



FRED BROWN'S RECOVERY SERVICES, INC.

A Non-Profit Organization

2033 S. Crescent Ave. San Pedro, CA 90731
Phone (310) 519-8723 Fax (310) 519-1309



June 01, 2026

Councilmember Tim McOsker
Los Angeles City Council, District 15
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Councilmember McOsker,

We appreciate your continued engagement regarding the proposed Serenity Recovery Campus and your recent May 29, 2026 community update letter. We respect your right to oppose this project and understand that you believe this is the wrong location for it.

At the same time, we feel compelled to respond to several recurring assertions that we believe are misleading, incomplete, or unsupported by the facts. Reasonable people can disagree about land use and neighborhood compatibility. But those disagreements should still be grounded in accurate information and fair characterization of the project and our organization.

Capacity and Licensing

Your letter again states that Fred Brown's Recovery Services (FBRS) is "incapable" of operating a facility of this scale.

You are, of course, entitled to your opinion. But the evaluation of behavioral health providers is not determined by elected officials—it is determined by the professional licensing, accreditation, and oversight agencies specifically charged with assessing provider qualifications, operational readiness, staffing, safety, and compliance.

FBRS has operated in San Pedro for more than 40 years and continues to receive the highest levels of accreditation and licensing oversight from County and State authorities, including as recently as last month.

Moreover, Proposition 1 was passed specifically to expand behavioral health treatment capacity across California. Nearly every BHCIP recipient is expanding services and operational scale. FBRS has already participated in County-supported capacity-building efforts and has repeatedly stated that any expansion would occur gradually, over several years, and only as permitted by State and County licensing authorities.

No facility can operate beyond the capacity approved by regulators. That is the purpose of the licensing and accreditation process.

It is also difficult to reconcile your current position with your strong prior support for another FBRS proposal elsewhere in San Pedro. While that project was smaller in scale, your support at that time strongly suggests that the central issue here is not whether FBRS is a qualified provider, but whether this particular neighborhood is willing to accept a facility of this kind.

Councilmember Tim McOsker

June 01, 2026

Page 2 of 4

Community Outreach and Transparency

Your letter also states that FBRS has treated the community “as an opponent, not a partner,” and suggests that we failed to engage transparently with the public.

Respectfully, that characterization omits important context.

FBRS informed your office in October 2025 that it intended to pursue this opportunity. During the many months before the project became public, your office never advised us that our outreach efforts were inadequate, nor did you request broader public engagement during the conditional application process.

In January 2026, FBRS gave the leadership of the South Shores Community Association a detailed briefing on the proposal, after which the Association invited FBRS to present to its Board. We accepted and asked several times to be placed on the agenda, but each request to schedule that presentation was denied. FBRS has answered every request for additional information and responded to every question raised, yet none of those responses has been shared or posted publicly by SSCA.

Additionally, since the project became public in March, FBRS has participated extensively in community engagement efforts, including:

- The Town Hall organized by your office
- Neighborhood Council meetings
- Chamber and community events
- Public release of detailed fact sheets, project overviews, and open letters addressing operational, safety, timeline, and funding questions

Reasonable people can disagree about the appropriate timing and scope of outreach surrounding a conditional State award that remains years away from operation. But the suggestion that FBRS has somehow refused engagement with the community is simply not accurate.

Public Records and the BHCIP Application

Your letter also criticizes FBRS for not voluntarily releasing its BHCIP application before it was obtained through a Public Records Act request.

The reality is straightforward: the application was submitted as part of a conditional State funding process involving evolving assumptions, preliminary operational projections, and technical terminology that was always expected to change over time as the project developed.

FBRS believed it was more responsible to communicate finalized and verified operational information directly to the community rather than release draft planning assumptions that could easily be misunderstood outside the technical context of a State application process.

In fact, much of the confusion surrounding “slots,” patient counts, and operational projections stems directly from the release of technical application materials that were never intended to function as public-facing project summaries.

Had we understood the application would be released at that stage of the process, we would have voluntarily provided it.

Councilmember Tim McOsker

June 01, 2026

Page 3 of 4

Community Advisory Committee

Your letter also states that FBRS “has established” a Community Advisory Committee while simultaneously suggesting that no such body exists.

To clarify: FBRS has publicly stated that it intends to establish such a committee as the project develops. We have never represented that the committee is already operational.

Given the high level of public interest surrounding the project, we believe it is important to establish that committee thoughtfully and deliberately, with appropriate community representation and clearly defined scope and responsibilities.

Current Residents of the Site

Finally, your letter again raises concerns regarding the current senior residents at the site while omitting several important facts that have already been publicly clarified.

FBRS is not the operator of the existing assisted living facility and is not responsible for resident relocation decisions. The property itself was already facing transition decisions independent of this proposal, and any future relocation process remains the responsibility of the current owner and operator under oversight of the California Department of Social Services.

FBRS has repeatedly stated that:

- We will not require access to the site until at least next year
- Full project occupancy is not anticipated until approximately 2030
- We do not intend to be the cause of disruption to current residents

Moving Forward

We understand and respect that you oppose this project. We also understand that many members of the community may continue to oppose it regardless of the information provided.

But public opposition should still be grounded in accurate and complete information.

FBRS remains committed to engaging transparently, continuing community outreach, and participating in a factual discussion about the project as the State’s review process continues.

SIGNATURE PAGE TO FOLLOW

Councilmember Tim McOsker

June 01, 2026

Page 4 of 4

Fred Brown's Recovery Services, Inc.

Signed by:

Michael Axelrod

6AAE814A7FAD407...
Michael Axelrod, CADC II
President

Signed by:

Roxanna Natale-Brown

6AAE814A7FAD407...
Roxanna Natale-Brown, LAADAC, CCJP, CA-CCS, SAP
Executive Director

Signed by:

Richard S. Merrick, M.D.

6AAE814A7FAD407...
Richard S. Merrick, M.D., DFASAM, ABAM
Medical Director

Signed by:

Mark Malone

6AAE814A7FAD407...
Mark Malone
Director of Administration