property.
3. Gonzalez claimed that Power Property claimed that the Artolier unit (in the apartment 9) was replaced with the Akuvox unit.
4. Gonzalez and others noted as I told them that there is no indication there is an interface in unit 9 to connect to the Akuvox. The Artolier has only audio and door entry function while the Akuvox has additional function of video. The units are not the same.

5. If the Akuvox is a replacement for the Artolier, why is the Artolier still in the unit if it is junk.
6. The city employees and owner was told that the state building code and city building code requires that the owner provide for each unit an "interface" (indoor monitor) for each apartment that would connect it to the Akuvox. I told them the owner has not installed the indoor monitor as required by law.
7. The property owner and city claimed I would use my cell phone to connect to the Akuvox. I told them I do not have a written agreement to use my private property for such purposes nor do I give my consent.
8. The owner claimed they tried to contact me by email but email bounced back as spam. I told them they can contact me by phone, in person, fax, or text message but they have failed to do so. Either way, they do not have my consent. The owner did not say have they notified me the email is not working? Nevertheless, email does not "bounce back" as spam. There could be something wrong with the owner email settings. If incoming mail is going into "spam" that means the owner is receiving it. If they email me and it comes back, it would say "undeliverable." Therefore they would have received all my emails stating there was been no directions how to use Akuvox and that I request they supply the cell phone and Wifi if that is to be used.
9. Incidentally I have received some emails from the owner (not on this subject) since 2014 which prove they are not going to spam.
10. The owner is asked to verify my correct email as it is above.
11. The senior supervisor S. Harrison, city of Los Angeles employee, said they will have to investigate the matter further to see what they can do and if the city housing has jurisdiction and authority. I told them the state building code gives them authority over the whole property.
12. The S. Harrison said he would have to see what the building codes says.
13. S. Harrison was supervisor and appeared to be a seasoned

employee. Why was he not aware of the laws governing intercom systems? The laws do not seem to be new since the building was built in 1973.

14. Quote the laws again below.

15. I note here that if the Akuvox is a replacement for the Artolier, the Artolier did not require me to use my cell phone or any other personal property to access the intercom function.

16. If I do not agree to provide my cell phone to use Akuvox—not a requirement in the law or my rent agreement—then the owner needs to provide the “interface” for the Akuvox to be used.

17. I told all present that the owner and city do not have any authority over my private property cell phone nor do they have the authority to tell me to use my cell phone for their purposes.

18. The owner said that they want me to use my cell phone because that is the service provided to the building. Again, I do not have any agreement that I have to use that service.

19. None of the parties admitted that the law requires the owner to provide the interface in each unit which would be the “indoor monitor”.

20. The parties admitted that they have copies of the laws that I quoted.

21. I told the parties they are not getting my phone to use for their purposes.

22. I think S. Harrison might have said that an “indoor monitor” could be a a workaround to the use of a cell phone. I have no problem if the owner would supply the cell phone but just as long as I do not use my private cell phone. This is not a waiver that the applicable laws require an indoor interface which I do not think means “cell phone”.

23. I remind all parties that the Artolier unit (old device in the unit) did not require the tenant to use their cell phone to use it.

24. If the Artolier is junk, the city should order it removed from the unit.

25. (Below) 11B-708.4.1 Common Use or Public Use System Interface

The common use or public use system interface shall include the capability of supporting voice and TTY communication with the residential dwelling unit interface.

26. How has the owner supplied the Akuvox residential unit interface? (Source code violation complaint 961003, et al.) Interface is defined as **a connection between two pieces of electronic equipment, or between a person and a computer**

27. The matter remains unresolved.

All rights reserved.

Geary Juan Johnson

Phone 323-807-3099

Tenant

Los Angeles Building Code 11B-708 specifies requirements for Two-Way Communication Systems in public buildings to ensure they are accessible to people with disabilities. It mandates that these systems must provide both **audible and visual signals** and, in the case of residential dwelling units, be capable of supporting voice and **TTY communication** with a central or public use interface.

Key Aspects of 11B-708:

- **Two-Way Communication**: This section addresses systems that allow for communication in both directions.

Section 11B-708 Two way communication systems

1. 11B-708.4 Residential dwelling unit communication systems. Communications systems between a residential dwelling unit and a site, building, or floor entrance shall comply with Section 11B-708.4.

11B-708.4.1 Common use or public use system interface. The common use or public use system

interface shall include the capability of supporting voice and TTY communication with the residential dwelling unit interface.

11B-708.4.2 Residential dwelling unit interface. The residential dwelling unit system interface shall include a telephone jack capable of supporting voice and TTY communication with the common use or public use system interface.

California Building Code 11A may also apply to this property.
California Building Code 2022 (Redacted)

11B-230.1 General

Where a two-way communication system is provided to gain admittance to a building or facility or to restricted areas within a building or facility, the system shall comply with Section 11B-708.

11B-708 Two Way Communications

11B-708.1 General

Two-way communication systems shall comply with Section 11B-708.

11B-708.2 Audible and Visual Indicators

The system shall provide both audible and visual signals.

11B-708.4 Residential Dwelling Unit Communication Systems

Communications systems between a [residential dwelling unit](#) and a [site](#), building or floor [entrance](#) shall comply with *Section 11B-708.4*.

11B-708.4.1 Common Use or Public Use System Interface

The common use or public use system interface shall include the capability of supporting voice and TTY communication with the residential dwelling unit interface.

11B-708.4.2 Residential Dwelling Unit Interface

The residential dwelling unit system interface shall include a telephone jack capable of supporting voice and TTY communication with the common use or public use system interface.

California Building Code 2022 (Redacted)

11B-230.1 General

Where a two-way communication system is provided to gain admittance to a building or facility or to restricted areas within a building or facility, the system shall comply with Section 11B-708.

11B-708 Two Way Communications

11B-708.1 General

Two-way communication systems shall comply with Section 11B-708.

11B-708.2 Audible and Visual Indicators

The system shall provide both audible and visual signals.

11B-708.4 Residential Dwelling Unit Communication Systems

Communications systems between a [residential dwelling unit](#) and a [site](#), building or floor [entrance](#) shall comply with *Section 11B-708.4*.

11B-708.4.1 Common Use or Public Use System Interface

The common use or public use system interface shall include the capability of supporting voice and TTY communication with the residential dwelling unit interface.

11B-708.4.2 Residential Dwelling Unit Interface

The residential dwelling unit system interface shall include a telephone jack capable of supporting voice and TTY communication with the common use or public use system interface.

2025-11-22 at 1522 car stall 2 with gas cans.jpg, 2025-11-22 ceiling unit 9 water leak 2 of 2.jpeg, 2025-11-22 ceiling unit 9 water leak 1 of 2.jpg, 2025-11-21 Artolier intercom still in unit 9.jpg