Hi Sheila & Jane,

In the interest of ensuring that the November 1 meeting is productive and efficient (especially because it will potentially be the night of Game 7), could you provide me with your two ideas via email prior to the meeting? If you recall the two ideas were: (1) How to increase access to the Park; and (2) How to increase safety for residents and visitors.

Please send them to me by Wednesday, October 25 so that the consultant has time to review.

Thank you!

--

Haven't seen study.
1. Only allow buses and vans and bikes into park
2. Create gondola to sign from observatory
3. Limit cars to Beachwood by only allowing non residents up via paid vans.

---

Original message

From: Jane Goichman
Date: 10/20/17 8:41 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: Sheila Irani
Subject: FW: Access & Mobility Study Stakeholder
Hi Sheila & Jane,

In the interest of ensuring that the November 1 meeting is productive and efficient (especially because it will potentially be the night of Game 7), could you provide me with your two ideas via email prior to the meeting? If you recall the two ideas were: (1) How to increase access to the Park; and (2) How to increase safety for residents and visitors.

Please send them to me by Wednesday, October 25 so that the consultant has time to review.

Thank you!

--

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.957.6415
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1

Virus-free. www.avast.com

Hi Shannon:

I certainly understand you wanting a productive meeting. But I am a bit puzzled. I thought this meeting was to begin the process of sharing the study results. Absent those, I am perplexed why we would start mucking up whatever the meeting is about with the interjection of a bunch of different ideas. It seems to me that the council office/your consultants should be sharing what has been done and the draft or final results of that study. If we all throw a bunch of ideas into the hat before hearing from those who conducted the study, it seems that the meeting begins with participants expecting that all of their ideas will be acknowledged and possibly addressed at the outset, possibly leading to you and other staff and study consultants being put into a defensive posture.
from the outset (because as we know, folks have strong opinions, and this topic is very divisive). Please help me understand what is taking place on November 1. Thanks.

Jane

---

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2017 11:04 PM
To: Jane Goichman
Cc: Shannon PRIOR
Subject: Re: FW: Access & Mobility Study Stakeholder Meeting

Haven't seen study.

1. Only allow buses and vans and bikes into park
2. Create gondola to sign from observatory
3. Limit cars to Beachwood by only allowing non residents up via paid vans.

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

----- Original message ----- 
From: Jane Goichman
Date: 10/20/17 8:41 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: Sheila Irani
Subject: FW: Access & Mobility Study Stakeholder Meeting

From: Shannon Prior [mailto:shannon.prior@lacity.org]
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2017 6:22 PM
To: Jane Goichman; Sheila Irani
Subject: Access & Mobility Study Stakeholder Meeting

Hi Sheila & Jane,

In the interest of ensuring that the November 1 meeting is productive and efficient (especially because it will potentially be the night of Game 7), could you provide me with your two ideas via email prior to the meeting? If you recall the two ideas were: (1) How to increase access to the Park; and (2) How to increase safety for residents and visitors.

Please send them to me by Wednesday, October 25 so that the consultant has time to review.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfeade515e&jsver=jIbIdzeP9wE.en.&view=pt&as_query=from%3A(shannon.prior%40lacity.org)%20to%3A(goichphoto%40e
4/12/2018

Thank you!

--

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.957.6415
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1

Virus-free. www.avast.com

Jane Goichman <jgoichman@goichphoto.com>
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Sheila Irani <sirani@lacity.org>
Mon, Oct 23, 2017 at 10:15 PM

Hi Shannon:

I’m sure you are busy. As I wrote the other day, I sort of wonder why you are looking for our input at this time. I would prefer to hear from consultant before we get this all mucked up with our ideas—my sense is that this request will just scramble up the presentation, expectations from attendees. But nevertheless, here are my thoughts:

1. I am not inclined to “increase access”. From what I have heard from park officials, the park is generally overwhelmed with visitors and cannot handle the crowds it now has. So why would consultant or city be anxious to add more people to the mix? Let’s figure out how to deal with the already overwhelming crowds before contemplating how to bring more people to the area. We have got to stop using popular paradigms when they run smack into reality and common sense. Unless the city has money to open more remote areas of the park to visitors, which I believe it is not inclined to do in any case, this seems like a non-starter. Even if the city has funds, it seems to me that resources now need to be spent on attending to the huge problems that visitors to park adjacent areas are now creating for our neighborhoods.

Moreover, I thought this study was to focus on how to manage the crowds in Beachwood, the Vista, etc. These are city streets that bring people to the edges of the park, but they are not the park. So let’s stick to the study topic.
2. We need to control visitor flow in our neighborhoods---use public vans instead of cars to bring visitors to the area and prohibit use of private cars for those visiting to see Hollywood sign or do light hiking---very little hiking is done by visitors to the Vista area. Of course this would require gating during the daytime and the concomitant needed changes to city and state laws as well as place where those using public transport could catch the vans and place where those in cars could park and catch vans. Sheila has suggested to me that there is some large parking lot largely unused in Hollywood. She would have to identify it. Use of public vans would relieve the streets of the mass of cars on 1920s narrow streets, stop the turning and u turns at most unfortunate spots and presumably decrease the large increase in pedestrians during past year who now also walk up the streets of Hollywoodland---adding to the already very unsafe situation on the Hollywoodland streets.

Additionally I would like to better understand the Mulholland fence that I understand LHHA and Ryu’s office have been working. I am unclear how it will work in light of the very heavy pedestrian use of Mulholland from Canyon Lake going east. Would fence lead to even more people walking on Mulholland? Parks folks do not seem to have really thought out an overall strategy for how to handle visitors at Vista. Even if we got vans, which at best would be long time in coming, Parks/Consultant still must figure out how to handle visitors once they arrive at the Vista as pedestrians. Despite clear view of sign from Vista, it “ain’t” close enough for many of the visitors.

Jane

From: Shannon Prior [mailto:shannon.prior@lacity.org]
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2017 6:22 PM
To: Jane Goichman; Sheila Irani
Subject: Access & Mobility Study Stakeholder Meeting

Hi Sheila & Jane,

[Quoted text hidden]

😊 Virus-free. www.avast.com

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> Thu, Oct 26, 2017 at 6:59 PM
To: Jane Goichman <goichphoto@...>
Cc: Sheila Irani

Thank you both! The consultant will present the data and some short term ideas. They haven't completed their full report yet. We want to make sure that as many ideas as possible are addressed in the final report. Hence asking for your feedback again. Thanks for your patience with the process!

[Quoted text hidden]
Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
Mon, Oct 16, 2017 at 3:54 PM  

Hi Shannon,

Thanks for reaching out. I would love to attend, but unfortunately I'll be overseas on the 1st. Can you share anything ahead of time? I'd be happy to compile some written feedback.

Thanks again,

Michael

[Quoted text hidden]
Haha, yes! Open the Beachwood Gate!

I’m sure this idea has been suggested many times but I really think a small localized shuttle would be a good way to increase access and to get people off the streets. If you’ve been to Santa perhaps it could do a loop from the Beachwood Market area (working with the existing terminus of the Dash shuttle), and then it could take people from the Market to the Beachwood Gate and around space at the base of Sunset Ranch.

I also think there should be restroom facilities created at the base of Sunset Ranch at the Beachwood Gate, as well as on the hill above Lake Hollywood Park. The restroom facilities at Joshua water fountains. Surely we could have some more put in these high tourist areas, not unlike the ones at Griffith Observatory).

Lastly, in terms of increasing access and safety, proper signage would go a long long way to help mitigate the confusion and some of the traffic (i.e. cars turning around, or aimlessly driving ar vehicular signage in/around the neighborhood as well as signage in Griffith Park for hikers.

Hope that helps, and please keep me posted of additional discussions, as I would love to contribute.

Thanks,

Michael
Hey Shannon... Happy saturday!

as our issue up here is the overwhelming tourist traffic so I don't have any idea and frankly don't want to increase access to the park though Hollywoodland...
I would however think a bus service to the park's main entrances would possibly decrease vehicular traffic...
safety is directly affected by the traffic jams created by tourist vehicular traffic and as you know blocks emergency gates into the park as well as a danger to hikers up our sidewalk free roads in Holywoodland... as well as blocking Hollywoodland residents egress & ingress... more parking enforcement, Park Rangers and police would be a good start but a vehicle free zone, except for residents, would go a long way to solving that those issues...

M

-----Original Message-----
From: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
To: Paul Martin Smith <paul.martin.smith@lacity.org>
Hi Shannon,

I’m still able to make it. I spoke to Chris and he said someone else from the HSign Board of Trustees will also be there (he mentioned Mary Lou Dudas) and that he communicated this in another email. Hopefully you are set.

As an individual I have “ideas”. But I’ll also be representing the Sign Trust Board and need to draw a distinction between my individual thoughts and the mission of the Trust – the preservation, security and maintenance of the sign and structure.

As an individual I’m still interested in the main point I noted in response to the questionnaire circulated last summer: “how to establish a methodology to gather info, research, and ideas from a broad group of stakeholders, then how to apply that background to testing concepts for potential solutions and mitigations.”

To be specific to your questions (as an Individual):

(1) How to increase access to the Park?

I’m interested in ways to make safe access to Griffith Park more porous with a variety of access points (both existing and new). This leverages LA’s limited Park space opportunities and at the same time lightens the load on any one access point by maintaining (monitoring and promoting) a multitude of entries to the park and sign.

(2) How to increase safety for residents and visitors.

I think this question has to be evaluated relative to each area as the needs and potential solutions are likely different.

But for instance, to comment on Beachwood Drive specifically, one un vetted idea could be:

- Restrict parking to one side of Beachwood to allow safe passage of emergency vehicles, make the other side a safe bike/pedestrian/stroller way.

Open the gate at the ranch and pave a 3’-4’ wide sidewalk (outside of the easement) up to the Hollyridge trail head.

- Review limiting access to the area on redflag days and other overburdened days—and clearly outline this policy so it is not a mystery to residents and visitors. Provide more ranger and police presence to monitor the park and residential areas. Provide an electric shuttle bus to the Hollyridge trail head along with some bathrooms and a water fountain along the trail to supplement the trash cans.
There are a lot of ideas out there, but right NOW I'd like to really see the info gathering and research fully play out to get the best/most input going. You never know (well we can predict some things…) how that will evolve until it starts and runs its course. Glad to see it’s starting.

See you on November 1st. (? It's still at Cheremoya Avenue Elementary School Wednesday, November 1, 2017 at 6:30 pm. Right?)

Brian
Hi Shannon,

Here are my ideas. Please let me know if you need me to condense ...

1) Access

- Open Ford Theatre Trailhead and Visitor Center in collaboration with County of LA
- Create transit/shuttle links between Ford Theatre and Hollywood/Highland (or other major transfer points)
- Develop/fund marketing plan for Ford Theatre, alongside Griffith Observatory, as city-sanctioned viewing points for Hollywood Sign
- Initiate shuttle service to Beachwood Canyon, with access to Hollyridge Trail and Hollywood Sign viewing platform
- Use portion of funds generated by Beachwood shuttles and/or Ford Theatre access to help pay for trail improvements at Beachwood
- Reinstate pedestrian access at Beachwood with alternate trail access proposal as starting point, vetted by legal counsel, with further input from community (HUNC has already endorsed the idea in concept). Seek further funding ideas from community.
- Form a small working group of stakeholders from all hillside areas, under leadership of Council office, to vet further ideas for park access and to provide follow-up/feedback on a regular basis
- Work with local stakeholders, businesses and tourism officials to develop long-term funding sources and ongoing marketing effort

2) Safety

- Convene stakeholder working group (see above) at least quarterly and/or solicit input as needed to ensure that new issues and/or trouble spots are addressed in a timely manner
- Individually assess all major access points (Lake Hollywood Overlook; Deronda Gate; Beachwood Gate; Bronson Canyon Park; etc.) along western edge of park, in consultation with local residents and businesses, for specific safety concerns at each, to include:
  - Parking
  - Traffic/unfamiliar drivers
  - Smoking/fires
- Prioritize no-smoking signs (Smokey signs are best) and ranger enforcement at major access points
- DOT traffic plan in consultation with local stakeholders in each affected hillside area
- See above re: marketing Ford Theatre and Griffith Observatory, as well as additional transit links, to take pressure off other hillside neighborhoods
- Ensure that some access is available through Beachwood, both to take pressure off other hillside neighborhoods (with related impacts) and to enable Beachwood residents to hike
- Vet safety plans through HUNC and other key neighborhood groups
- Use leadership of Council office to seek to unite hillside neighborhoods under common needs/issues (as opposed to "us vs. them")

Obviously this is more than you asked for, but I think all of these elements are important. Again, please let me know if this is useful, and I look forward to our meeting next week.

Jason

From: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2017 7:05 PM
To: Jason Greenwald
Cc: 
Subject: Re: Griffith Park Access and Mobility Study Stakeholder Meeting
Hey Shannon. Thanks for accepting this in my absence form the future meeting.

ACCESS IDEAS
1- Reopen Beachwood with shuttle service from a designated point on Hollywood Blvd. and charge for the service. Proceeds can be used to pay for security at that entrance.

2- Reopen pedestrian access at Beachwood with new stairwell at right of existing gate.

3- Create shuttle service to Duranda gate. This may help with car traffic.

4- New access at Ford Theater.

SAFETY IDEAS
1- Designated Ranger or Park personnel at all access gates to help with crowd control, directions, hiking info, parking and public safety. Weekends are especially challenging. City has to acknowledge and help with crowd control issues affecting visitors and residents alike.

2- Canyon Drive sidewalk at entry of park to eliminate pedestrian traffic in roadway.

3- Signage - No Smoking, No littering, Please Help Keep Our Park Clean

4- Homeless/Vagrant camping has increased since porta potty was placed at Canyon Drive Park. This presents fire hazards as well as public safety risks. Maybe lock porta potty at night. A more permanent bathroom structure, like the ones at Ferndell, would serve the public better and be easier to lock at night. Have police be more present and do occasional sweeps.

5- Speed Bumps on Canyon Drive have disappeared since road was repaved last week. They should be reinstalled and additional ones between Spring Oak Drive and Canyon Drive Park entrance should be installed to reduce speeding and potential pedestrian injury.

I know this more than you asked for but it is hard to delineate a singular issue to a what I perceive as a comprehensive set of problems.

Hope this helps.
And thanks again for representing our interests at the meeting.
Feel free to contact me with any questions.

Bill Doyle

On Fri, 10/13/17, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> wrote:

Subject: Re: Griffith Park Access and Mobility Study Stakeholder Meeting
To: "Bill Doyle"
Date: Friday, October 13, 2017, 5:13 PM

Thank you,
Bill!
On Fri, Oct 13, 2017 at
4:58 PM, Bill Doyle wrote:
Thanks for the invite Shannon.

Unfortunately I am previously engaged on that evening... the only evening that week.

I will send you my ideas so you have them for the meeting.

Thanks again for including me in the is process.

Bill Doyle

-------------------------------
On Thu, 10/12/17, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> wrote:

Subject: Griffith Park Access and Mobility Study Stakeholder Meeting

To: "Jason Greenwald" ,

Date: Thursday, October 12, 2017, 1:51 PM

[Quoted text hidden]

Shannon Prior

Deputy Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu Office:

323.957.6415 http://davidryu.lacity.org/

Immediate

life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency:

9-1-1 Parking

enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate

impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184 Police

non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD

(877-275-5273) Sanitation

(missed trash pick-up, broken container):

800-773-2489 Traffic

control (signal light out): 213-485-4184 Dept. of

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfeade51e&jsver=jIbIdzeP9wE.en.&view=pt&msg=15f50904eed5c49b&cat=Feedback%20Dixon%20study%20publish%202
Hi Shannon,

You asked for a list of discussion topics we would like to cover at the GP Access and Mobility Study Stakeholders Meeting.

Our two topics are:
1) Re-open Beachwood Canyon access to the Hollyridge Trail.
2) More shuttles, fewer cars.

Thanks for inviting us and for giving us an opportunity to participate in this important conversation with the Councilmember.

Best,
Linda
Hi, Shannon:

As requested, in an almost timely fashion are the topics the BCNA discussed regarding Griffith Park, the Hollyridge Trail, Hollywood sign, tourism, and safety: Thank you for including us.

--
Missy Kelly
LA News Clips

128K
October 25, 2017

Dear Councilmember Ryu,

As requested, here are some of our concerns regarding the questions you have presented to us. We look forward to continued dialog going forward.

1) How to increase access to the Park:

Open access to Hollyridge trail is a priority for many residents in Beachwood Canyon. This new access would be created on the right side of the existing electric gate. The installation of modular stairs up to and connecting to the Hollyridge trail will take pedestrian traffic to the hiking trail avoiding the easement shared by the City and Sunset Ranch. Details for this brilliant proposal are found in docs received by the City from Griffith Park Advisory Council.

2) How to increase safety for residents and visitors:

Pedestrian safety: There is an ongoing need for more traffic control personnel and/or cadets at our hot spots (upper Deronda, Ledgewood/Mulholland, Scenic View, Beachwood Drive at the electric gate).

Hiker safety: continue the efforts by R.A.P. to install water fountains and trail signage. Install Porto bathrooms like the one existing at Martinez Arena maintained in pristine condition by R.A.P. Rangers and staff.

Traffic Safety: The hot populated tourist zones need “UNIQUE SIGNAGE” (No Smoking and No Parking), created with our community spirit in mind and strategically placed to get the message across to out-of-town visitors. The current generic DOT signs DO NOT do the job.
Griffith Park Access & Mobility Study Stakeholder Meeting

Chris Laib <[redacted]> 
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Cc: DonaldS261 <[redacted]>

Shannon. Here is mine

1). Access increase: In light of the current unmitigated traffic in the neighborhoods accessed by Western Cyn/Fern Dell, Vermont, Hillhurst and Commonwealth, there cannot be any increase in private passenger vehicles. There are several obvious solutions that will take political courage to implement, but are logical. We can open a parking lot south of the park, in the Sunset/Hollywood/Santa Monica Blvd corridors. Shuttles can be used to increase visitors and decrease vehicles entering the park from the east, west and south via this method. There is an equally logical and practical solution to relocate the ingress from Hollywood and the SFV, by staging it from the Forest Lawn Drive side of the park. Develop DG lots on the RAP owned land between the river and Forest Lawn Dr, just west of headworks. Shuttle these visitors directly into the east side of the park for the Zoo, Autry and other east attractions, or over Mt Hollywood Dr to the Observatory and Greek. Logical, as Universal Studios is also on the top 10 tourist attractions and it is adjacent to these lots. Otherwise, the southern entrances to the park can handle no further traffic and ultimately, we need to close these access areas to the park. They burden dense residential neighborhoods and need to be closed to private passenger vehicles. Worldwide best practices for municipal and national parks of this size is that there is no private vehicle access; Los Angeles is a laggard in this regard and we need to catch up

2) Safety will be greatly increased by reducing the amount of private vehicles in the park. Passive recreation, such as hiking, jogging, picnicking and biking are in direct conflict with autos. As an interim measure, a segregated walking path from a) the Greek north lots to the Observatory b) a pedestrian bridge over or under (like Hollywood Bowl) upper Vermont- north of the Vermont/Commonwealth Canyon intersection pinch point is a priority. Currently, we have pedestrians, Vermont ingress vehicles, Uber/Lyft drop offs and Roosevelt golfers all coming and going thru this 2 lane intersection. Impossible and a tragic accident is eminent. There have been plans for 2 years now to create a new pedestrian crossing 125 yards north of this intersection, thus relieving the density. Ultimately, the prohibition of private vehicles will resolve this problem also.

There you are. Hope this helps

Sent from my iPhone
Hi Shannon,

My thoughts:
1) I believe improved park access would most benefit from expanding the shuttle bus system within the park. The current critical crunch location is the Mt. Hollywood area near the Observatory, and we should explore the possibility of opening Mt. Hollywood Drive as a shuttle bus route connecting the Observatory to new parking locations on the north of the park. This would enable park users to avoid the congested southern streets leading into the park (Vermont Avenue, Commonwealth Avenue, Fern Dell Drive) without burdening the eastern road system or Los Feliz Blvd. Eventually, another shuttle route should be developed on the eastern road system (Crystal Springs Drive, etc.) with parking at the zoo area or near the pony rides to further limit traffic within the park. Finally, a formal Hollywood Sign viewing area in Hollywood ought to be developed, with historic exhibits connected to the Hollywood Sign for public interest.

2) Safety for residents and park visitors can only be enhanced through reduced traffic combined with additional pedestrian pathways to reduce the need to walk on the roads while walking from one place to another. Distributing foot traffic through the maintenance of ALL historic park access routes and gates is also important, and the closure of any gates (e.g. the Beachwood Gate) should be immediately reversed.

Don

In a message dated 10/20/2017 5:56:15 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, shannon.prior@lacity.org writes:

Hello Don and Chris,

In the interest of making sure that the November 1 meeting is productive and efficient (especially because it will potentially be the night of Game 7), could you provide me with your two ideas via email prior to the meeting? If you recall, the two ideas were: (1) How to increase access to the Park; and (2) How to increase safety for residents and visitors.

Please send them to me by Wednesday, October 25 so that the consultant has time to review.

Thank you!

On Fri, Oct 13, 2017 at 5:51 PM, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> wrote:

Great -- thanks so much!

On Fri, Oct 13, 2017 at 2:14 PM, DonaldS261 < wrote:

Hi Shannon,

The correct spelling of my last name is Seligman. I am also a past president of LFIA and Vice Chair of the Griffith Park Advisory Board.

Don

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 13, 2017, at 12:55, Nyla Arslanian > wrote:

Hi Shannon,

Thank you for the invitation. The two LFIA board members who will be participating in the Griffith Park Access and Mobility Study Stakeholder meeting are:
Chris Laib, Co-chair of LFIA Parks Committee
Don Seligman, LFIA Treasurer and board member well versed on mobility issues

We look forward to hearing the results of the substantive discussions.

Best regards,

Nyla
Nyla Arslanian
President
LOS FELIZ IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION

[my daytime business number]
www.LFIA.org

From: Shannon Prior [mailto:shannon.prior@lacity.org]
[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]
NOv. 1 Park Meeting Suggestions

Jim Van Dusen

To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Fri, Oct 27, 2017 at 4:42 PM

Shannon, my suggestions attached. I've been out of town and have just now been able to deal with this. Please advise if you need anything else from me for the meeting. Thanks.  Jim

Jim Van Dusen

NOv. 1 Park Meeting Suggestions.docx

458K
Increase access to park (Griffith Park): Eliminate or severely limit all parking in the park and run frequent buses to the established park openings and into the park much like the busses now running to the Observatory. This would include the Bronson Canyon Park (Canyon Drive), Fern Dell and east. This would not be possible for the areas west of Canyon Drive on the LA city side as there are only a couple of fire roads and ad hoc trails in those areas with no effective infrastructure addition or mitigation possible. Adding a bus run up the back of the park from the Riverside Drive area would also increase the number of people going into the park.

Increase safety in the hillside areas: As a start, continued and vigorous enforcement of all laws and signs in the hillside areas including assigning full time police and park rangers coupled with 7 day permit parking (PPD) from Franklin Avenue to the park boundaries (7 day PPD’s would also help the lower canyon areas deal with the increased lack of parking in their neighborhoods due to the increase of construction with reduced parking in Hollywood that is causing people to park in the lower hill areas and walk to work or to the entertainment options in Hollywood). These measures coupled with significant numbers of buses added to the established park openings would solve the majority of the safety concerns.
Hello Daniel and Jeffrey,

The Office of Councilmember David Ryu would like to invite you to attend the Griffith Park Access and Mobility Study Stakeholder meeting.

The Access and Mobility Study was initiated by the Councilmember to identify comprehensive solutions that will provide safe and easy access to the Park while also minimizing negative impacts on the Park's surrounding residential streets.

The purpose of the meeting is bring together members of the communities affected by the popularity of Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign so that they can share their ideas and hear about the data collected by the study's consultant Dixon Resources Unlimited.

We ask that attendees bring two ideas: (1) How to increase access to the Park; and (2) How to increase safety for residents and visitors.

The meeting will be held at Cheremoya Avenue Elementary School on **Wednesday, November 1, 2017 at 6:30 pm**.

Please RSVP to me at shannon.prior@lacity.org by **October 23, 2017**.

Thank you.

--

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.957.6415
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: **9-1-1**
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): **213-485-4184**
- Police non-emergency: **877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)**
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): **800-773-2489**
- Traffic control (signal light out): **213-485-4184**
- Dept. of Water & Power: **800-342-5397**
- Other City issues: **3-1-1**

Shannon Prior
To: Jeffery Masino <parkschair@hhwnc.org>
Cc: "Anastasia Mann <president@hhwnc.org>

Fri, Oct 20, 2017 at 6:23 PM

In the interest of ensuring that the November 1 meeting is productive and efficient (especially because it will potentially be the night of Game 7), could you provide me with your two ideas via email prior to the meeting? If you recall the two ideas were: (1) How to increase access to the Park; and (2) How to increase safety for residents and visitors.

Please send them to me by **Wednesday, October 25** so that the consultant has time to review.

Also, Daniel, please let me know if you can attend!

Thank you!
On Wed, Oct 18, 2017 at 5:05 PM, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> wrote:

Excellent!

On Oct 18, 2017, at 1:30 PM, Jeffery Masino <parkchair@hhwnc.org> wrote:

Hi Shannon. I am available that date.

Best,
Jeff

Jeffery Masino
Parks and Open Space Chair

From: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2017 12:51:35 PM  
To: Jeffery Masino; Anastasia Mann 
Cc:  
Subject: Griffith Park Access and Mobility Study Stakeholder Meeting 

[Quoted text hidden]

Jeffery Masino <parkchair@hhwnc.org> Sun, Oct 29, 2017 at 9:32 PM 
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> 
Cc: Anastasia Mann <president@hhwnc.org> 

Hi Shannon, Hi Daniel, Hi Anastasia,

I just want to check in on the meeting this Wed evening. How long is the meeting supposed to take place?

Shannon, you had asked for input on questions in your email (Sorry, I've been traveling):
Increasing access via south-facing neighborhoods is increasingly problematic due to the sheer volume of vehicles - made possible through internet and phone apps that literally put these small, limited neighborhood streets on the map of thousands of mobile phone users. Canyon Drive, Beachwood, the Dells, HHWNC Area 1 - all of these areas are besieged. Therefore, in cases that involve peaks, such a Cauhenga peak, find a way to create access via north-facing slopes. Do not continue to only look at HHWNC and HUNC neighborhoods as the logical access points.

In our June Parks and Open Space Committee meeting, we talked about the owners of Forest Lawn Cemetery being responsive, collaborative, and actively involved in community issues with the City. In the past, this apparently involved the acquisition of some Cemetery land to the City of Los Angeles. If so, this would help to create the north-facing access need to draw resources away from over-burdened south-facing neighborhoods. If another partner could be found to provide parking along Forest Lawn Drive (perhaps Warner Bros. Studios?), then perhaps a nominal fee for parking access could be charged to any trail goer.

This would also help to create a safer access - away from homes needing possible emergency vehicle access.

Best,

Jeff

Jeffery Masino
Parks and Open Space Chair

---

From: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2017 6:23:59 PM
To: Jeffery Masino
Cc: Anastasia Mann
Subject: Re: Griffith Park Access and Mobility Study Stakeholder Meeting

[Quoted text hidden]
The big issue is to find a way to create new Laws/restrictions to protect neighborhoods and small streets that absolutely CANNOT tolerate heavy traffic.

This IS possible. No one thought we could get a state law through to control tour busses locally. But we did.

Common sense and safety have to prevail over now-outdated rules. Times have changed and local government and city agencies have to change too, and be bold enough to be creative and adapt “safety first” principles to protect communities, residents AND visitors.

Dangerous encounters are occurring between normally civilized people.

These small streets must be regulated and restricted for passage not intended to a residence.

The northern “entries” Jeff refers to mean working with Griffith Park and Forest Lawn.

This WAS done when the Observatory re-opened. Recall how NO ONE was allowed to drive up the very PUBLIC streets to the Observatory. You were forced to take designated busses.

Also working with the Ford Amphitheatre folks for their “alternate” hiking trail. They provide parking and a structured path to view the sign.

The words “it can’t be done” should not exist in today’s Crazy, crowded reality. We must adapt and find “new rules”. This means being bold and creative.

The drawing board must have no edges.

Anastasia

Anastasia Mann
HHWNC President

7095 Hollywood Blvd., Suite #1004
Hollywood, CA 90028

president@hhwnc.org
HHWNC.ORG
Griffith Park Access and Mobility Study Stakeholder Meeting

Shannon,  

Here's the short version of our input. We hope we can expand on this at the meeting.  

1) Proceed with the implementation of the "alternative access plan" at Beachwood which complies with Judge Feffer's court order. And don't close any more public accesses to the park.

2) Implement new shuttles to viable park access points and sign viewing locations. Don't discourage the use of public transportation to Griffith Park as was done at Beachwood. Bottom line, more public transportation means less cars and increased safety.

Thanks,
Gerry Hans
Follow Up from Nov. 12th Meeting

Ronald Deutsch

To: 
Cc: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Mon, Nov 13, 2017 at 1:23 PM

Dear Julie,

I attended yesterday’s meeting and made the suggestion about extending the park-wide circulator service to Bronson Canyon / Griffith Park. I am also a member of the Griffith Park advisory board. Thanks for your invitation and for an informative and well-run meeting.

Here are a couple of follow up points, per your request:

1. Developing the Vista Site at Mulholland is a no-brainer for tourists seeking pictures of the Hollywood Sign. FYI, 5 years ago I sat on the Hollywoodland HA Board and we actually installed signs directing visitors to the site, via D.O.T. and Tom LaBonge’s office. The signs were immediately torn down by hostile homeowners in Beachwood Canyon. Still think it’s a great idea!

The Vista Site should also include restrooms at Lake Hollywood Park. The public urination is a problem. Parking meters would be a good idea at the site as well — whether you think people will pay or not. Obviously that area should be staffed with a full time DOT officer during the summer and holidays. This is part of the sorely needed infrastructure to facilitate tourists. The City needs to understand that if they’re going to market the Hollywood Sign world-wide, they need to provide the requisite and fundamental services.

2. The GP shuttle system from parking facilities should mitigate park visitor and hiker’s needs. My understanding from Joe Salaices is that the three small (20 person) shuttle route will extend only to Western Canyon Dr. / Fern Dale, I think extending the shuttle to Canyon would mitigate traffic there.

3. As a resident of Beachwood Canyon, I can tell you that permanent closure of the Hollyridge gate has had a positive effect on the quality of life issues in Beachwood canyon. I was never a proponent for permanent closure of the gate, but now that it’s done, I have to admit that it’s working to return the canyon to normalcy. As long as there’s directly access to the park from Beachwood Canyon, via the Deronda gate, I can’t see how anyone would have an issue.

4. Relative to PPD’s at Deronda Gate. I’m not sure that judging the traffic on Deronda on a holiday weekend is the best way to judge regular traffic flow. I often park on Deronda and hike into the park after 4:00 and there never seems to be problems with traffic. My suggestion for PPD hours there:

10 AM to 4 PM, 7 days a week, May - Oct. all weekends and holidays. Otherwise, you’re prohibiting usage from neighbors who like to hike in the late afternoon.

Please let me know if there’s anything I can do to further your goals. Happy to sit on any other committees you may be forming for this effort.

Best,

rd
Hi Julie,

Thanks so much for the informative presentation last night—and all the hard work that went into it. I wanted to share one quick piece of feedback, if you don't mind.

It's a big step forward for our community to have our Council office making decisions based on good data. If there are further opportunities to collect more data before the final report, as Sarah suggested might be possible, I'd like to see data to justify the recommendation to extend the Beachwood PPD. Any data which could demonstrate how the extension would mitigate traffic, both pedestrian and vehicular, would be helpful.

Beyond my own concerns about that particular PPD, I fear that extending or implementing a PPD without robust supporting data could set a very bad precedent for all of our neighborhoods.

Thanks again for all your hard work and the statistical rigor you're bringing to these very complicated issues.

Best,
David Parker
Lake Hollywood

Dear Mr. Parker,

On behalf of DIXON, I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge your feedback following the stakeholder meeting held on November 12th at the Hollywood Neighborhood City Hall.

We have been receiving valuable feedback from many meeting participants with regard to their individual concerns, suggestions for further data collection efforts, and their ideas for additional recommendations. I wanted to respond and assure you that your feedback about the Beachwood PPD and the need for data to justify any changes to PPDs has been reviewed by the DIXON team. At the present time, we are finalizing additional data collection efforts to be conducted in the coming weeks with Council District 4 Staff that will make for more robust recommendations moving forward.

Thank you for taking the time to email the DIXON team. Please feel free to reach out to us in the coming weeks. For your reference, here is a link to the presentation Julie gave at the stakeholder meeting:

Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited

From: David A Parker <david@daparker.com>
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2017 3:10:06 PM
To: Julie Dixon
Cc: Shannon Prior
Subject: Griffith Park Mobility Study

[Quoted text hidden]
Hi Julie,

Great meeting you Sunday. Thanks for your work getting this initial phase going.

Here's a link to the interactive map I mentioned that was used for the TOD Visioning in Culver City. [https://www.culvertodvision.org/map/](https://www.culvertodvision.org/map/). Unfortunately, you have to register to see the comments, but it attempts to organize things via five topics + a catch all "other" category. It was one of the tools used to gather information across a limited area.

I think the data collection you started is great and something that can be refined and built on. Naturally the issues start with cars and you have to go there first, but I would continue to extend to the support and mitigation of pedestrian access since we know this brings additional issues. It would be nice to capture it in depth while you have everyone's attention.

Pedestrian access is what made me ask whether we had all the stakeholders in the room. An observation is that participants skewed primarily toward homeowners (of which I'm one!) BUT what Griffith Park really is, is a resource for all Angelenos (and visitors).

Don't know if you've seen this document, It doesn't have a lot of concrete ideas to cull but it gives some sentiment felt by people both within the area and the City at large [https://petitions.moveon.org/sign/open-our-park-1.fb49?r_by=18344308&source=s.fb.ty](https:// petitions.moveon.org/sign/open-our-park-1.fb49?r_by=18344308&source=s.fb.ty). For what it's worth!

Finally, I wanted to bone up on the city's street classifications so I gathered these links. There's a little conflict in the "collector" definition and what shows up on Zimas and Assessors Maps for Beachwood width (38'). I may be missing something.

[https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfdeade515e&jsver=Z-grDj2gpow.en.&view=pt&msg=15fbdb01577359fc&cat=Feedback%20Dixon%20study%20publish&sel](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfdeade515e&jsver=Z-grDj2gpow.en.&view=pt&msg=15fbdb01577359fc&cat=Feedback%20Dixon%20study%20publish&sel)
Street Designations
Street Designations II
Street Designations III
AP Map

Brian Lane AIA, LEED® A.P. Principal
Subject: FW: Beachwood changed

Date:    Thursday, 16 November 2017 at 08:34:00 Pacific Standard Time
From:    Julie Dixon
To:      Dan Pearce, Emily Kwatinetz

Julie Dixon

-----Original Message-----
From: Fran Reichenbach [mailto:]
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2017 4:27 PM
To: Julie Dixon <>
Subject: Beachwood changed

I’m with the Beachwood Canyon Neighborhood Assn. In the meeting last Sunday, 7-day a week permit parking was mentioned as a possibility. We are totally opposed to that as it would pass on even more negative impacts to the community just south of Beachwood Village. As a matter of fact, the only permit parking areas that could benefit while not impacting other areas would be upper Deronda where the pedestrian gate leads to Mt Lee Drive.

We are also hearing that the existing weekend PPDs don’t allow one neighbor to visit another unless there is a guest pass acquired. We all wish they could be all one PPD number so that we can visit one another and maybe even have neighborhood parties hosted at one home or another.

I hope you can include these notes on your findings.

Fran Reichenbach

Sent from my iPhone
Hi Julie,

I attended the meeting on Sunday as an “At Large” member and I am also a member of the Griffith Park Advisory Board.

Your presentation was very informative, and you answered a lot of questions we had going into the meeting. I appreciate your offer to listen and incorporate ideas into the final plan coming in January.

One of the issues we didn’t have time to discuss and should be considered for the future is the Alternate Trail Access at the top of Beachwood. I worked to design this plan and GPAB, HUNC, Friends of Griffith Park, the Los Feliz Homeowners Association and the Oaks Homeowners Association have all overwhelmingly approved it. The alternate trail is to provide the pedestrian access into Griffith Park that has been stopped in the ongoing lawsuit Sunset Ranch v. City of Los Angeles. We designed this plan to be in keeping with all the court orders relating to the Ranch lawsuit and I presume that since CD4 is involved in litigation, they might have asked you not to discuss it.

It is listed in the Survey results you summarized. I am attaching the pdf summary of the plan so you will be able to see how it fits in with your Beachwood Drive analysis.

One of the “low hanging fruit” plans you presented is to have PPDs 7 days a week on Beachwood Drive. Many of us who live in Beachwood canyon can’t understand why PPDs exist at all any more above Ledgewood on Beachwood Drive let alone 7 days a week. If you venture up Beachwood any day of the week, you will see dozens of parking spaces available.

If PPDs are added every day, many people will be hugely inconvenienced for no good reason. My neighbors and I urge you to take a second look at that suggestion.

Finally, one attendee at the meeting on Sunday asked if the circulator plans would extend west of Vermont to include Beachwood. I am not clear on what your response was. Since many of us who filled out the CD4 survey suggested adding shuttles all the way up Beachwood, and some suggested adding shuttles to travel up Ledgewood to the Vista (or extending Dash buses to the top of Beachwood) we are hoping you will include public transportation west of Vermont as part of your plan. It is a no brainer that having public transportation to the top of Beachwood will alleviate residents’ concerns about safety of walkers and car congestion in that location.

Thanks for listening. I look forward to meeting with you again.

Sincerely,

Kris Sullivan
Subject: RE: Beachwood survey
Date: Sunday, 26 November 2017 at 19:53:18 Pacific Standard Time
From: Julie Dixon
To: Christine Kent
CC: Emily Kwatinetz, Dan Pearce

Hello Christine

I am copying my colleagues on this response. I will be on the road this week, but will ask Emily to coordinate a time to talk with you. Hopefully, I will be available, but regardless, Emily will be able to follow up with you.

Thanks

Julie Dixon

-----Original Message-----
From: Christine Kent [mailto:]
Sent: Sunday, November 26, 2017 10:47 AM
To: Julie Dixon <>
Subject: Beachwood survey

Hi Julie. You were given (in a Hollywood land Facebook thread) in Kris Sullivan's post as the contact for the recent survey. I live at the very end of beachwood and would like to meet with you. I will be in Los Angeles next week. Can we set up a call some time next week. Thank you. Christine

Sent from my iPhone
More examples of what we encounter on Mulholland.

Jane
On Nov 27, 2017, at 2:53 PM, Jane Goichman wrote:

I will forward to Dixon, Unlimited, the consultant working for Ryu.

From: Lester Kiss [mailto:
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 2:36 PM
To: sarah.dusseault@lacity.org; ; David Benz; Andy Corrigan; 
; Kristina O'Neil; Rio Phior; ; david.ryu@lacity.org; 
Jane Goichman; Sheila Irani 1
Subject: One more video, same vehicle

Virus-free: www.avast.com
Subject: FW: One more video, same vehicle
Date: Monday, 27 November 2017 at 15:41:08 Pacific Standard Time
From: Julie Dixon
To: Emily Kwatinetz, Dan Pearce
Attachments: image001.jpg

Julie Dixon

From: Sarah Dusseault [mailto:sarah.dusseault@lacity.org]
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 2:40 PM
To: Lester Kiss ; Julie Dixon
Subject: Re: One more video, same vehicle

Lester,

Please submit any perceived omissions directly to Dixon and Associates so that there can be no confusion that they received your submissions.

Thanks,

Sarah

On Mon, Nov 27, 2017 at 2:35 PM, Lester Kiss <lesterkiss@me.com> wrote:

CD4:
Did Dixon think about making the double solid line a dotted line to allow passing on Canyon Lake Dr? Did they address this passing issue at all? Isn’t it a traffic issue? What page in report? Hopefully I missed it and it was addressed. The dangerous conditions forcing local residents to violate traffic laws continue. Please advise us. Should we pass or just wait?

Lester
Sent from my iPhone
Julie,

Thanks for the presentation of results of the Traffic Study around Griffith Park. I was impressed by the amount of brain power gathered around the table and believe some positive solutions can be developed and implemented to help affected neighborhoods deal with the crush of tourism on our local streets.

Before diving deeply into solutions based on the data collected I believe it is prudent to consider and include facts about the data collection results that were not part of the report that was presented.

As per your request I will bullet point some issues to consider.

TRAFFIC STUDY

1- Study did not occur during Peak Summer weekends, (June July, August).
2- Labor Day and Memorial Day are traditionally lighter traffic weekends. This is a local secret that the study data bears out when you compare the 2 weekends of study.
3- ADT counters were placed in areas that counted all (local and tourist) traffic in all areas except Canyon Drive which counted only park entrance traffic. This inflates counts in some areas and deflates counts on Canyon Drive. I think you would agree this is an apples and oranges comparison.
4- Using an April count (pre Beachwood Closure) on Canyon Drive and September counts in all other areas is not only inexplicable but does not provide quality comparative data.
5- Ferndell and Vermont were not measured on same weekends by the study or at all.
6- 106 degree heat wave on Labor Day weekend further affected the study data collection.

Canyon Drive (Bronson Park) is primarily a hiking entry point. This kind of historic heat wave traditionally encourages people to stay in their air-conditioned vehicles and seek quick sightings of the Hollywood sign in Beachwood and Lake Hollywood.

Having lived adjacent to the park for 17 years I am in no way a NIMBY. Shannon can attest that I have been active in trying to calm the Beachwood closure backlash while looking for responsible and reasonable solutions to the problems that accompany heavy tourism.

My major concern is that the study results, as they stand now, do not give a complete picture of the challenges facing our community.

When determining traffic flows it is critical to measure Peak Summer Times in all areas simultaneously. Only then can comprehensive solutions be constructed to solve parking and traffic flow impacts.

Having said that, the study did reveal some areas of concern regarding Duranda and Wonderland regardless of missing Peak Summer time measurements and these issues can and should be addressed in the near future.

One additional issue is the concept of using shuttles.

USE OF SHUTTLES

The profile of people who are driving into our neighborhoods to access the park are as follows:

1- Locals using park to hike/dog walk.
2- California residents from all counties driving there personal vehicles.
3- Out of state visitors driving their personal vehicles.
4- Tourists who have chosen to spend part of their budget renting a vehicle for transportation.
5- Uber/Lyft users.
This comprises your target audience and shuttles will not have much of an affect on these visitors. I believe the use of shuttles will only add to congestion in residential areas.

Shuttles should be used to access Ford Theater site which is not situated in a residential area.

PARKING

It was suggested at the meeting that Beachwood be given additional preferential parking privileges. If this solution is pursued I believe it is only fair to supply all affected residential neighborhoods north of Franklin with the same protections and privileges to avoid simply shifting the problem from one neighborhood to the next. This is not my preference, but the horses may already be out of the barn on this issue.

I hope this helps and is received in the spirit of solidarity in which it was written.
I would be happy to further discuss and share my insights as I am a daily user of the park and can provide extensive anecdotal evidence to the challenges we are facing.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,
Bill Doyle

---

Dan Pearce

To:  
CC: Emily Kwatinetz  Julie Dixon
"shannon.prior@lacity.org" <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Dear Mr. Doyle,

On behalf of DIXON, I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge your feedback following the stakeholder meeting held on November 12th at the Hollywood Neighborhood City Hall.

We have been receiving valuable feedback from many meeting participants with regard to their individual concerns, suggestions for further data collection efforts, and their ideas for additional recommendations. I wanted to respond and assure you that your feedback about the data collection, shuttles and PPDs has been reviewed by the DIXON team. At the present time, we are working with Council District 4 Staff to finalize additional data collection efforts to be conducted in the coming weeks. As Julie stated in the meeting, recommendations are still evolving and are not finalized. Stakeholder feedback such as yours, will be crucial in addressing the needs of the community moving forward and coming up with the right solution for the neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time to email the DIXON team. Please feel free to reach out to us in the coming weeks. For your reference, here is a link to the presentation Julie gave at the stakeholder meeting:


Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce
Dixon Resources Unlimited

[Quoted text hidden]
Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Dixon Study - clarification/correction needed

2 messages

Jeanne Clark <Jeanne.Clark@lacity.org>  Tue, Nov 21, 2017 at 4:22 PM

To: Julie Dixon
Cc: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>, Catherine Landers <catherine.landers@lacity.org>, HHA

Julie,

My previous email to CD4 (copy to you) regarding the Mobility Study, questioned Navigate LA’s classifications for the study areas.

Obviously using the Los Angeles' performance metric assigned for a collector street on a street that changes substantially from beginning at Franklin to the dead end is erroneous as most of the traffic/safety issues occur at the constricted section with no parkways/sidewalks. This is a huge concern especially since we are all trying to determine the best solutions for safe access.

Also, the Canyon Dr study area, which is appropriately classified as a collector street on Navigate LA and has continuous sidewalks, parkways and generous widths from Franklin to the terminatation at the legal Griffith Park entrance does not have ADT data posted. Was it collected and just not included or was it not collected at all? If not collected, why not?

I would also like to request clarification on the application of San Diego's performance standards. You did explain at the 11/12 meeting and in the study draft that LA did not have ADT metrics published for local street standard classifications thus you used San Diego street design manual as a reference point.

Unlike collector streets, there are no operational criteria standards defined by the City for ADT counts along local streets. As a reference point, the City of San Diego's Street Design Manual defines an operational criteria of 1,500 ADT on local streets.

While the March 2017 version of the San Diego street design guide (attached) does show operational criteria of 1500 ADT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1-3. RESIDENTIAL LOCAL STREET SPECIFICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width, Right-of-Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-loaded*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design ADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width, Curb-to-Curb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-loaded*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Curve Radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Single-loaded street not permitted in Medium-to-Very High Density Multiple Dwelling Residential areas.

it clearly defines the ROW specification of 52-62 feet, width of 28-32 ft and maximum grades of 15%.

In addition, this same guide also provides operational criteria for local streets that have narrower ROW and roadway width,
with an ADT of only 700 (3 hr ADT=87.5).

While Deronda, Ledgewood and portions of Mulholland are still substandard (ROW's of 21-25 feet) compared to the San Diego specifications for low volume residential local streets --- why didn't Dixon at least reference this guideline as the more appropriate ADT?

Furthermore, the Deronda ADT study area has much more similarities to a San Diego Cul de sac definition than even the SD low volume residential local. This specifications has an even further reduced ADT of 200. Yet in the Dixon study, this section of road was held at the operational criteria of 1500 ADT ---over seven times the San Diego recommendation???
It is quite disturbing that Dixon, in choosing San Diego operational criteria as a standard to measure Los Angeles substandard, hillside streets with no sidewalks, steep grades and dead ends, did not feel the need to reference those SD standards the best applied to the true nature of the street studied.

Please advise how you will correct these blatant errors.

Jeanne Clark

---

Dan Pearce  
Wed, Nov 29, 2017 at 9:10 AM

To:  
Cc: Emily Kwatinetz  Julie Dixon  Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Dear Ms. Clark,

On behalf of DIXON, I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge your feedback following the stakeholder meeting held on November 12th at the Hollywood Neighborhood City Hall. I will do my best to answer your questions.

We have been receiving valuable feedback from many meeting participants with regard to their individual concerns, suggestions for further data collection efforts, and their ideas for additional recommendations. I wanted to respond and assure you that your concerns about street classifications and ADT volumes in the area have been reviewed by the DIXON team.

First and foremost, I can confirm that during the first round of data collection ADT volumes were not collected along Canyon Drive. Only parking occupancy, bike, and pedestrian counts were collected in that area. Data collection sites were decided in discussion with Council District 4 Staff with the purpose of capturing conditions across the whole study area. However, ADT counts will be collected at the entrance to Griffith Park on Canyon Drive during the next round of data collection. The additional data collection scope and dates will be confirmed shortly.

Secondly, concerning the application of San Diego’s local street standards, as you mentioned, their ADT threshold was used for reference purposes only. We will review the San Diego report and broaden the discussion to include street widths and lower ADT thresholds before making further recommendations. We understand and agree that the roadway classifications and ADT standards are not precise. ADT volume standards and street classifications were included in the report for reference purposes only. As Julie stated in the meeting, recommendations are still evolving and are not finalized. Stakeholder feedback such as yours will be crucial in addressing the needs of the community moving forward and coming up with the right solution for the neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time to email the DIXON team. Please feel free to reach out to us in the coming weeks. For your reference, here is a link to the presentation Julie gave at the stakeholder meeting:

Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited

---

From: Jeanne Clark <jeanne.clark@hha.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2017 4:22:30 PM
To: Julie Dixon
Cc: Shannon Prior; Sarah Dusseault; Catherine Landers; HHA
Subject: Dixon Study - clarification/correction needed

Julie,

My previous email to CD4 (copy to you) regarding the Mobility Study, questioned Navigate LA's classifications for the study areas.

Obviously using the Los Angeles' performance metric assigned for a collector street on a street that changes substantially from beginning at Franklin to the dead end is erroneous as most of the traffic/safety issues occur at the constricted section with no parkways/sidewalks. This is a huge concern especially since we are all trying to determine the best solutions for safe access.

Also, the Canyon Dr study area, which is appropriately classified as a collector street on Navigate LA and has continuous sidewalks, parkways and generous widths from Franklin to the termination at the legal Griffith Park entrance does not have ADT data posted. Was it collected and just not included or was it not collected at all? If not collected, why not?

I would also like to request clarification on the application of San Diego's performance standards. You did explain at the 11/12 meeting and in the study draft that LA did not have ADT metrics published for local street standard classifications thus you used San Diego street design manual as a reference point.
Access and Mobility Study correction
3 messages

Alexa Williams <alexa.williams@lacity.org> Fri, Nov 17, 2017 at 3:35 PM
To: "sarah.dusseault@lacity.org" <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, 
"catherine.landers@lacity.org" <catherine.landers@lacity.org>, Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>
Cc: "Gregory P. Williams" <gregory.p.williams@lacity.org>, HHA Hollywood Homeowner Association <ha.hha.org>,

Dear Sarah, Shannon and Catherine,

As a co-owner of the Beachwood Village commercial corner, I was surprised to read this section in the Access and Mobility study prepared for CD4 by Dixon Resources Unlimited:

Los Angeles District 4 Data Analysis Report, 14

C. Week 1 vs. Week 2: Beachwood Village Lot Occupancy Study

The Beachwood Village Lot is located behind the Beachwood Market. Off-street occupancy was recorded on the same days and time periods as on-street occupancies described above for the same two-week period.

The parking lot referred to in the study is private property. We actively discourage hikers from parking with clear signage. Alex Papalexis, proprietor of the Beachwood Market, puts out a chalkboard every weekend that reads: “Parking while in businesses only”. Hiker and tourist parking hurts our private lot and hurts the businesses next door. I do not know why anyone at Dixon did not speak to my brother, Gregory Williams, who is the property manager there. I will cc Greg as I am sure he would like to know this.

Please amend this section of the Dixon study as this parking lot is not public as inferred by Dixon and resend a corrected copy to the participants of the meeting held on November 12 so that they may be informed as well.

Best regards,

Alexa A. Williams
Although the lot is private, it was included in the study so that the consultant could get an understanding of how the nearby PPDs affect the availability of parking for customers of the Village. It was included to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the parking situation in Beachwood. I will ask that the consultant explicitly state that the lot is private in the final report. I believe the draft that was sent is silent on whether the lot is public or private. Please correct me if I am mistaken.

Thank you.

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.957.6415
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfadde515e&jsver=Z-grDj2gpow.en.&view=pt&cat=Feedback%20Dixon%20study%20publish&search=cat&th=15fd179891e
Hi Shannon,

You are correct: our lot is not identified in this report as private, as is the unmentioned parking lot across from us on Beachwood. I am curious why this parking lot across from us was not included in the study with ours. Both are private and tempt visitors with their open parking spaces..

The Dixon report states that hikers park in our lot without noting that they are trespassing by doing so and ignoring the no parking for hiking and sightseeing signs that are posted. That omission makes it seems that the lot is there to accommodate hikers which is why I request a change in the wording.

Parking restrictions around the Village impact our businesses negatively, contributing to the decline of their economic health and their ability to serve the neighborhood that has thrived for ninety years under the sign that it created.

The city needs to find a more global solution to encourage visitors to the sign without impeding the health of an entire neighborhood.

[Quoted text hidden]
Bill Doyle <Sun, Nov 26, 2017 at 11:49 AM>
To: Julie,
Cc: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Jason Greenwald

Thanks for the presentation of results of the Traffic Study around Griffith Park.
I was impressed by the amount of brain power gathered around the table and believe some positive solutions can be
developed and implemented to help affected neighborhoods deal with the crush of tourism on our local streets.

Before diving deeply into solutions based on the data collected I believe it is prudent to consider and include facts about
the data collection results that were not part of the report that was presented.

As per your request I will bullet point some issues to consider.

TRAFFIC STUDY

1- Study did not occur during Peak Summer weekends, (June July, August).
2- Labor Day and Memorial Day are traditionally lighter traffic weekends. This is a local secret that the study data bears
out when you compare the 2 weekends of study.
3- ADT counters were placed in areas that counted all (local and tourist) traffic in all areas except Canyon Drive which
counted only park entrance traffic. This inflates counts in some areas and deflates counts on Canyon Drive.
I think you would agree this is an apples and oranges comparison.
4- Using an April count (pre Beachwood Closure) on Canyon Drive and September counts in all other areas is not only
inexplicable but does not provide quality comparative data.
5- Ferndell and Vermont were not measured on same weekends by the study or at all.
6- 106 degree heat wave on Labor Day weekend further affected the study data collection.
Canyon Drive (Bronson Park) is primarily a hiking entry point. This kind of historic heat wave traditionally encourages
people to stay in their air-conditioned vehicles and seek quick sightings of the Hollywood sign in Beachwood and Lake
Hollywood.

Having lived adjacent to the park for 17 years I am in no way a NIMBY. Shannon can attest that I have been active in
trying to calm the Beachwood closure backlash while looking for responsible and reasonable solutions to the problems
that accompany heavy tourism.

My major concern is that the study results, as they stand now, do not give a complete picture of the challenges facing our
community.

When determining traffic flows it is critical to measure Peak Summer Times in all areas simultaneously. Only then can
comprehensive solutions be constructed to solve parking and traffic flow impacts.

Having said that, the study did reveal some areas of concern regarding Duranda and Wonderland regardless of missing
Peak Summer time measurements and these issues can and should be addressed in the near future.

One additional issue is the concept of using shuttles.

USE OF SHUTTLES

The profile of people who are driving into our neighborhoods to access the park are as follows:

1- Locals using park to hike/ dog walk.
2- California residents from all counties driving there personal vehicles.
3- Out of state visitors driving their personal vehicles.
4- Tourists who have chosen to spend part of their budget renting a vehicle for transportation.
5- Uber/Lyft users.
This comprises your target audience and shuttles will not have much of an affect on these visitors. I believe the use of shuttles will only add to congestion in residential areas.

Shuttles should be used to access Ford Theater site which is not situated in a residential area.

PARKING

It was suggested at the meeting that Beachwood be given additional preferential parking privileges. If this solution is pursued I believe it is only fair to supply all affected residential neighborhoods north of Franklin with the same protections and privileges to avoid simply shifting the problem from one neighborhood to the next. This is not my preference, but the horses may already be out of the barn on this issue.

I hope this helps and is received in the spirit of solidarity in which it was written. I would be happy to further discuss and share my insights as I am a daily user of the park and can provide extensive anecdotal evidence to the challenges we are facing.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,
Bill Doyle
Re: One more video, same vehicle
2 messages

Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org> Mon, Nov 27, 2017 at 2:47 PM
To: Lester Kiss <...>
Cc: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Shannon would be best to cc as she is keeping track of these items.

Thanks,

Sarah

On Mon, Nov 27, 2017 at 2:41 PM, Lester Kiss <...> wrote:
Great idea!! Thank you so much for putting me in touch. I'll cc you so you are in the loop if that's ok.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 27, 2017, at 2:39 PM, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org> wrote:

Lester,

Please submit any perceived omissions directly to Dixon and Associates so that there can be no confusion that they received your submissions.

Thanks,

Sarah

On Mon, Nov 27, 2017 at 2:35 PM, Lester Kiss <...> wrote:

Download Attachment
Available until Dec 27, 2017

CD4:
Did Dixon think about making the double solid line a dotted line to allow passing on Canyon Lake Dr? Did they address this passing issue at all? Isn’t it a traffic issue? What page in report? Hopefully I missed it and it was addressed. The dangerous conditions forcing local residents to violate traffic laws continue. Please advise us. Should we pass or just wait?

Lester

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
To: Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>
Cc: Lester Kiss <levkiss@lacity.org>

Thank you, Lester.
[Quoted text hidden]

–

Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
Other City issues: 3-1-1
Lucinda Phillips <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
Mon, Nov 27, 2017 at 10:53 AM  

To: shannon.prior@lacity.org  

Dear Julie and Shannon  
Thank you for organizing and presenting the GP Access & Mobility Study Meeting.  
I would like to comment on 3 points:  
1) Due to the fact that the Traffic Study on Canyon Drive was not done at the same time as the other Traffic Studies, the study is not viable. There needs to be new vehicle data for Canyon Drive to determine the effects of the closure. The new data should be collected at a time of similar high usage as the September 2017 dates, one of which was Labor Day Weekend.  
2) Low Hanging Fruit - steps that can be taken immediately. One such immediate step should be a commitment to the Alternate Access Path to the Park at the end of Beachwood Drive. This route is a logical step and should be implemented.  
3) Hollywood Sign Viewing/Tourist Center - should be followed up on and implemented. It's an extremely important way to go forward to relieve the pressure on Griffith Park and the surrounding residential areas.  
Thank you,  
best regards  
Lucinda Phillips  
Friends of Griffith Park

Dan Pearce  
Wed, Nov 29, 2017 at 9:19 AM  

To: "shannon.prior@lacity.org" <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
Cc: Emily Kwatinetz  

"shannon.prior@lacity.org" <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  

Dear Ms. Phillips,  
On behalf of DIXON, I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge your feedback following the stakeholder meeting held on November 12th at the Hollywood Neighborhood City Hall.  

We have been receiving valuable feedback from many meeting participants with regard to their individual concerns, suggestions for further data collection efforts, and their ideas for additional recommendations. I wanted to respond and assure you that your feedback about the need for additional data collection along Canyon Drive, the Alternate Access Path at Beachwood Drive, and the tourist center have been reviewed by the DIXON team. At the present time, we are working with Council District 4 Staff to finalize additional data collection efforts to be conducted in the coming weeks.  

As Julie stated in the meeting, recommendations are still evolving and are not finalized. Stakeholder feedback such as yours, will be crucial in addressing the needs of the community moving forward and coming up with the right solution for the neighborhood.
Thank you for taking the time to email the DIXON team. Please feel free to reach out to us in the coming weeks. For your reference, here is a link to the presentation Julie gave at the stakeholder meeting:


Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited

From: Lucinda Phillips [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 10:53 AM
To: Julie Dixon <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Subject: GP Access & Mobility study Meeting Follow up

[Quoted text hidden]
Dear Sarah, Julie and Julia,

We want to thank you again for including us in the process of analyzing and assessing the mobility issues in and around the Beachwood Canyon and Canyon Drive areas. Attached is our feedback, including comments and suggestions regarding the survey presentation and future possible solutions to the problems of mobility especially as it relates to the Oaks. We’ve also attached our own mini survey made on Thanksgiving weekend in Bronson Canyon. Though it may only have anecdotal value it is a very real reflection of the situation on the ground.

We look forward to continued discussion and collaboration with you and all the stakeholders to find reasonable solutions to the traffic problems that we face in our neighborhood.

Respectfully yours,

Linda Othenin-Girard

President

Oaks Homeowners Association
Dear Linda,

On behalf of DIXON, I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge your feedback following the stakeholder meeting held on November 12th at the Hollywood Neighborhood City Hall. We have been receiving valuable feedback from many meeting participants with regard to their individual concerns, suggestions for further data collection, and their ideas for additional recommendations.

I wanted to respond and assure you that your feedback about the ADT and parking occupancy data, the Alternate Access Path, extending the DASH to the Beachwood Gate, and the suggestion of a Visitor/Transit Center have been reviewed by the DIXON team and will be considered further. As Julie stated in the meeting, recommendations are still evolving and are not finalized. Stakeholder feedback such as yours, will be crucial in addressing the needs of the community moving forward and coming up with the right solution for the neighborhood.

We are in the last stages of finalizing additional data collection areas, which together with resident feedback, will allow us to make robust recommendations. I can confirm, however, that additional ADT counts will be collected at the entrance to Griffith Park on Canyon Drive during the next round of data collection. The additional data collection scope and dates will be confirmed shortly. Regarding the occupancy study at Canyon Drive, that data consists of vehicle counts across several time periods on select days. The data collection days and time periods are detailed in the Data Analysis Report that was shared with stakeholders following the meeting on November 12th. Unfortunately, the raw data will not be made available until after the final report has been distributed. I apologize for any inconvenience.

Thank you for taking the time to email the DIXON team. Please feel free to reach out to us in the coming weeks. For your reference, here is a link to the presentation Julie gave at the stakeholder meeting:


Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited
From: Linda Othenin-Girard [mailto:]
Sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2017 3:52 PM
To: Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>; Julia Duncan <julia.duncan@lacity.org>; Julie Dixon <>
Cc: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>; Robert Young <>
Linda Othenin-Girard

Subject: Park Mobility Survey Response from the Oaks

[Quoted text hidden]

Linda Othenin-Girard
Cell:

Hi Dan,
Thanks so much for your response. We look forward to further communication on the survey and continued collaboration regarding the Park Mobility Survey and your final recommendations.

Sincerely,
Linda

Linda Othenin-Girard
President
Oaks Homeowners Association
Cell:

[Quoted text hidden]

Dan Pearce

Hi Linda,
You are very welcome. Thank you for your patience.

Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited
Park Mobility Study Comments

1. **The ADT Traffic Data.** It is difficult for the Oaks to place faith in the analysis when it has been acknowledged that the vehicle data for Canyon Drive was from a different period (and a different traffic study by a different entity) than the period used for the rest of the study (April 2017 versus September 2017). This vehicle data was not included in the PDF but was presented at the Nov 12th meeting – with the inference being drawn by those in attendance that traffic on Canyon Drive was not a problem. The Council Office and the City would like us to support this process and yet here is a fairly significant problem – acknowledged by Dixon. Because of this error, we have no idea of the impact created on Canyon Drive by the recent (April 18th) Beachwood Trail closure. There needs to be new vehicle data for Canyon Drive to determine the effects of the closure. The new data should be collected at a time of similar high usage as the September 2017 dates, one of which was Labor Day Weekend.

2. **The Canyon Drive Parking Lots usage data.** It is inconceivable to us that the parking lots within Bronson Park were less than 30% occupied at noon on the Sunday of Labor Day Weekend. This lot is overfilled every weekend day from early morning to afternoon in warm weather. This can be observed by anyone any Sunday. Because of this inconsistency, we request that we be allowed to see the raw data and the methodology used to generate these results. How was occupancy determined or measured? What is a full lot? We will need to see more here in order to trust something that defies all of our experience and personal observation.

Our own survey of the parking lots during the recent Thanksgiving weekend period (November 25-26) is provided as a separate PDF, complete with photos. While the street parking was not counted for this study, spaces were full or nearly full from the Bronson gate upwards.

3. **Proposals for what should be done moving forward.**
Ms. Dixon referred to “low-hanging fruit” – finding ideas for which we can take steps right away. One such immediate step should be a commitment to the Alternate Access Path to the Park at the end of Beachwood Drive. This commitment is crucial to the residents of the Canyon Drive area and the Oaks and is supported by the Griffith Park Advisory Board, Hollywood United Neighborhood Association, Los Feliz Improvement Association, Friends of Griffith Park, Beachwood Canyon Neighborhood Association, and the Griffith Trust, as well as many residents of Beachwood Canyon. This simple commitment costs the city nothing, and such a commitment would be a catalyst for additional positive changes in mobility within the Park areas. Furthermore, this Alternate Access proposal should not be restricted from the conversation at our committee meetings insofar as it is in compliance with the Judge’s order in the Sunset Ranch case. It must be seriously discussed and considered at our next committee meeting.
We would also suggest extending the current DASH bus route up to the Beachwood Gate. This extended route could utilize smaller shuttles than the current Beachwood busses in order to facilitate turn-around at the north end of the route. As demonstrated by the successful Sunset and Vermont DASH shuttle to the Observatory, tourists will gladly opt for public transportation. Yet, the access closure at Beachwood Canyon penalizes rather than encourages those who once accessed the park from the DASH terminus at Beachwood Village.

We also support the idea of a Visitor/Transit Center somewhere in Hollywood that would serve as gateway/focal point for Hollywood Sign visitors and tourists. This Center might serve as a starting point for shuttle service to the end of Beachwood Drive or to the Anson Ford Theatre Hollywood Sign observation site. It’s important that the Visitors Center be within walking distance of a metro station. From the revenue standpoint, the Center could also include retail opportunities so that Hollywood Sign merchandise could be purchased by visitors.
BRONSON OFF-STREET PARKING LOT SURVEY
(November 25 & 26, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main dirt lot</th>
<th>Girls' Camp Lot</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Occupancy %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/25/2017</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/2017</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At full occupancy 65 * 15 80

* Considering the inefficiencies of gravel lots, 65 seems to be reasonably full level.

Total Off-Street Occupancy

Photo 1: 9:00 a.m. Sunday
Hi Julie,

I hope you've had a nice Thanksgiving (and I hope you're reading this note after the holiday weekend!).

First of all, thank you again for leading the recent stakeholder meeting to share your team's initial findings. I appreciated the balancing act of presenting so much information and trying to give voice to 30+ participants -- not an easy challenge!

As I thought about our discussion, I wanted to add one item to the mix. Shannon suggested that I reach out to you with my thoughts.

As you know, Bronson Canyon Park is both a starting point for hikers and also a neighborhood park used by families. As you and your team develop recommendations, I want to be sure that you are fully aware of the extent to which neighborhood families use this park.

My family lives on one of the side streets just off Canyon, close to the park entrance. In recent months, as park usage has increased, the journey to the park with our son has become more challenging. As you know, many of the side-streets don't have sidewalks, and the park entrance acts as a funnel, with a narrow opening, no crosswalk and no sidewalk. Inside the park, both children's play areas are close to the narrow road, and the stop sign & crosswalk between them don't always deter vehicles from moving quickly or making questionable choices.

I bring this to your attention for two reasons. First of all, I hope the presence of many small children and families will be part of the equation in considering both the number and kind of vehicles at Bronson Canyon Park. Unfamiliar park-users, Lyft/Uber drivers and shuttle buses all present their own challenges. In the past, moderate park usage and neighborhood awareness have been sufficient to maintain a balance. With the increase in users since April, that balance has been thrown off. I am aware that a number of hillside neighborhoods have been affected, and am hopeful that solutions will be found to spread the flow of visitors widely enough that that no single
entrance is unduly impacted. Along those lines, I hope pedestrian safety will be carefully weighed before adding additional vehicles to Bronson Canyon.

Second, it would seem wise to include some basic traffic safety measures in any plans for Bronson Canyon Park moving forward. As noted above, families walking to the park face numerous challenges. Of these, by far the biggest issue is the park entrance on Canyon Drive. It is literally impossible for a family to enter the park by foot without stepping directly into the road, which narrows at the entrance, with stone walls on each side that hinder driver visibility. For these reasons, the most significant safety measure would be a sidewalk entrance to the park, which would enable families (and others) to enter the park with fewer safety concerns.

In addition, I can see some basic traffic safety improvements that would be a good start, including the following:

- Speed humps or other traffic control between Spring Oak and the park entrance
- "SLOW" painted on Canyon Drive prior to the park entrance, and/or signage along the road
- Stop signs in both directions at park entrance, with limit lines and "STOP" painted on the road.
- "SLOW" painted on the road between park entrance and crosswalk/play areas; much more prominent crosswalk between play areas; limit line and "STOP" re-painted on ground near crosswalk stop sign

I am also in agreement with many others who have pointed out that managing the overall flow of park visitors -- as part of a comprehensive plan for all hillside neighborhoods -- remains the best mitigation possible.

Again, on Shannon's recommendation, I wanted to be sure your team is considering the number of families who use Bronson Canyon Park, especially those in the neighborhood who arrive on foot with little ones. As the father of a small child, I know that I am not alone in hoping that safety measures will remain paramount as we consider solutions throughout the hillside neighborhoods abutting Griffith Park.

Thank you for considering these ideas. Please don't hesitate to have a member of your team reach out after the holiday if further discussion would be helpful.

Kind regards,

Jason Greenwald
Dear Mr. Greenwald,

On behalf of DIXON, I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge your feedback following the stakeholder meeting held on November 12th at the Hollywood Neighborhood City Hall.

We have been receiving valuable feedback from many meeting participants with regard to their individual concerns, suggestions for further data collection efforts, and their ideas for additional recommendations. I wanted to respond and assure you that your feedback about pedestrian conditions next to Bronson Canyon Park and the need for traffic calming measures and sidewalks has been reviewed by the DIXON Team. Pedestrian safety is a key factor in this project. As Julie stated in the meeting, recommendations are still evolving and are not finalized. Stakeholder feedback such as yours, will be crucial in addressing the needs of the community moving forward and coming up with the right solution for the neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time to email the DIXON team. Please feel free to reach out to us in the coming weeks. For your reference, here is a link to the presentation Julie gave at the stakeholder meeting:


Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce
Dixon Resources Unlimited

From: Jason Greenwald
Sent: Saturday, November 25, 2017 12:15:42 PM
To: Julie Dixon
Cc: shannon.prior@lacity.org
Subject: Griffith Park Mobility follow-up
Re: CD4 Traffic Report and Meeting on November 12, 2017

2 messages

Dan Pearce
To: Kris Sullivan
Cc: Julie Dixon <Julie.Dixon@lacity.org> Emily Kwatinetz <Emily.Kwatinetz@lacity.org> Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Dear Ms. Sullivan,

On behalf of DIXON, I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge your feedback following the stakeholder meeting held on November 12th at the Hollywood Neighborhood City Hall.

We have been receiving valuable feedback from many meeting participants with regard to their individual concerns, suggestions for further data collection efforts, and their ideas for additional recommendations. I wanted to respond and assure you that your feedback about alternate trail access at the top of Beachwood, concerns about PPDs, and extending the Circulator/DASH have been reviewed by the DIXON team. As Julie stated in the meeting, recommendations are still evolving and are not finalized. Stakeholder feedback such as yours will be crucial in addressing the needs of the community moving forward and coming up with the right solution for the neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time to email the DIXON team. Please feel free to reach out to us in the coming weeks. For your reference, here is a link to the presentation Julie gave at the stakeholder meeting:


Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited

From: Kris Sullivan
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2017 3:09 PM
To: Julie Dixon <Julie.Dixon@lacity.org>
Subject: CD4 Traffic Report and Meeting on November 12, 2017
Hi Julie,

I attended the meeting on Sunday as an "At Large" member and I am also a member of the Griffith Park Advisory Board.

Your presentation was very informative, and you answered a lot of questions we had going in to the meeting. I appreciate your offer to listen and incorporate ideas into the final plan coming in January.

One of the issues we didn’t have time to discuss and should be considered for the future is the Alternate Trail Access at the top of Beachwood. I worked to design this plan and GPAB, HUNC, Friends of Griffith Park, the Los Feliz Homeowners Association and the Oaks Homeowners Association have all overwhelmingly approved it. The alternate trail is to provide the pedestrian access into Griffith Park that has been stopped in the ongoing lawsuit Sunset Ranch v. City of Los Angeles. We designed this plan to be in keeping with all the court orders relating to the Ranch lawsuit and I presume that since CD4 is involved in litigation, they might have asked you not to discuss it.

It is listed in the Survey results you summarized. I am attaching the pdf summary of the plan so you will be able to see how it fits in with your Beachwood Drive analysis.

One of the "low hanging fruit" plans you presented is to have PPDs 7 days a week on Beachwood Drive. Many of us who live in Beachwood canyon can’t understand why PPDs exist at all any more above Ledgewood on Beachwood Drive let alone 7 days a week. If you venture up Beachwood any day of the week, you will see dozens of parking spaces available.

If PPDs are added every day, many people will be hugely inconvenienced for no good reason. My neighbors and I urge you to take a second look at that suggestion.

Finally, one attendee at the meeting on Sunday asked if the circulator plans would extend west of Vermont to include Beachwood. I am not clear on what your response was.

Since many of us who filled out the CD4 survey suggested adding shuttles all the way up Beachwood, and some suggested adding shuttles to travel up Ledgewood to the Vista (or extending Dash buses to the top of Beachwood) we are hoping you will include public transportation west of Vermont as part of your plan. It is a no brainer that having public transportation to the top of Beachwood will alleviate residents’ concerns about safety of walkers and car congestion in that location.

Thanks for listening. I look forward to meeting with you again.

Sincerely,

Kris Sullivan

Dan Pearce

To: "ksullivan22@roadrunner.com" <ksullivan22@roadrunner.com>
Cc: Julie Dixon <jdixon@cityhall.lacity.org> Emily Kwatinetz <emily.kwatinetz@lacity.org> Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

[Quoted text hidden]
Dear Mr. Mykytenko,

On behalf of DIXON, I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge your feedback following the stakeholder meeting held on November 12th at the Hollywood Neighborhood City Hall.

We have been receiving valuable feedback from many meeting participants with regard to their individual concerns, suggestions for further data collection efforts, and their ideas for additional recommendations. I wanted to respond and assure you that your concerns about street classifications and ADT volumes in the area have been reviewed by the DIXON team.

First and foremost, I can confirm that the vehicle counts were bi-directional. Your email that DIXON was copied on did an excellent job of putting into perspective the ADT volumes experienced in the area. We understand and agree that the roadway classifications and ADT standards are not precise. ADT volume standards and street classifications were included in the report for reference purposes only. As Julie stated in the meeting, recommendations are still evolving and are not finalized. Stakeholder feedback such as yours will be crucial in addressing the needs of the community moving forward and coming up with the right solution for the neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time to email the DIXON team. Please feel free to reach out to us in the coming weeks. For your reference, here is a link to the presentation Julie gave at the stakeholder meeting:


Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited
Thank you, Jeanne. I would also add that per Navigate LA and the 2005 draft EIR http://www.planning.lacity.org/cpu/hollywood/EIR/DEIR/4.5_Transportation.pdf, Canyon Drive is also a Collector Street. The study methods also do not clarify in the methods if the vehicle counts are uni or bi-directional. Nevertheless, I think the larger issue is the suggesting that 6000-7000 vehicles per day is an acceptable number for any neighborhood of this size. These numbers are both obscene and absurd. Let's put these numbers in perspective. There are 500 homes in Hollywoodland, and let's say that there are 2 cars per household. This is an extra 5000-6000 cars per day in the neighborhood, 10-12 extra cars per household, which would be 10-40 extra people per household per day. This would be like everyone in Hollywoodland having a party every weekend day. If you break it down by destination, you've got roughly 3000 cars a day going to the vista on substandard streets, 1000 each going to Deronda and Mulholland on substandard streets, and I suppose the other 1000 are going up North Beachwood to the Beachwood gate to an entrance that is supposed to be closed. I am shocked and dismayed that there is not more alarm about these numbers by our Council District 4, whose priority is supposed to be the protection of their constituents. It seems to me that a call to action is in order.

James

On Nov 16, 2017, at 4:52 PM, Jeanne Clark wrote:

Sarah, Shannon, Catherine,

In reading the Dixon study, I found some disturbing inaccuracies related to the City's own classifications.

I was hoping CD4 could clarify some of these apparent misrepresentations.

The street designations as identified in the Complete Streets Design Guide give specific measurements for right of way, roadway width etc.. However, when using Navigate LA (as Dixon did) to determine classifications, it appears none of the Hollywoodland streets in the study come close to meeting the measurements of the association classifications. This would make application of associated performance criteria such as ADT and VPH misleading and inaccurate.

Using the sources sited in the Dixon study:

Navigate LA shows Beachwood to the Village as a collector having a 60' ROW and 40' roadway width:
Beachwood from Franklin almost to the Village does have large parkways continuous standard sidewalks - ROW close to 66' and roadway width approx. 40'.

However Beachwood north of the Belden - parkways are nonexistent and sidewalks are much reduced. Furthermore -above Ledgewood-Beachwood is ID'd the same, a collector with 40' width/66'ROW:

Yet Beachwood above Ledgewood has an actual roadway width (at best) of ~29' and unlike Beachwood below, does not have ANY parkways and no contiguous sidewalks. Some areas of Beachwood the roadway width is the total ROW.

Navigate LA references the complete streets design guide which states that collector streets are for local traffic and further confirms measurements at 40' roadway width with ROW of 66ft.

Based on the City's own street design guide, Beachwood above Belden (given the infrastructure limitations - no parkways, limited sidewalks and narrow ROW) would better fit the classification as a hillside local - although even then most sections would still be substandard.

Navigate LA identifies the study areas of Deronda and Ledgewood by Mulholland as "local street-standard" with 60' ROW. Deronda has a street width and ROW of ~21' as there are no parkways or sidewalks not to mention steep drop offs, grades and curves. Ledgewood also lacks sidewalks and parkways and has a ROW/roadway width of 22.5-24'. Sections of Mulholland are similar.

These streets would better fit the classification of substandard, hillside limited.
It is apparent that the Navigate LA classification of Beachwood above Belden, Mulholland, Deronda and Ledgewood are a gross misrepresentation of the actual infrastructure based on the design standards called out in the LA street design guide. Blindly applying the performance criteria of streets that are far wider, with more infrastructure would be erroneous.

I understand that during the mobility plan process and during several iterations of the Hollywood Community plan, these misclassifications have been called out by concerned residents and asked to be corrected. Obviously that has not been done.

Going forward, there are two areas that must be rectified:

1) For the Dixon study, knowing these roadway classifications are clearly inconsistent with true nature of the infrastructure studied in Hollywoodland, any conclusions/recommendations related to ADT, parking and ped/bike traffic analysis as exists in the current report would be considered seriously flawed. Potentially fraudulent.

2) For the City documents that carry these gross misclassifications, how can Councilmember Ryu and CD4 help to get these corrected with Bureau of Engineering so that the documents can be updated to properly reflect the nature and condition of Hollywoodland infrastructure?

While the Mobility Plan was adopted by City Council in Aug 2015 it is understood that former CD4 Councilmember LaBonge was largely responsible for the oversights. I urge Councilmember Ryu to swiftly correct these glaring errors.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Jeanne Clark

Resident Hollywoodland
Dear Mr. McCarthy,

On behalf of DIXON, I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge your feedback following the stakeholder meeting held on November 12th at the Hollywood Neighborhood City Hall.

We have been receiving valuable feedback from many meeting participants with regard to their individual concerns, suggestions for further data collection efforts, and their ideas for additional recommendations. I wanted to respond and assure you that your feedback about relocating the Wisdom Tree Trailhead and recommendations for additional data collection areas has been reviewed by the DIXON Team. As Julie stated in the meeting, recommendations are still evolving and are not finalized. Stakeholder feedback such as yours, will be crucial in addressing the needs of the community moving forward and coming up with the right solution for the neighborhood. At the present time, we are working with Council District 4 Staff to finalize additional data collection efforts to be conducted in the coming weeks.

Thank you for taking the time to email the DIXON team. Please feel free to reach out to us in the coming weeks. For your reference, here is a link to the presentation Julie gave at the stakeholder meeting:


Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce
Dixon Resources Unlimited
Brace McCarthy
Senior Counsel | Marketing and PR

On Fri, Nov 24, 2017 at 12:13 PM, Bruce McCarthy wrote:

Thanks, Ken.

And thanks, Julie for your presentation/meeting on Sunday, November 12.

The only thing I'd add (which I raised at the meeting) are the ideal more permanent solutions to minimize the tremendous vehicle and pedestrian traffic on the very local sidewalk-less Wonder View Drive:

1. Move the wisdom tree trailhead from the top of Wonder View Drive to another location (perhaps down at Forest Lawn where there is ample street parking or down starting at Lake Hollywood Reservoir).
2. And/or, a more immediate solution would be to just close the wisdom tree trailhead at the top of Wonder View Drive. Access is through DWP land (where the Water Tank is). Folks can still access the Wisdom Tree from Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign. Despite that meaning that residents of Wonder View would also not be able to have access to the trailhead from Wonder View, via email, everyone on the street has given their OK to this option.

Lastly, at the meeting, you asked for any more suggestions for data collection.

- Ken suggested to count vehicles at Lake Hollywood Drive and La Suvida (it gets backed up as folks try to get on Barham).
- I also suggest vehicles and pedestrians be counted at the corner Lake Hollywood Drive and Wonder View Drive (both for overall traffic at that corner to to count the ones that head up Wonder View).

Thank you!

Bruce McCarthy
Senior Counsel | Marketing and PR
On Fri, Nov 24, 2017 at 11:29 AM, Ken Gralla wrote:

I am stake holder of the Upper Wonder View Drive hiking trail.

These are recommendations for your "Griffith Park Access and Mobility Study".

1. Put meters up and down Lake Hollywood from Upper Wonder View to the gate at the bottom. (This would generate funds for the Project and control length of parking)
2. Make 3400 Wonder View "Permit" parking on weekdays and and/or weekends. (Control non resident parking)
3. Install a trash can (or two) and a port-a-potty or two near the DWP water tank.
4. Install a people gate at the top of Wonder View Drive.
5. Add new signs to clarify that the "Hollywood sign" is not visible from upper Wonder View Dr.

Ken Gralla

Sent from Outlook

Bruce McCarthy <brucem@netflix.com> Fri, Dec 1, 2017 at 11:23 AM

To: Dan Pearce
Cc: Emily Kwatinetz Julie Dixon "shannon.prior@lacity.org" <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Ken Gralla Chris & Art Capps Daniel Savage <daniel@danielsavage.com>

Hi Dan,

Thank you very much for your acknowledgment and kind note.

Coincidentally, one of our neighbors on Wonder View reported the following today:

"About 45 minutes ago a big group of hikers came up Wonder view Dr. I took these photos of a big bus parked on Lake Hollywood Dr. where they should not be per my understanding. It may still be there. CA lic. # CP 88913
Another person took photos and talked to the bus driver, who said this was a field trip. Too many hikers still and a group of 40+ clogs Wonder View Dr. and is dangerous." [Pictures attached]

I know if goes without saying, but if the Widsom Tree trailhead were moved away from the top of Wonder View to somewhere else that could accommodate such traffic, folks could still enjoy the amazing hike and nature and without the impact on the very local neighborhood and, in this case, without a likely traffic violation.

Thank you again!
Hi Bruce,

Thank you for sharing this information and pictures of the tour bus. It is very useful for us to know moving forward.

Regards,
On behalf of DIXON, I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge your feedback following the stakeholder meeting held on November 12th at the Hollywood Neighborhood City Hall.

We have been receiving valuable feedback from many meeting participants with regard to their individual concerns, suggestions for further data collection efforts, and their ideas for additional recommendations. I wanted to respond and assure you that your concerns about PPDs has been reviewed by the DIXON team. As Julie stated in the meeting, recommendations are still evolving and are not finalized. Stakeholder feedback such as yours will be crucial in addressing the needs of the community moving forward and coming up with the right solution for the neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time to email the DIXON team. Please feel free to reach out to us in the coming weeks. For your reference, here is a link to the presentation Julie gave at the stakeholder meeting:


Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce
Dixon Resources Unlimited

-----Original Message-----
From: Fran Reichenbach [mailto]
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2017 4:27 PM
To: Julie Dixon
Subject: Beachwood changed

I'm with the Beachwood Canyon Neighborhood Assn. In the meeting last Sunday, 7-day a week permit parking was mentioned as a possibility. We are totally opposed to that as it would pass on even more negative impacts to the community just south of Beachwood Village. As a matter of fact, the only permit parking areas that could benefit while not impacting other areas would be upper Deronda where the pedestrian gate leads to Mt Lee Drive.

We are also hearing that the existing weekend PPDs don’t allow one neighbor to visit another unless there is a guest pass acquired. We all wish they could be all one PPD number so that we can visit one another and maybe even have neighborhood parties hosted at one home or another.

I hope you can include these notes on your findings.

Fran Reichenbach

Sent from my iPhone
Hi Julie:

You and your team did a great job with the presentation today. I look forward to receiving the link to the material you presented; it was just too much to take good notes to review and share with our HOA. As I mentioned following the meeting, it was pretty unclear where in fact we want people who come to vista to stop, walk, take photographs and what we should do to have them exit successfully and safely (more specifically if they intend to return from where they came—where to turn around safely—or providing clear signage about alternative exit route), as well as where taxis or Uber should deposit visitors. Therefore, it would really be helpful if a group of us could meet with you at the park/vista/Mulholland and walk/discuss these issues with you as well as colleagues whom you mentioned might be useful at such a meeting/walk. It seems clear that a signage program that is consistent with a master plan to deal with all these issues in the short to medium term can only be effective if we first figure out what folks should be doing once they arrive...
in this area and how to exit. As I mentioned to you, it seems clear that on the Lake Hollywood Estates side, our visitors really are not hikers but rather visitors who want the “best ever” photo of the sign. Presumably that is why they walk down Mulholland, though it is unnecessary to walk there to get a really good view of the sign. Probably we would also like to discuss the pedestrian issue, because as we mentioned during the meeting, the number of folks walking from Franklin or the Beachwood market area up Ledgewood all the way up to Mulholland has dramatically increased during the past few months. Now with earlier sunset, I am actually coming upon folks walking down the hill, often in dark colors, after dark. That means over and above the narrow streets without sidewalks, we now have nearly invisible pedestrians walking down the hill in dusk or dark.

I hope we can meet soon.

Best,

Jane Goichman

Virus-free. www.avast.com

Gosh—this is short notice. What time will you be here? I have no idea if Paul is available, and, as I had written you, we wanted to invite a couple of others from at a minimum Tahoe Drive.

If this afternoon does not work, can we schedule something for next week, subject to availability of Paul, me and hopefully a few others?

Jane
It just so happens that we are going to be in your neighborhood this afternoon.

I realize that this short notice, but if you are available, we would be happy to meet up with you today.

Let me know if this works, otherwise, we will find a more conducive time.

Julie

Julie Dixon

---

From: Jane Goichman [mailto:
Sent: Sunday, November 12, 2017 7:47 PM
To: Julie Dixon <shannon.prior@lacity.org
Cc: Paul Rusconi <shannon.prior@lacity.org
Subject: Lake Hollywood Estates Followup to Nov. 12th meeting about Griffith Park/Neighborhoods

Hi Julie:

You and your team did a great job with the presentation today. I look forward to receiving the link to the material you presented; it was just too much to take good notes to review and share with our HOA. As I mentioned following the meeting, it was pretty unclear where in fact we want people who come to vista to stop, walk, take photographs and what we should do to have them exit successfully and safely (more specifically if they intend to return from where they came—where to turn around safely—or providing clear signage about alternative exit route), as well as where taxis or Uber should deposit visitors. Therefore, it would really be helpful if a group of us could meet with you at the park/vista/Mulholland and walk/discuss these issues with you as well as colleagues whom you mentioned might be useful at such a meeting/walk. It seems clear that a signage program that is consistent with a master plan to deal with all these issues in the short to medium term can only be effective if we first figure out what folks should be doing once they arrive in this area and how to exit. As I mentioned to you, it seems clear that on the Lake Hollywood Estates side, our visitors really are not hikers but rather visitors who want the “best ever” photo of the sign. Presumably that is why they walk down Mulholland, though it is unnecessary to walk there to get a really good view of the sign. Probably we would also like to discuss the pedestrian issue, because as we mentioned during the meeting, the number of folks walking from Franklin or the Beachwood market area up Ledgewood all the way up to Mulholland has dramatically increased during the past few months. Now with earlier sunset, I am actually coming upon folks walking down the hill, often in dark colors, after dark. That means over and above the narrow streets without sidewalks, we now have nearly invisible pedestrians walking down the hill in dusk or dark.

I hope we can meet soon.

Best,
What time this afternoon? I'd love to make myself available then.

I just left a message with Julie and also called Andy Corrigan to find out whether she would be available. She said she can flex. I need to run a few errands soon if we are meeting this afternoon. I think we should see if Sheila and maybe Richard Pierce from Innsdale are available—would be good to have all streets represented. I assume David is at work during the afternoon.
Hi Jane:

I can be available to meet at Andy’s at 5PM today.

David
Emily Kwatinetz  Mon, Nov 20, 2017 at 11:11 AM
To: David Benz <com>, Paul Rusconi <com>, Jane Goichman
Cc: Julie Dixon <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Dan Pearce

It'll be dark out, but 5pm works for us.

On Nov 20, 2017, at 11:00 AM, David Benz <com> wrote:

Hi Jane:

I can be available to meet at Andy’s at 5PM today.

David

David Benz, President
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Andrae Corrigan <[mailto:<br44:>
To: Emily Kwatinetz [mailto:<br44:>
Cc: Julie Dixon <[mailto:<br44:>

Hi Emily:

There is a misunderstanding. David was referring to our 5pm Board meeting.

Several of us would like to meet with you during daylight. Can you come up at 3:30pm?

Thanks!

Andy Corrigan

Emily Kwatinetz (<[mailto:<br44:>
To: Andrae Corrigan <[mailto:<br44:>
Cc: Julie Dixon <[mailto:<br44:>

We are meeting with the council office at 3pm so that won't work. We were just trying to take advantage of being in the area - if this doesn't work, we can plan another time.

Thanks

We are meeting with the council office at 3pm so that won't work. We were just trying to take advantage of being in the area - if this doesn't work, we can plan another time.

Thanks
Hi:

We are having email mix-ups. I was checking whether David could be available earlier in the afternoon, and he was replying about an already scheduled meeting at 5 pm. 5 pm in the dark does not work for us. If you are available in the mid-afternoon, around say 3:30, that could work. Otherwise, we need to select another day. Please advise ASAP whether you want to meet mid-afternoon. I don’t know why Emily’s email to me did not come through. Andy Corrigan phoned and then forwarded the email from Emily.

Best,
Jane

---

From: David Benz [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2017 11:00 AM
To: Jane Goichman; 'Paul Rusconi'
Cc: 'Julie Dixon'; shannon.prior@lacity.org; 'Emily Kwatinetz'; 'Dan Pearce';

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Emily Kwatinetz
Mon, Nov 20, 2017 at 11:42 AM
To: Jane Goichman
Cc: David Benz, Paul Rusconi, Julie Dixon, "shannon.prior@lacity.org" <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Dan Pearce

Hi Jane,

3:30 does not work for us. We have a meeting scheduled with the council office at that time. Let's plan on scheduling a walk through on a different date.

Thanks

On Nov 20, 2017, at 11:30 AM, Jane Goichman wrote:

Hi:

We are having email mix-ups. I was checking whether David could be available earlier in the afternoon, and he was replying about an already scheduled meeting at 5 pm. 5 pm in the dark does not work for us. If you are available in the mid-afternoon, around say 3:30, that could work. Otherwise, we need to select another day. Please advise ASAP whether you want to meet mid-afternoon. I don’t know why Emily’s email to
me did not come through. Andy Corrigan phoned and then forwarded the email from Emily.

Best,
Jane

---

From: David Benz [mailto:com]
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2017 11:00 AM
To: Jane Goichman; 'Paul Rusconi'
Cc: 'Julie Dixon'; shannon.prior@lacity.org; 'Emily Kwatinetz'; 'Dan Pearce';
Subject: RE: Lake Hollywood Estates Follow-up to Nov. 12th meeting about Griffith Park/Neighborhoods

Hi Jane:

I can be available to meet at Andy’s at 5PM today.

David

David Benz, President
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Andrae Corrigan <Mon, Nov 20, 2017 at 11:58 AM>
To: Emily Kwatinetz <Emily Kwatinetz @ cityofla.ca>; Jane Goichman <Jane Goichman @ cityofla.ca>
Cc: Paul Rusconi <Paul Rusconi @ cityofla.ca>; Julie Dixon <Julie Dixon @ cityofla.ca>
shannon.prior@lacity.org, Dan Pearce <Dan Pearce @ cityofla.ca>

What time are you here today?

---

Emily Kwatinetz [mailto:Emily Kwatinetz @ cityofla.ca] [Mon, Nov 20, 2017 at 11:42 AM]
To: Jane Goichman <Jane Goichman @ cityofla.ca>
Cc: David Benz <David Benz @ cityofla.ca>; Paul Rusconi <Paul Rusconi @ cityofla.ca>; Julie Dixon <Julie Dixon @ cityofla.ca>
shannon.prior@lacity.org, Dan Pearce <Dan Pearce @ cityofla.ca>
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---

Jane Goichman <Tue, Nov 21, 2017 at 9:21 PM>
To: Emily Kwatinetz <Emily Kwatinetz @ cityofla.ca>; Andrae Corrigan <Andrae Corrigan @ cityofla.ca>
Cc: Paul Rusconi <Paul Rusconi @ cityofla.ca>; Julie Dixon <Julie Dixon @ cityofla.ca>
shannon.prior@lacity.org, Dan Pearce <Dan Pearce @ cityofla.ca>

Hi:

Paul, Andy and I want to thank Emily and Dan for spending more than an hour with us yesterday to discuss our concerns about visitor issues in our community and possible interim solutions. We are going to forward your draft analysis information to our neighborhood, along with a summary of the meeting earlier this month and our discussion of yesterday, and ask for neighborhood input. We plan to send you our neighborhood’s thoughts by mid-December. If you have any ideas or questions relating to matters we discussed during our walk, please follow up with us.

Happy Turkey Day to all.

Best,
Jane
Hi Jane,

I wanted to quickly follow-up with you and the other Lake Hollywood Estates residents, after our recent neighborhood walkthrough. It was valuable to be on-site with you all and hear first-hand your concerns in the neighborhood.

I wanted to respond and assure you that your feedback has been shared with the DIXON Team. As Julie stated in the meeting, recommendations are still evolving and are not finalized. Stakeholder feedback such as yours, will be crucial in addressing the needs of the community moving forward and coming up with the right solution for the neighborhood. We are in the last stages of finalizing additional data collection areas, which together with resident feedback, will allow us to make robust recommendations.

Thank you for taking the time to email the DIXON team. Please feel free to reach out to us in the coming weeks. For your reference, here is a link to the presentation Julie gave at the stakeholder meeting:


Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce
Dear Mr. Kiss,

On behalf of DIXON, I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge your feedback following the stakeholder meeting held on November 12th at the Hollywood Neighborhood City Hall.

We have been receiving valuable feedback from many meeting participants with regard to their individual concerns, suggestions for further data collection efforts, and their ideas for additional recommendations. I wanted to respond and assure you that your feedback about the double-yellow line on Canyon Lake Drive, tourist vehicular activity, and the parking signs located in the neighborhood have been reviewed by the DIXON team and will be considered further. As Julie stated in the meeting, recommendations are still evolving and are not finalized. Stakeholder feedback such as yours, will be crucial in addressing the needs of the community moving forward and coming up with the right solution for the neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time to email the DIXON team. Please feel free to reach out to us in the coming weeks. For your reference, here is a link to the presentation Julie gave at the stakeholder meeting:


Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited
Perfect. Many thanks as always.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 27, 2017, at 3:08 PM, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org> wrote:

Lester,

This specific issue and some specific proposed solutions were raised at the group meeting. Dixon would be happy to take further input on this.

Thanks,

Sarah

On Mon, Nov 27, 2017 at 2:56 PM, Lester Kiss <mailto: wrote:

Thanks Sarah. As local drivers in LHE, we are put in dangerous situations multiple times a week because of the tourism/sign photography on Canyon Lake Dr and Mulholland Hwy. I think I'm also going to speak with an LAPD officer and ask what they recommend drivers do when vehicles stop in front of us to take photos on a single lane road divided by double lines. The tourists of course signal to pass — it's no biggie to them. See attached video with tourists waving, then cursing me and the kids as I finally pass with 3 cars behind me like we are crazy. We should know what is legal especially if there is a head on collision while passing on a double line as our insurance will be involved.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 27, 2017, at 2:37 PM, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org> wrote:

Lester,

At the request of your Board, LADOT put up the signs. LADOT will move the signs once they determine the most effective location and not move them only to have a different Board request them to be moved again.
With respect to your submissions re the study, we have shared your comments and concerns with Dixon and Associates. We are still receiving public comment and if you feel that their short-term recommendations do not reflect what you submitted, we would be happy to facilitate a conversation with them. They specifically discussed several issues related to what you raised at the group meeting, but if that is not enough for you, you are welcome to have a further discussion or opportunity for submission.

Thanks,

Sarah

On Mon, Nov 27, 2017 at 2:30 PM, Lester Kiss wrote:

Dear CD4:

I have sent you video after video of illegal tourist traffic activity along Mulholland Hwy and Canyon Lake Dr. I didn’t see any of this specifically addressed in the “study.” You put up a “parking” sign with an arrow per the previous boards request but it was in the wrong place. Sheila Irani concurred that this should be moved, as did the board. We sent you photos of exactly where it might go. Personally I find these signs ineffective and you might remove it completely and come up with a better solution. The attached video from today shows the dangerous situation that continues on Mulholland Hwy. A second video will follow.

Please remove or relocate the “parking ——>” sign ASAP and point me to the page in the “study” that addresses the dangerous traffic activity depicted in at least 20 emails I’ve sent you.

Best,

Lester
Click to Download
IMG_5694.MOV
0 bytes

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Julie,

My apologies for missing the meeting in the park during Thanksgiving week. I understand your firm is in the midst of fine tuning a traffic study. Thanks for your hard work. Below are some photos from earlier this year illustrating (1) the fact that our neighborhood needs to be looked at in the context of Hollywood Sign tourism (not just from a general point of view based on traffic counts) and (2) tourist behavior is PREDICTABLE and REPETITIVE. These photos are a few of thousands that have been compiled over the last 5 years. They are taken, in the order that they appear, on Mullhoand Hwy, Canyon Lake Dr, Beachwood Dr near the market, Mulholland Hwy and Canyon Lake Dr.

I personally am pleased that Sarah Dusseault, Chief of Staff, is working so diligently to open up the Ford Theater, a safe alternative site with facilities and parking. One suggestion you might consider is deeming this small residential area of Lake Hollywood unsafe for hundreds of thousands of photo seekers a year (due to narrow streets and PREDICTABLE and REPETITIVE traffic violations by masses of tourists, and suggesting the City begin working on a transition plan to move the mass tourism to Ford (including PR, geotagging, temporary traffic personnel to redirect, etc). The intended result would be to decrease traffic, fire and other risks in this small residential neighborhood and instead use a managed, commercial area to accommodate photo seekers—i.e., Ford Theater.

I am happy to send you a video from last New Years—the situation was in my view completely out of control with very high numbers of stopped vehicles seeking photos. I’m sure Sarah will request additional resources this year to manage this as she usually does, however, it’s quite scary when the streets are so clogged a fire truck cannot get through.

My apologies if others have reported these things to you but it is very important to see the photos.

Best,
Lester
Dear Lester,

On behalf of Julie, I’d like to thank you for your insights to the issues in the area and for sharing those photographs. We agree that those photographs are very important to see and they will be useful to us moving forward as we continue formulating recommendations for the area. Once again, thank you for sharing.

Kind regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited
From: Julie Dixon <[REDACTED]>
Date: Saturday, 2 December 2017 at 15:56
To: Dan Pearce [REDACTED] Emily Kwatinetz
Subject: Fwd: Photos of Traffic Violations

Julie Dixon

From: Lester Kiss <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, December 2, 2017 6:49:54 PM
To: Julie Dixon
Cc: Jane Goichman; Paul Rusconi; Shannon Prior; Andy Corrigan
Subject: Fwd: Photos of Traffic Violations

[Quoted text hidden]
Access & Mobility Response
2 messages

Fri, Dec 15, 2017 at 10:37 AM
Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>

Attached is the Friends of Griffith Park response to the November Access and Mobility meeting.

Best regards,
Marian Dodge
President
Friends of Griffith Park

---

Access & Mobility response.pdf
415K

Mon, Dec 18, 2017 at 11:50 AM
Dan Pearce <Dan Pearce> (Redacted)
To: "Dan Pearce" (Redacted)
Cc: Julie Dixon <Emily Kwatinetz <shannon.prior@lacity.org> <shannon.prior@lacity.org>"

Dear Ms. Dodge,

On behalf of DIXON, thank you for sharing the Friends of Griffith Park's response to the meeting we held on November 12. Although we did not discuss some of topics mentioned in your letter, we have certainly discussed them since and they have been raised by several other stakeholders in emails. In the coming weeks, we will be sharing a survey for residents of the neighborhoods to comment and state their preference on a number of recommendations we have been developing since the last meeting. We look forward to your feedback at that time and encourage you to keep reaching out to us with any other comments or concerns.

Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce
Dixon Resources Unlimited
CONCERN ABOUT LOCATION OF SURVEY TODAY, AND FIRE

2 messages

christina capps < >
To: shannon.prior@lacity.org
Cc: Roth Alice <alice.roth@lacity.org>, Kathie.Hirata@ladwp.com

Sat, Dec 16, 2017 at 6:33 PM

Evening Shannon,
I'm CONCERNED, that DIXON and EMPLOYEES FEEL THAT THE ENTRANCE TO WONDER VIEW TRAIL HEAD IS AT LAKE HOLLYWOOD WHERE IT INTERSECTS WITH WONDER VIEW.

INSTEAD, AS YOU KNOW, THE TRAIL STARTS AT ABOUT 1300 FEET UP THE ROAD. JUST AS AN ASIDE, WE RECENTLY HAD A BURLY GUY CUTTING ONE OF OUR TREES—IN FRONT OF MY HOUSE, 3615 WONDER VIEW!! WHEN I AND A NEIGHBOR CONFRONTED HIM—HE SAID "CALL A PARK RANGER!"

PERHAPS THIS WAS JUST A TRAFFIC COUNT AT THE INTERSECTION.

WE HAD ABOUT 500+ HIKERS TODAY.

THEY WERE COMING DOWN THE MOUNTAIN AT 11:00 LAST EVENING—SMOKING.

IM AFRAID A FIRE IS JUST A MATTER OF TIME.

BEST,
CHRISTINA
3615 WONDER VIEW

Sent from my iPhone

Dan Pearce
Mon, Dec 18, 2017 at 1:13 PM

To: christina capps < >
Cc: Roth Alice <alice.roth@lacity.org>, "Kathie.Hirata@ladwp.com" <Kathie.Hirata@ladwp.com>, "shannon.prior@lacity.org" <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Emily Kwatinetz, Julie Dixon

Hi Christina,

Thank you for communicating your concerns. I'm sorry you had a bad experience with that gentleman. However, let me reassure you that we are aware of the many challenges this specific location faces and are aware of the gate's correct location. We have formulated several recommendations related to Wonder View Drive that we will be sharing in the coming weeks in a recommendation survey for residents. We look forward to your feedback at that time.

Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited
Councilman Ryu Study about Traffic and Access Problems in western portion of Griffith Park INFORMATION AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS BY DEC 5

5 messages

David Benz <com> Wed, Dec 6, 2017 at 12:28 PM
To: "" David Benz <com>, Kristina O'Neil <com>, Andy Corrigan <com>, David Ryu <com>, Sarah Dusseault <com>
Cc: shannon.prior@lacity.org

Dear Julie:

I’m Vice President of Lake Hollywood Homeowners’ Association. Kindly please read below from bottom to top. I received one response back from my neighbor Marina Palmier which I’ve forwarded to you below.

Thanks for your hard work on this issue.

Best regards

David Benz

Marina Palmier

Dear David,

I received one response back from my neighbor Marina Palmier which I’ve forwarded to you below.

Thanks for your hard work on this issue.

Best regards

David Benz

From: Marina Palmier [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 9:44 PM
To: David Benz <com>
Subject: Re: ONE MORE CORRECTION USE THIS ONE Councilman Ryu Study about Traffic and Access Problems in western portion of Griffith Park INFORMATION AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS BY DEC 5

David,

Hope you had a wonderful Thanksgiving. I was going around the vista today at 11:20 and now a new problem has arisen. When cars can’t find parking, they make a U turn at the drive-way of Madonna’s old house—5 cars were doing this and, of course, cars were backed up because that section of the road is not wide enough to make a U turn it takes them time to make the turn. It was very frustrating and again there were two cars parked in the red zone along the blind spot (mind you the driver’s weren’t even in the cars). Personally I think planting trees along the pathway is not going to help.
Dear Neighbors:

Councilman Ryu is undertaking a study of the traffic and access problems in the western portion of Griffith Park, focusing on, among other areas, the Lake Hollywood Estates environs. He has hired Dixon Resources Unlimited, the organization that has been working with Recreation and Parks on access to the Observatory area. Ryu/Dixon have shared a draft of the data collected by Dixon and its subcontractors, most of which was collected over the Labor Day weekend at the beginning of September 2017 and two weeks later. The draft analysis report is attached. Data was collected at various points, including Beachwood, Mulholland Highway above the Lake Hollywood Park, Lake Hollywood Park, and at Lake Hollywood Drive/Wonder View. The analysis relating to traffic counts compares traffic counted with LA City and in some cases San Diego definitions of what is acceptable on collector streets or local streets. The data shows that on Canyon Lake near Lake Hollywood Park traffic counts on the weekends in question were high during portions of the days compared with what the criteria for local streets are. The draft report also analyzes counts for parking space availability on Canyon Lake.

Paul Rusconi and Jane Goichman attended a meeting where this preliminary material was presented followed by an opportunity for input from meeting attendees. The power point presentation for that meeting is also attached. Currently Dixon is focusing on interim solutions, dubbed the low-lying fruit. Ideas discussed by Julie Dixon included:

- planting shrubbery at the eastern end of Mulholland to dissuade drivers from stopping to photograph the sign from Mulholland;
- creating clear signs about where to go and park to take photograph or take hike along with branding this message on official tourism web sites and on sites like Google Maps;
- controlling pedestrians around Vista by creating clearer path along Mulholland and using bollards;
- designating drop-off areas for ride-sharing vehicles, taxis, etc.;
- use of parking meters or other paid parking mechanism;
- adding drinking fountains/ restroom at some trailheads; and
- extending PPD hours on Ledgewood.
Meeting attendees suggestions included:

- Compare various suggestions based on what each would accomplish and each would cost;
- One way streets (in area further down in Hollywoodland);
- Current dash bus, used in Observatory area, bring visitors to western areas of park to decrease individual cars coming to this area;
- Gates at Wonder View entrance to park to shut down that entrance in the evenings.

Paul mentioned creating another mirror Hollywood sign on the other side of the mountain, facing Universal City or the cemeteries.

Dixon also mentioned possible long-term solutions like a Gondola up the mountain; Jane mentioned daytime gating of entire area with public access being only by public vehicle transport. Long term solutions are probably years off, and many would require environmental studies.

After the meeting, Paul also spoke to Ryu's office about the idea of speed humps on Tahoe Drive.

Andy Corrigan, Jane Goichman and Paul Rusconi recently met with two representatives of the Dixon study group to walk and discuss our neighborhood issues on Canyon Lake, Mulholland and Tahoe Drive. They emphasized safety issues on Tahoe due to the high volume of cars and speeding by many of them, the issue of whether to encourage the visitors who come to this area to photograph from the Vista or in the park, possible plantings to put a halt to cars stopping to photograph the sign on Mulholland, possible planting near the relatively large vista area along Mulholland, what signage is appropriate. They also pointed out places where visitors make U-turns, pedestrian issues on Mulholland and Ledgewood.

Ryu's office/Dixon are accepting comments on the draft data analysis report and other suggestions that our local communities have about interim and long-term solutions. We would appreciate any suggestions or comments you have on this summary or the attached materials by Dec. 5, so that LHHA can forward its comments to Dixon and Ryu's office by mid-December. Please send your comments by email to [redacted] or drop your comments in my mailbox at [redacted] by Dec. 5th.

Thank you.

Best regards,

LHHA 2017-18 Board of Directors
Julie Dixon <julie.dixon@lacity.org>  
To: David Benz <david.benz@lacity.org>, Kristina O'Neil <kristina.oneil@lacity.org>, Andy Corrigan <andy.corrigan@lacity.org>, Paul Rusconi <paul.rusconi@lacity.org>, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>, Emily Kwatinetz <emily.kwatinetz@lacity.org>, Dan Pearce <dan.pearce@lacity.org>  
Cc: "  "<  "shannon.prior@lacity.org"  "David Benz  "Kristina O'Neil  "Andy Corrigan  "Paul Rusconi  "David Ryu  "Sarah Dusseault  "Emily Kwatinetz  "Dan Pearce  

Wed, Dec 6, 2017 at 3:06 PM

David

Thank you for coordinating the centralized response. It’s very helpful.
We will look forward to hearing any additional feedback.

Thanks

Julie

Julie Dixon

From: David Benz [mailto: com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 6, 2017 12:28 PM
To: Julie Dixon <>
Cc: Kristina O'Neil < Andy Corrigan < Paul Rusconi < shannon.prior@lacity.org; David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>; Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>
Subject: Councilman Ryu Study about Traffic and Access Problems in western portion of Griffith Park INFORMATION AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS BY DEC 5

Jane Goichman < Wed, Dec 6, 2017 at 4:07 PM
To: Julie Dixon David Benz < com>
Cc: Kristina O'Neil < Andy Corrigan < Paul Rusconi < shannon.prior@lacity.org; David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>; Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>, Emily Kwatinetz < Dan Pearce

One additional thought of mine after early morning encounter with car/photographers at Vista. Despite the bollards, their bright convertible was parked at the beginning of the bollards. I told them they need to move the car, but they just went back to photographing and said just a minute. I said again that they need to move the car. Then the woman photographing her daughter asked how I knew it was her car. I said she had just acknowledged it and did not say but noted that there was no one else up there to whom the car could belong. Anyway—I don’t remember whether there currently is a bollard smack in the middle at the top (right where Mulholland and Canyon Lake connect) of the zone with bollards. If not, we probably should consider adding one in that location to simply preclude a car from parking there.

Pedestrian issue is harder nut to crack. If we put fencing or planting to shut off the beginning of the Mulholland “dirt path”, then the visitors probably will be more inclined to walk in the street. How to persuade people that they don’t really get a superior photo of the sign by walking along Mulholland?

Jane

From: Julie Dixon [mailto: ]
Sent: Wednesday, December 06, 2017 3:06 PM
To: David Benz  
Cc: Kristina O'Neill; Andy Corrigan; Paul Rusconi; shannon.prior@lacity.org; David Ryu; Sarah Dusseault; Emily Kwatinetz; Dan Pearce  
Subject: RE: Councilman Ryu Study about Traffic and Access Problems in western portion of Griffith Park INFORMATION AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS BY DEC 5

Dear Julie:

This email has been scanned for spam and viruses by Proofpoint Essentials. Click here to report this email as spam.

---

David Benz <com> Fri, Dec 8, 2017 at 12:01 PM  
To: Julie Dixon  
Cc: Kristina O'Neill; Andy Corrigan; Paul Rusconi; shannon.prior@lacity.org; David Ryu; Sarah Dusseault; Emily Kwatinetz; Dan Pearce  
Subject: RE: Councilman Ryu Study about Traffic and Access Problems in western portion of Griffith Park INFORMATION AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS BY DEC 5

Dear Julie:


MARINA PALMIER

Virus-free. www.avast.com
I’d like to give you my thoughts, some of which are in alignment with the views of the board members of Lake Hollywood Homeowners’ Association (I currently serve as Vice President), and others which are my thoughts independent of our board of directors:

A. The vista on both the north and south side of the street should be LUSHLY planted with native/drought tolerant vegetation to make it no longer a viewing area either for the LA basin and Hollywood sign views. Our board could raise funds to hopefully come up with larger plant specimens so hopefully the plants would fill in faster.

B. There is an area of Mulholland Highway between Durand and Canyon Lake Drives where cars jump the curbs for photo shoots. This entire area also needs to be similarly lushly planted to make it impossible for cars to jump the curb.

C. Irrigation and proper fertilizer needs to be provided by the city to make this planting successful.

D. Excellent quality but possibly temporary fencing needs to be installed to protect the newly planted plants. The quality needs to be high enough to survive until the plants are well established.

E. I think a dirt walkway needs to remain open between the end of the sidewalk at Canyon Lake/Mulholland Highway and towards Durand Drive. Otherwise, hikers, who will still come, will walk into the street.

F. The city attorney’s office should study restricting access of the entire area to local residents with permits only. I understand Lombard Street in San Francisco is facing similar challenges. I think you should investigate how they’re restricting traffic on this street and see if we can appropriate any of their ideas.

G. Has anyone considered the idea of changing to perpendicular parking on Canyon Lake Drive adjacent to the park and having no parking on the west side of the street? It is less time consuming to pull into a perpendicular space than to parallel park. This might improve the traffic flow.

H. There should be a program, perhaps in conjunction with Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, to provide informational brochures in multiple languages to tourists explaining the extreme fire danger of smoking in the hills. The brochures should be left at the major hotels throughout LA but particularly in Hollywood and Universal City.

I. The fine for smoking should increase to $5000, and signage should be updated accordingly.

J. The city attorney should work with US Immigration and Customs Enforcement to come up with a workable plan to revoke visas for foreign travelers if they’re cited for smoking in the hillside areas. I say this as a business owner with an office in Shanghai and a 10 year visa to travel to the People’s Republic of China. I’m EXTREMELY careful to “behave myself” when I’m traveling in China, as it would be extremely detrimental to me if the Chinese government were to revoke my visa. It is a privilege to have a visa to travel to the United States. Most of the smokers seem to be from other countries. Threat of visa revocation
should help deter smoking: among all the issues that the influx of visitors have brought, the neighborhood fears fires caused by a careless smoker first and foremost!

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best regards,

David

---

From: Julie Dixon [mailto:]
Sent: Wednesday, December 06, 2017 3:06 PM
To: David Benz <com>
Cc: Kristina O'Neil <  Andy Corrigan <  Paul Rusconi <  shannon.prior@lacity.org; David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>; Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>; Emily Kwatinetz < Dan Pearce
Subject: RE: Councilman Ryu Study about Traffic and Access Problems in western portion of Griffith Park INFORMATION AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS BY DEC 5
Hi David,

I'll respond on Julie’s behalf as she is out of the office this week. I’m glad that the neighborhood has a coordinated approach and clear ideas about recommendations for the area. Several of these recommendations, such as the planting of the vista sites, has come up several times in our conversations. I take this as a positive that we are all seeing the big picture and moving in the right direction to address these problems. You do raise several new ideas that I will discuss further with our team this week. In the coming weeks, we will be seeking further input from stakeholders on our recommendations in a survey format. In the meantime, if anything additional comes up in discussions with residents in the neighborhood, please feel free to keep sharing.

Kind regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited
Fw: alternative access trail

I am sending you this message for consideration as part of your study. This is instead of the current "Upper Wonder View Trail" head.

Ken Gralla

Sent from Outlook

Hi Wonderview Residents

Last week Mark Gleason and I tried to find a connection from the parking area to the trail head that would NOT go through our street and we found this:

There is an existing trail that leads down from the water tower (see attached picture). This trail ends close to the powerline-tower and could be fairly easily connected to the lower parking area where Lake Hollywood Drive meets the Lake.

While this solution would not be as good as getting the Forest Lawn trail acess, it is a very feasible and low cost solution that could get the hikers off our street now and it could be done in days if everyone is on board (DWP?)

Let's discuss

Toby Gad
Hi Ken,

Thanks for sharing and passing on the idea. We will certainly look into this further.

Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce
Dixon Resources Unlimited
Hi Dan, Emily and Julie:

Attached are three more photographs taken about 20 minutes ago--a non-holiday weekend in December--that shows: 1) visitors getting back into the car they parked with door open on Mulholland; 2) a few yards further along Mulholland, a motorcycle stopped with riders off the bike taking photographs, and 3) a car making u-turn (the car that was parked in #1) on Canyon Lake, which was completely full with parked cars on both sides of the street from top to bottom at Arrowhead Drive.

There was a traffic cop coming towards me on Mulholland--of course, he or she missed the parked car which had started driving. I don't know whether the officer did anything about the motorcycle.

All this once again shows that the concept of any kind of effective enforcement, that can actually address and solve the problems, is not realistic because of the geography of this area.

Of course, I support any short term interim partial solutions that we can all come up with, but we all really must now focus on long-term solutions and start the process towards such solutions in the near future.

Best,
Jane

-----Original Message-----
From: [mailto:]
Sent: Saturday, December 02, 2017 1:21 PM
To: Goichman Jane & Hank
Subject: Tourists

---
This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
https://www.avast.com/antivirus
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Andrae Corrigan  < Sat, Dec 2, 2017 at 8:02 PM
To: Jane Goichman < Dan Pearce < Julie Dixon
Cc: sarah.dusseault@lacity.org, shannon.prior@lacity.org, David Benz < com>, Kristina ONeil 
Pau...}

Hi All:

At 12:15pm today a city parking enforcement vehicle was parked on at the

corner of Canyon Lake and Tahoe Drive. We passed it as we drove up Canyon

Lake and around to Mulholland. There were four vehicles parked in the red

on Mulholland. It makes no sense to me to see city vehicles parked far away

from the problem areas.

Best--

Andy Corrigan

[Quoted text hidden]
Hi Jane,

Thank you for sharing the photographs. They are very informative and further aid our understanding of the problems at this particularly location.

Best Regards,

Dan Pearce
Dixon Resources Unlimited

Hi Andy,

Thank you for sharing this insight. It is noted down and is useful for us to know moving forward.

Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce
Dixon Resources Unlimited
Hi Christina,

Thank you for sharing your email.

I appreciate your concerns with the proposal to relocate/alter access to the Wonder View Trailhead. We will certainly discuss your concerns and consider your suggestions for a higher/more expansive gate along Wonder View Drive. At the moment, this a proposed recommendation that is still in development. We will be seeking input from stakeholders about our recommendations in the coming weeks. Certainly, a recommendation like this one would probably need the environmental impacts to be studied further. One additional recommendation that we have discussed is working with the mapping companies (Google and Waze) to correct their information, which should reduce the number of misdirected tourists.

Once again, thank you sharing and please feel free to continue to reach out to us.

Kinds Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: christina capps  
Date: December 7, 2017 at 3:59:19 PM PST  
To:  
Subject: WonderView Trail -Suggested relocation via back of the Toyon tanks.

HI JULIE,— MY HOME IS 120 FEET, WEST OF THE PROPOSED JUNCTION OF THE WONDER VIEW TRAIL.

The reasons I STRONGLY OPPOSE the above idea for new trail, are as follows:

1. UNLESS THE CURRENT DWP GATE, 50' EAST OF MY HOME IS GREATLY HEIGHTENED AND ENLARGED AND EXPANDED DOWN AND ACROSS THE SURROUNDING HILLSIDE IT WILL NOT KEEP FOOT TRAFFIC OFF THIS STREET. (Having hiked these hills since "God was a little girl," I can assure you it will be very easy to get around a lesser gate.

2. THIS TRAIL WOULD CUT ACROSS THE LAST REMAINING PASS THROUGH WILDLIFE CORRIDOR TO THE WEST.

(As first hand observation, you may be assured that wildlife NOW rarely passes through the "WonderView Trail" since the influx of people using the trail. There is a rare deer, or coyote,— but gone are the days when a plaintive coyote cry echoed through this canyon.

3. FINALLY, UNLESS SOMETHING IS DONE TO CORRECT THE GPS IN CARS, THE HUNDREDS OF MISDIRECTED TOURISTS A DAY THAT TRY VALIANTLY , TO TURN AROUND IN OUR TINY STREET, WILL STILL BE COMING UP HERE.

OBVIOUSLY, AS YOU SO WELL PUT IT AT THE MEETING, WE NEED TO GO AFTER THE LOW HANGING FRUIT, FIRST—MY FEAR IS THAT THIS PIECE OF FRUIT HAS SEVERAL WORMS IN IT.

BEST,
Christina Capps
WonderView Drive

Sent from my iPhone
December 15, 2017

Sarah Dusseault, CD 4 Chief of Staff
Shannon Prior, CD 4
Julie Dixon Resources Unlimited

Dear Sarah and Julie,

Friends of Griffith Park is disappointed with the November 12 Access and Mobility meeting.

Several organizations have supported the Alternative Access Plan for the Beachwood Gate area and submitted that suggestion; however it was not discussed. This is a simple, viable plan which complies with Judge Feffer’s order. We hope that it will be seriously discussed and considered at the next meeting.

Although the shuttles to Griffith Observatory have attracted thousands of riders, the number of people coming into the park continues to grow. Expanding and improving shuttle service to the park should be a high priority. We know you are working on it.

Friends of Griffith Park encourages you to continue to investigate all potential solutions to the heavy traffic on the entire south side of Griffith Park. We are happy that people, tourists included, are enjoying the park; however the park should be protected from being overwhelmed with vehicles. It is not a pleasant experience for anyone.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

President
Mobility comments - Gerry Hans

4 messages

Gerry Hans <gerry.hans@lacity.org> Fri, Dec 15, 2017 at 9:10 AM
To: Julie Dixon <julie.dixon@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>
Cc: Catherine Landers <catherine.landers@lacity.org>, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Dear all,

Sorry about being late with this. Attached are my comments following Mobility Meeting #1. See you at the January 11th meeting.

Best regards,
Gerry Hans

Hans Dixon comments Meeting 1.pdf

352K

Dan Pearce <dixonresourcesunlimited@gmail.com> Mon, Dec 18, 2017 at 12:05 PM
To: Julie Dixon <julie.dixon@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>, Emily Kwatinetz <emily.kwatinetz@lacity.org>, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Dear Mr. Hans,

On behalf of DIXON, thank you for sharing your comments and thoughts on the meeting we held on November 12. Although we did not discuss some of the topics mentioned in your letter, they have certainly been discussed since and have been raised by several other stakeholders in emails. In the coming weeks, we will be sharing a survey with residents of the neighborhoods to comment and state their preference on a number of recommendations we have been developing since the last meeting. In addition, an intercept survey of tourists was recently conducted to understand their motivations for visiting the area.

We look forward to your feedback on recommendations soon and encourage you to keep reaching out to us with any other comments or concerns.

Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited

From: Gerry Hans [mailto:]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 9:10 AM
To: Julie Dixon <julie.dixon@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>
Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> Fri, Dec 29, 2017 at 2:02 PM
To: Dan Pearce
Cc: Julie Dixon, Emily Kwatinetz
Hi Gerry,

Thank you for providing your feedback. I just wanted to clarify that AP Diaz from RAP was scheduled to attend but had to cancel due to a last minute emergency.

Thank you.

--

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.957.6415
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1

Gerry Hans <Fri, Dec 29, 2017 at 2:19 PM>
To: Shannon Prior, Dan Pearce, Julie Dixon, Emily Kwatinetz
Cc: Catherine Landers, Shannon Prior, Shannon Prior

Thanks Shannon. I don't believe anyone knew this. I think others with boots on the ground could also be very helpful: Joe, Tracy, Patrick Joyce, Albert Torres, for example.

Bet regards,
Gerry

[Quoted text hidden]
Note: I attended as a Friends of Griffith Park representative. However, these are my personal comments which based on my own observations and convictions.

1. **Involv RAP**: At future meetings of this group, RAP should be present. Their role is important for many reasons. They are experts on the traffic problems at the Observatory area, including what is working as a result of the plan’s implementation as well as its shortcomings. Rescue and safety concerns are known by park managers better than others. While RAP may not have in-house knowledge of wildlife and habitat impacts, the adopted GP Wildlife Management Plan and an extensive volume of privately-provided science/survey work is available for the asking.

   I have attended public meetings specifically scheduled regarding tourist and traffic problems at the park’s interface since 2011. Never before has RAP not been in attendance, to my knowledge.

2. **Elevate the importance of access at Beachwood Canyon**: The Stakeholder Feedback slide shows Beachwood Gate access as one of seven points included as comments from committee members ahead of the first meeting. Julie mentioned the comments are not listed in order of most often cited. Why not? After all, before discussing this slide, Julie said we are interested in “low-hanging fruit” and that we need to “prioritize and compromise” our ideas. My suggestion is to show the points in order of frequency cited by stakeholders. Please release all submitted comments to the committee, redacting submitters’ names.

   Julie added a considerable amount of supplementary information on each Stakeholder Feedback topic, except for Beachwood Access, which was simply read as it appears on the powerpoint list, nothing more. A presentation of the alternative access proposal for those not familiar with it should be done at the next meeting.

   Ninety minutes into the meeting I brought up the subject of the importance of the Beachwood Access (in relation with DASH being available there). Discussion again seemed intentionally stifled. I can only imagine this is because of pending litigation, but if this was the case, it should have been said.

3. **Consider the park user motivation**: While some study of traffic and parking may be warranted, what is missed completely in the analysis is park users’ reasons for entering or coming near the park. For example, one visitor may only want to snap a photo of the Hollywood Sign, while another may want to hike one to three miles to see the Sign, and another may want to see both the Observatory and the Hollywood Sign in one convenient trip.
Studying park user motivations may not be necessary, although some suggested it during the discussion at the November 12 meeting, but it’s pretty common sense. More importantly, what needs to be analyzed is how to best match venues with these various motivations, taking into account other factors such as the visitor’s transportation mode, the amount of time the visitor has, and the physical mobility of the visitor.

This is an excellent way to promote “sharing the burden” over the larger area. Equally important, the city can better exert control in order to improve the “visitor experience.” In my opinion, the current visitor experience is very negative. Tourists feel they are given the run-around by signage and GPS apps. They are also deliberately misguided by misinformation posted on websites specifically created to selfishly relieve certain residential areas. The city needs to fight back to take control.

As suggested at the meeting, managing park user behavior can be accomplished through official websites and social media. It may also be better managed with branded signage, although details may be difficult to include on signage. My hope is that tourists can be slotted to visit the appropriate venue based upon what they want!

4. **ADT and Occupancy**: All this data is influenced by variables making it not fair game for comparison purposes. The current closure of the Beachwood Gate has a major influence on the results, and unauthorized signage impacts tourists behavior. The standard for a “collector” street versus a “local” street are hugely different, so you can’t compare one street to the other unless they are similar; none are. And parking occupancy in a business area (Beachwood Village) is not a fair comparison to parking occupancy on a residential street such as Deronda or Canyon. All these factors must be kept in mind if any conclusions are to be drawn. Still, this study provides a good basis for discussion of what may or may not be tolerable by residents.

5. **Forget bikes**: There is no reason to study or discuss bike counts entering the park. Only at Deronda are they legal. Bikes are prohibited by code on all non-paved city park roads.
Hi Julie... I live at Deronda Drive and we met at CD4 when you presented the results of the traffic survey... I see that there are new road vehicle counting tubes again this time in the right place Deronda & Rockcliff just before the last leg of Deronda... problem is they are counting cars in the 'OFF' season!.... we might have a small up tick at Christmas but usually winter is much much quieter, it starts going crazy spring break... so I'm afraid you will not get a true picture of the craziness up here...

all my best...

Martin Smith

Hi Paul,

Thank you for sharing your concerns and forwarding your email. While it may not be the busiest period of the year in terms of tourists, I’m sure the data will be very useful and reveal several insights. Additionally, our visits/walk-throughs...
throughout the summer when we were not collecting data in addition to all the great stakeholder feedback we have received has certainly help paint the picture of how busy it can get in the neighborhoods.

Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited

-----Original Message-----
From: Paul Martin Smith <paulmartin.smith@deronda-drive.com>
To: Julie <julie@julie.com>
Sent: Sun, Dec 17, 2017 3:27 pm
Subject: from Martin Smith re Deronda Drive

Hi Julie... I live at Deronda Drive and we met at CD4 when you presented the results of the traffic survey...

I see that there are new road vehicle counting tubes again this time in the right place Deronda & Rockcliff just before the last leg of Deronda... problem is they are counting cars in the 'OFF' season!.... we might have a small up tick at Christmas but usually winter is much quieter, it starts going crazy spring break... so I'm afraid you will not get a true picture of the craziness up here...
all my best...

Martin Smith

---

Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>
To: Paul Martin Smith <paul.martin.smith@lacity.org>
Cc: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Tue, Dec 19, 2017 at 11:55 AM

Thanks,

We have some counts from Spring, September and now in December, so we should have a fairly complete data profile.

If we need to take a few additional counts at Spring Break again, we can certainly add.

Sarah
LHHA Board, and concerned residents. EMERGENCY

Traffic, parking and lawlessness at the Park and vista are unenforceable. LAFD, LAPD, Rangers, and DOT each just told me they are powerless to enable closure, cannot limit traffic to residents only, nor can they imitate traffic control, and or access control. They said, this area is frightening to them. Each said, call C4 CM. He is the only one that can protect the area with any of the above because enforcement has completely failed.

I recorded all conversations for our records. I had a gas leak call. It took 25 minutes to get service because of traffic bottleneck to emergency service on Canyon Lake from the Vista to Hollywood Park. Our CM must act now, or He is grossly negligent as is the city of LA

Please excuse typos, IOS auto correct gets it wrong from time to time.

Thanks
Tony

Dear Tony

I was up there yesterday and it was horrible. It took over ten minutes to go from Deronda to Tahoe. They had three or four DOT personal and it was still hopeless. I spoke with one DOT person who told me she had just called her supervisor to request it be shut down. She said conditions were crazy, that a firetruck could never get through and that IT WAS TOO DANGEROUS TO STAY OPEN. This certainly pops the bubble that this is just a matter of enforcement and you just need enough people. These conditions will be even worse the next few days. Labonge used to shut down the whole neighborhood and conditions were not as bad as this.

(Criminal charges were filed in conjunction with the "Ghost Ship" fire up north. This is even worse because the very people who are supposed to be protecting the public are the ones actually endangering them. )

In addition I also spoke to various DOT and LAPD personal at the various magnets. They said the same thing. "This is too much. Call CD4 and shut this all down.".

Sarajane. Schwartz
Sent from my iPhone
The Skirball fire is a warning for your neighborhood.

From what I understand, many people are blaming Koretz because he failed to monitor the encampments despite prior warnings.

--

Lester Kiss
Thu, Dec 28, 2017 at 6:42 PM
To: shannon.prior@lacity.org, Sarah Dusseau <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>
Cc: shannon.prior@lacity.org, Sarah Dusseau <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>

Dear Julie,

It’s my humble opinion that when you have hundreds of tourists all seeking to get to the Vista and trying to parallel park on both sides of Canyon Lake Dr, traffic stops in both directions. One cannot easily parallel park as the hill is very steep. It often takes multiple tries. This could easily result in emergency vehicles not getting through or being delayed. I’ve tried to park there myself and felt very pressured, palms sweating — it’s a recipe for gridlock on holidays. Has Dixon considered redoing this parking? Is there room to do one side only but not parallel parking?

Of course if the situation has no solution closure must be an option in my view. Emergency vehicles need to get through each and every day. We can just say — oh, Christmas and New Years are fine for gridlock we’ll take the risk.

Thanks for listening. Happy New Year!

Best,

Lester

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From:  
Date: December 28, 2017 at 7:15:48 PM EST
To: Tony Fisch >
Cc: Lester Kiss >, Paul Rusconi <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseau <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>, Christine O’Brien >, Daniel Guss >, Rio Phior <councilmember.ryu@lacity.org>, "shannon.prior@lacity.org" <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Dan Pearce

Mon, Jan 8, 2018 at 1:40 PM

To: “shannon.prior@lacity.org” <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Cc: Emily Kwatinetz <emily.kwatinetz@dixonresourcesunlimited.com> Julie Dixon

Dear Mr. Kiss,

I hope you had a great New Year. Thank you for sharing your feedback.

We appreciate your concern. The team has been working hard to analyze new data and we have been revising and developing our recommendations to meet these issues. Our latest round of recommendations has been shared with District 4 Staff who are currently reviewing them. We certainly have included recommendations that will have an effect on parking in the area that we believe will help the issue. We will be sharing new findings and recommendations at the upcoming stakeholder meeting on January 16. We hope to see you there and are looking forward to sharing the latest work.

Kind regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited
Thanks for the great customer response. I'll try to be there.

Best,

Lester
est, cess & Mobility response
2 messages

Marian A. Dodge <[redacted]> Mon, Jan 15, 2018 at 5:02 PM
To: Sarah Dusseault <[redacted]>, Shannon Prior <[redacted]>

Dear Sarah & Julie,

Here is my response to the Access & Mobility Committee meeting.

See you Tuesday.

Best regards,

Marian Dodge

2017 1215 Access & Mobility response.pdf 70K

Dan Pearce Fri, Jan 19, 2018 at 12:19 PM
To: [redacted]

Dear Ms. Dodge,

I wanted to take a moment to thank you for providing feedback, and for your participation during Tuesday’s stakeholder meeting. I hope that you found discussions and recommendations around shuttles, DASH buses, and the Beachwood Gate insightful, and that Julie provided the answers you were looking for during the meeting. We look forward to seeing District 4 Staff continue to work with residents to implement many of the recommendations in the report, which we are confident will alleviate many of the current issues related to the park and sign.

Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce
Dixon Resources Unlimited

[Quoted text hidden]
January 15, 2018

Re: Access & Mobility meeting

Dear Sarah and Julie,

When I walked into the room, I initially had high hopes for a successful meeting. I observed the people that you had gathered. Although I did not know everyone, those that I did recognize are all rational citizens committed to their communities. I was optimistic.

You asked participants to submit suggestions ahead of time, another good sign. I naively thought that you would actually discuss some of the suggestions that were submitted. Numerous groups supported the Alternative Access Plan for the Beachwood Gate area and submitted that suggestion. However it was not discussed.

When Friends of Griffith Park Vice President Gerry Hans brought up the Alternative Access Plan near the end of the meeting because by then it was obvious you were not going to discuss it, Julie quickly changed the subject. Since Sara had run up to Julie and whispered something in her ear, one can surmise that Sarah told Julie not to discuss it.

Another issue of concern is the inequity of the traffic/parking surveys. It was obvious from the maps provided by Dixon that only the area around the Beachwood gate had been surveyed. RAP put up signs directing traffic to the east to Canyon Drive, Western Avenue, and Vermont Avenue. There were no “before” surveys done so it is impossible to determine the “after” impact. CD 4 and RAP had already gone to great efforts to mitigate the heavy traffic on Vermont Avenue and around the Griffith Observatory. The decision to put more traffic on Vermont Avenue greatly diminished RAP’s efforts to ease traffic around the observatory.

The newly planned traffic surveys may address some of the inequities, but it will depend a great deal on when they are conducted. Will they be done during the holidays or on Sundays?

I have a suggestion for making the existing shuttles more effective without adding more shuttles. (We still need more shuttles, but that takes money and time.) The current route from the Red Line Sunset/ Vermont station takes a convoluted route up Vermont one block, turns right to go to Hillhurst where it has to make several left turns. Left turns are something to be avoided because of the long wait time usually involved. If the shuttle went straight up Vermont to the Greek Theatre and Griffith Observatory and returned via Hillhurst you could save a lot of time because the shuttle wouldn’t have to go through the six-street intersection and it wouldn’t have to make a left turn from Vermont to Los Feliz. Even better would be to go straight up Vermont and return on Vermont, turning southeast on Hollywood Blvd. right on Maubert Ave., south on Rodney Dr., right on Sunset Bl. to get back to the Metro stop on the right side of the street. Maubert and Rodney are both narrow streets; I’m not sure the DASH would fit comfortably, but it should be explored.

I already know that you’ll have to convince DOT that the Observatory DASH will not be competing with the Hollywood DASH. I tried to get DOT to realign the Los Feliz DASH route when it was first
implemented many years ago. I wanted the Los Feliz DASH to go up Vermont and down Hillhurst instead of going back up Hillhurst. It would have cut the route time in half, doubling the service without adding another shuttle. However DOT had a rule that one DASH route could not cover the same street as another. The realignment would have meant that the Los Feliz DASH traveled the same route as the Hollywood DASH from Sunset to Franklin. Perhaps if you promised DOT that you wouldn’t stop along that section of Vermont, they could be convinced. It might need a big nudge from the Mayor.

The Observatory DASH could stop at Ambrose Avenue/Vermont in order to connect to Los Feliz Bl. with its busses.

The current DASH route serves neither the local business district nor the observatory very well.

Best regards,

Marian Dodge
Hello -

Thank you all for your thoughtful participation last night and throughout this process. We look forward to continuing the conversation.

Please see the press release below, which contains links to the study, data report, and council motion filed today. The PowerPoint presentation from last night can be found HERE.

Please send your feedback to me, and let me know if you have questions.

- Shannon

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

January 17, 2018

Press Contact:

Estevan Montemayor

estevan.montemayor@lacity.org

213.605.4145
Access, Safety & Mobility Study for Griffith Park & Hollywood Sign Released

Los Angeles, CA -- Today, Dixon Resources Unlimited, a transportation consulting firm, released a comprehensive study to improve safety, traffic, and tourist access around Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign. Councilmember Ryu introduced a motion instructing various City departments to study each strategy presented in the Dixon Resources Unlimited Study for its feasibility.

“Resolving issues of safety, traffic and responsible tourist and hiking access to our City’s most popular park and most famous icon have been a priority since the day I entered office,” Councilmember Ryu said. “I am very pleased to finally have this report after months of study by Dixon Unlimited.”

The study, created with input from various community stakeholders, offers a total of 29 strategies to improve access to Griffith Park and Trailheads, improve emergency vehicle access, expand transit options, enhance pedestrian safety, improve traffic flow & reduce congestion, increase parking efficiency and compliance rates and proactively manage visitors to the Park and Hollywood Sign. Data was collected through average daily traffic counts of both pedestrians and motor vehicles, occupancy of various trails, streets, and park areas, and by surveying visitors to the Park and Sign.

"The Department looks forward to working with Councilmember Ryu on resolving neighborhood concerns related to traffic, access and mobility," said Michael Shull, General Manager for Recreation and Parks. "This study provides tremendous opportunities to achieve these goals by focusing on community concerns and potential strategies to improve the park and surrounding neighborhoods."

The report, conducted by Dixon Resources Unlimited, to address issues of traffic and safety around the sign, offers several recommendations such as developing a shuttle service up Beachwood Canyon, studying the feasibility of an aerial tram, establishing a Hollywood Sign Visitor Center, implementing a wayfinding strategy, installing new signage, and working with Google and Waze to communicate accurate access information.

Councilmember Ryu has held hundreds of meetings with community groups, local businesses and stakeholders to embrace ideas and find consensus leading up to the commission of this study, and has not taken a position on any particular strategy offered in the Dixon study.


"Fixing traffic and mobility issues surrounding Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign is incredibly important work," said Julie Dixon of Dixon Resources Unlimited. "Our priority was to work with the community and the park to develop a balanced solution that provides access and addresses safety, and our goal was to explore every possible route to find this solution."

The Dixon study marks the first time a comprehensive study, replete with data and strategies relating to visitor access to the Hollywood Sign and reducing negative impacts on nearby neighborhoods, has been made available to the City of Los Angeles. With the new information and visitor data, it is now possible for the City to analyze the possible solutions with accurate and up-to-date information.
“The Hollywood Sign and Griffith Park are being loved to death,” Ryu added. “This is a world-renowned icon, and possibly the only one without proper access to it. It’s like having the Statue of Liberty without a visitor’s center, viewing platform, or even a sign telling you how to get to it. It is unsustainable and unsafe. I look forward to looking at the specifics of the feasibility of these strategies.”

Councilmember Ryu’s motion today instructs various City departments to begin studying the feasibility of the various strategies proposed in the Dixon study. Councilmember Ryu will continue to seek input from community members throughout the process. No single proposed idea is preferred over another by Councilmember Ryu at this time.

Read the report here.

Read the data collection & analysis here.

Read the motion here.

Read the FAQ here.

###


--

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.957.6415
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1

avid A Parker

To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Hi Shannon,

First off, thanks so much for including all of us in this process. I'm grateful for the opportunity to weigh in.

There are a lot of good ideas among these recommendations, but as I mentioned last night, it concerns me that there are no specific recommendations for increased funding for staffing and enforcement. Most of the problems at the Vista, for example, are mitigated when we have a ranger or parking enforcement there. I know your office has had to work hard to
secure those hours for us—which we greatly appreciate—but any set of recommendations should include a more permanent allocation of enforcement resources.

For similar reasons, I think a PPD for Lake Hollywood would be a terrible mistake. Many of the tourists who come up here are not currently observing simple, obvious, internationally-recognized restrictions. Absent round-the-clock enforcement, there's absolutely no reason to believe these tourists, who typically come to the neighborhood for fifteen minutes to take a photo of the sign, would observe PPD restrictions.

As a result, a PPD in Lake Hollywood would mostly punish our neighbors who come up here to go to the Park or to walk on the trail, not to mention adding a major inconvenience to our own lives. There's historically been strong opposition to a PPD in this neighborhood, and I know a lot of us will do everything we can to prevent one from being implemented.

Thanks again for all the work you and your office are doing not only to deal with these issues on daily basis, but to manage all of the conflicting views about the best way forward. I know it can't be easy.

Best,
David

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
To: David A Parker >

Hey David,

Thank you so much for participating and for your thoughtful comments. You are completely correct about the need for permanent and standardized enforcement resources. The Councilmember submitted a motion last November directing LAPD, DOT, and RAP to formulate a budget to manage tourism in the area so that it can be integrated into the City's annual budget. We believe it should be a part of the regular budget.

You can view the motion HERE and the council file HERE.

We take the implementation of PPDs very seriously because they often result in unintended consequences. We will take good care to make sure there is ample support and need before we would initiate a PPD for your area.

Please let me know if you have any further comments or questions.

Thanks!

David A Parker < >  
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Thanks, Shannon. All the big ideas are fun and exciting but I really do think a lot of the issues in our neighborhoods could be mostly solved by a permanent investment in increased staffing levels. I'm sure the same can be said of most issues facing Los Angeles, but I'm very glad to hear your office is pushing for the human resources our district needs.

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
To: David A Parker >

Bcc: Karen Rosen, Tara Stephenson-Fong, Kris SULLIVAN, Jim Van Dusen, Jane Goichman, Marian Dodge

I don't believe you received my below email last week following up on the stakeholder meeting. I think it didn't go through because of the size of the attachments. My apologies. Here is the email sans the attachments. You can find the report and
the data analysis using the links below. Thank you.

Kris Sullivan -
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Thank you Shannon! I appreciate your sending this. I will look it over and put in my two cents!

All the best,

Kris

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
To: Kris Sullivan -

Thank you, Kris. I apologize for the delay!

[Quoted text hidden]
Another suggestion that wasn't addressed at last night's meeting.

missykly <missykly@missykly.com> 4 messages

To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Catherine Landers <catherine.landers@davidryu.com>
Cc: Fran Reichenbach <fran.reichenbach@davidryu.com>

Wed, Jan 17, 2018 at 10:44 AM

I am not a fan nor do I believe that a aerial tram or a gondola are actually viable but has anyone considered a pedestrian bridge over and across Beachwood to get that picture?

Seems a more cost effective, less parking space intrusive and even a safer pedestrian crossing than currently available.

On another note, just spoke to the LA Times. Other than the tram and gondola gave high marks to the team, the report, and the Councilman

Thank you all for everything you've done

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> 3 messages

Wed, Jan 17, 2018 at 3:52 PM

Thank you for your comments and participation, Missy! So a bridge on upper Beachwood? Or down closer to where the bulb out was proposed in the report?

Missy Kelly <missykly@missykly.com> Wed, Jan 17, 2018 at 4:00 PM

Either way. My dogs and I have almost been hit several times crossing Beachwood.

I think near where the bend is that gives the best shot for tourists. Residents will adapt.

Even if it was only open during daytime hours to avoid the usual problems associated with these things it would alleviate multiple issues.

Sorry, did you see the LA Times? Just did KNX. Although they quote me praising the work, they cut me out from doing so directly.

Dan Pearce Dixon Resources Unlimited

To: Missy Kelly <missykly@missykly.com>, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Cc: Julie Dixon <julie.dixon@davidryu.com>

Hi Missy,

I wanted to take a moment to thank you for providing feedback, and for your participation during Tuesday's stakeholder meeting. I hope that you found discussions around the recommendation that Julie provided the answers you were looking for during the meeting. I think it is important that residents in the community continue suggesting ideas to District 4 Staff. We look forward to † work with residents to implement many of the recommendations in the report, which we are confident will alleviate many of the current issues related to the park and sign.

Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cf6e6f515e&jv=Z-TDd2gpow.en.&view=pt&cat=Feedback%20Dixon%20study%20publish&search=cat&th=161102682052
Access, Safety & Mobility Study for Griffith Park & Hollywood Sign Released

Christine Kent <christine.kent@lacity.org>
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Wed, Jan 17, 2018 at 3:59 PM

Thanks Shannon - happy new year to you too! Couple of things - did Dixon look at the Bronson Caves area (end of Canyon/Brush Canyon trail to the right) as a potential spot for a welcome center and a place for restrooms, concession, probably even room for more parking back there, etc. Its flat with great access and the bonus is the fantastic view and picture opportunity of the Hollywood sign. A shuttle bus could bring picture seekers in there all day long! I guess it's puzzling that one of the best views of the sign isn't underscored in this research. I'm glad to talk to someone on their team if you can make the introduction. I'm surprised the Oaks Homeowners association didn't mention this.

Also can you let me know if the survey that the city did last summer at the top of Beachwood is publicly available yet. I understand per their license codes they are required to file their survey within 90 days - and we are well past that date given the survey was performed last summer. Thank you! christine

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Sincerely,

Christine Kent
Office
Cell
Fwd: Griffith Park report
7 messages

Catherine Landers <catherine.landers@lacity.org> Thu, Jan 18, 2018 at 9:18 AM
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Cc: Adam Miller <adam.miller@lacity.org>, Estevan Montemayor <estevan.montemayor@lacity.org>

Shannon can you help draft a response?

Catherine Landers
Office of Councilmember David Ryu

Please excuse typos, sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Luke H. Klipp" <lukeklipp@losfeliznc.org>
Date: January 18, 2018 at 9:16:34 AM PST
To: Adam Miller <adam.miller@lacity.org>
Cc: Catherine Landers <catherine.landers@lacity.org>
Subject: Griffith Park report

Adam,

I have seen the press blowing up about this: https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/davidryucc/pages/1277/attachments/original/1516129669/FINAL_Comprehensive_Strategies_Report_%282%29.pdf?1516129669

And I noticed that under “Stakeholders” it lists the Los Feliz NC. This is also being reported in the Los Feliz Ledger as our having had input on this report. I’m sorry, I don’t mean to be upset, but I am. We’ve had no input into this report. I appreciate that the entirety of Griffith Park falls within our NC’s boundaries, but that’s the extent to which our neighborhood council has been engaged in this process. We were invited to a stakeholder meeting a few months back where we were presented with some very specific parking/traffic items that may have informed one or two of the items in this report, but with 30 people around the table, a number of whom owned what little time was given for feedback.

So, please help me here, why is the Los Feliz NC listed as a “stakeholder” in the acknowledgments section? Thanks.

Luke H. Klipp, President and District E Rep
Los Feliz Neighborhood Council

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> Thu, Jan 18, 2018 at 1:01 PM
To: "Luke H. Klipp" <lukeklipp@losfeliznc.org>
Cc: Adam Miller <adam.miller@lacity.org>, Catherine Landers <catherine.landers@lacity.org>
Bcc: Estevan Montemayor <estevan.montemayor@lacity.org>

Hi Luke,

LFNC is listed as a stakeholder because you were invited to participate and attended at least one of the stakeholder meetings. All of our stakeholders had the opportunity to provide comments directly to the Dixon team after the initial stakeholder meeting. Dixon had many calls, exchanges and even in-person meetings with various stakeholders after that initial meeting.
To recap: You and fellow LFNC member Shannon Carlson were invited to attend the initial stakeholder meeting in November. My records show that only you attended. The purpose of the initial meeting was to provide representatives with information about the status of the study, its preliminary data, and some of the ideas being considered by Dixon. Representatives were given an opportunity to provide their initial reactions and feedback. Julie worked through the room to allow for representatives to provide their comments and ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, Julie's information was shared so that representatives could send further questions and comments to her. After the meeting, I sent the draft data analysis report and powerpoint presentation to all of the participates. In the subsequent weeks, Julie and the Dixon team received numerous follow up comments via, email, phone, and in-person from the representatives. As a result of the feedback, Dixon conducted further data gathering, including average daily traffic counts at Fern Dell Drive and Vermont Avenue.

I apologize that the second stakeholder meeting conflicted with LFNC's monthly meeting. If you recall, I offered to meet with you and Shannon the day of the meeting or the following day. You replied that you could not meet then so I offered to meet when it would be convenient for you. I did not receive a reply from you. And I have never received any responses from Shannon Carlson. Adam Miller also reached out to LFNC's Jon Deutsch to see if he could attend at least for a portion of the stakeholder meeting.

Even though the report has been released, we are still in the early stages of the process and have asked for the implicated City department to study the feasibility of the proposed strategies. I would still be happy to meet to go over the report with you. Either way, we would like to hear your comments and questions regarding the contents of the report. Your feedback will help guide how we move forward.

Thank you.

From: "Luke H. Klipp" <lukekliipp@losfeliznc.org>
Date: January 18, 2018 at 9:16:34 AM PST
To: Adam Miller <adam.miller@lacity.org>
Cc: Catherine Landers <catherine.landers@lacity.org>
Subject: Griffith Park report

Adam,

I have seen the press blowing up about this: https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/davidryucc/pages/1277/attachments/original/1516129669/FINAL_Comprehensive_Strategies_Report_%282%29.pdf?1516129669

And I noticed that under “Stakeholders” it lists the Los Feliz NC. This is also being reported in the Los Feliz Ledger as our having had input on this report. I’m sorry, I don’t mean to be upset, but I am. We’ve had no input into this report. I appreciate that the entirety of Griffith Park falls within our NC’s boundaries, but that’s the extent to which our neighborhood council has been engaged in this process. We were invited to a stakeholder meeting a few months back where we were presented with some very specific parking/traffic items that may have informed one or two of the items in this report, but with 30 people around the table, a number of whom owned what little time was given for feedback.

So, please help me here, why is the Los Feliz NC listed as a “stakeholder” in the acknowledgments section? Thanks.

Luke H. Klipp, President and District E Rep
Los Feliz Neighborhood Council
Luke H. Klipp <lukeklipp@losfeliznc.org>
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Cc: Adam Miller <adam.miller@lacity.org>, Catherine Landers <catherine.landers@lacity.org>

Shannon,

Thank you for your thorough response! I really appreciate it.

I was unaware, after the first meeting, which was very specific and limited to a small area of scope and topics, that the final report would be so broad and far-reaching. Frankly, given the meeting topic of “Griffith Park Mobility” at that first meeting, my understanding going in was that we would likely be covering a broad range of territory, or at least a broader range than was ultimately covered. And given the geographic limits and specifics to individual roads, on-street parking counts, and trail access counts, it was something that seemed very different from the report now being discussed.

I would certainly appreciate the opportunity to sit down with you and/or anyone else from your team to go over the report. Since I work most days in Long Beach, this is a bit challenging, although I could meet at City Hall sometime in the morning of Friday, January 26, if that works for you. I might also like to invite our Transportation Committee co-chairs to see if they could participate as well.

In the meantime, I understand that you’re doing your best to outreach to a number of community stakeholders, and I really appreciate it. Perhaps, because LFNC operates under a different set of constraints than a number of the other stakeholders (primarily neighborhood associations), we might also then want a more formalized presentation to our council that could result in some set of comments from the LFNC. We are the only NC whose boundaries include the entirety of Griffith Park, and we are generally quite interested in providing formal comments on things related to Griffith Park. We also, obviously, have the same interest as the other NCs who participated in this process, as our stakeholders living in areas immediately adjacent to the park have an interest in ensuring access to the park that is not also overly disruptive to their neighborhoods.

Please let me know if the morning of Friday the 26th could work for you, and thank you again.

Luke H. Klipp, President and District E Rep
Los Feliz Neighborhood Council

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
To: Catherine Landers <catherine.landers@lacity.org>, Adam Miller <adam.miller@lacity.org>

Unfortunately I cannot meet on Friday the 26th. Catherine, would you be able to review the study with him on that date?

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Luke H. Klipp <lukeklipp@losfeliznc.org>

Catherine Landers <catherine.landers@lacity.org>
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Cc: Adam Miller <adam.miller@lacity.org>

I could to that Friday morning

Catherine Landers
Senior Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Hey Luke,

Thanks for your response. Unfortunately I won’t be available on Friday but Catherine Landers, who is very well versed on the report, can meet with you that morning. You are welcome to also invite the NC’s Transportation Committee co-chairs. We appreciate your flexibility given your work schedule. Let us know what time you were thinking and if you would like for us to arrange parking for you.

Thanks, again.

Shannon Prior

Hey Luke,

Just checking in to see if Friday is still good and what time works best.

Thanks!

Shannon Prior
Julie, Joe: Attached is the map that we discussed tonight (email that went with it is below). The main points:

1. The Hollyridge trailhead is closed by court order and there is no way to mitigate the traffic and crowds in that area even with a shuttle if it is open.
2. Canyon Drive is wide, with speedbumps and sidewalks and can accommodate a DASH bus.
3. The DASH can enter the park and turn around in the small parking lot at the end.
4. There appear to be one or two possible trails to the Hollyridge Trail from the catch basin next to the bat caves. This could be the “Trail to the Hollywood Sign”.

Jim

Jim Van Dusen

Joe, There are options being proposed for Hollyridge Trail access and I don’t know if the following one has been presented (please see the attached map). It appears to me that a trail from the catch basin in Bronson Park up to the Hollyridge Trail would be an option. I’ve drawn two lines, a blue and red one for the path of the trails. The blue trail would bring people to just below the stables which might be a problem as those crowds may just go up to take a picture and then go on down to the gate at Beachwood to exit rather than hike to the Hollywood Sign which puts them on the easement road. The red trail would
put hikers at just above the stables and it looks like the distance from the catch basin to the Hollyridge Trail is almost the same as from that point on the trail to the gate at Beachwood Drive. I walked to the catch basin last Saturday afternoon and was impressed by the extent of the park facilities, trees, etc. as it has been some time since I have gone to that park entrance (I was also impressed by how open it was. There were not that many people there at 4:30pm on a Saturday). Either trail would follow the natural ridge lines.

It also appears to me that it would be easy to run a DASH bus or shuttle from Canyon and Franklin Blvd. to Bronson Park. It could go into the park and let people off at the kid’s playground if people just wanted to picnic and then let the hikers off at the closed end of the road. You could move 5 automobile parking spaces out of that small parking lot and the DASH/shuttle could turn around in that lot, drop people off and go back down Canyon. The advantage that Canyon Drive has over other roads in the area is that it is a wide, fairly straight street with sidewalks and ample room for a DASH/shuttle, automobile traffic and walkers. The only additional infrastructure needed would be a stop light at Canyon and Franklin, something the residents in The Oaks have been requesting for several years.

The only drawback that I can see with the new hiking trail would be that it could deposit a lot of people near the ranch as we are seeing that while hikers do not enter the easement road from Beachwood Drive, many hikers are exiting the park through that gate. Bringing more people up by DASH/shuttle to Bronson Park to hike up the new trail would then allow the hikers to walk down the ranch easement road and exit through the Beachwood gate below the ranch and walk down Beachwood Drive to catch the DASH at the Hollywoodland market area. This crowd would only increase over time which might cause more problems on the easement road in light of the legal decision just made as well as bring all the issues about crowd control on Beachwood Drive back to the front burner as cars are still coming up thinking they can drive to the Hollywood Sign or take a picture of it. Adding more hikers to that mix puts us back into the safety issues that we have been grappling with for the last 6 years.

Although I’m not convinced that this new trail idea is a good one, I wasn’t sure if it had been proposed to RAP and I thought I’d forward this to you just in case it has not.     Jim Van Dusen

Jim Van Dusen
Hi Shannon -

Email re Dixon study. Will enter in OMS once maintenance is done this morning.

Thanks,
Rachel

---------- Forwarded message ----------

From: Logun, Elizabeth (NBCUniversal) <>
Date: Thu, Jan 18, 2018 at 6:35 PM
Subject: Proposal to build Hollywood sign - No!
To: “cd4.issues@lacity.org” <cd4.issues@lacity.org>
Cc: 

To Whom it May Concern:

I just read about a proposal to build a second Hollywood sign for tourists on the SF Valley side. What a truly AWFUL idea. In addition to the glaringly obvious fact that it would be a FAKE Hollywood sign and therefore have zero relevance, we already have enough congestion in the 101/134/5 Universal City/Toluca Lake/Burbank/ Glendale area of the Valley, thanks to both residents, commuters who work at the studios (myself included), as well as tourists flocking to Universal Studios and Warner Brothers etc..

We also have Forest Lawn and Mount Sinai. Do people visiting their loved ones really need to be fighting tourist buses galore and an endless trek of tourists intruding on their sacred space? Not to mention the EYESORE a large Hollywood sign would be on the Burbank side of the Cahuenga Peak.

One of the great pleasures of living in the San Fernando Valley is that it is not Hollywood. We actually have an equestrian neighborhood in Burbank/Glendale, and access to the L.A. River and the L.A. Zoo and The Autry Museum – all of which gives us a rural feel in many places - and we would like to keep it that way.

Please – NO second Hollywood sign in the Valley.

I voted for David Ryu -- but rest assured I will not vote for him again if this proposal takes shape.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Logun

Submissions, Content and Production Risk

NBCUniversal
Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> To: Elizabeth.Logun@nbcuni.com

Hello Elizabeth,

Thank you for your comments. The Councilmember has not endorsed any of the strategies presented by Dixon Resources Unlimited. All of the ideas will now be studied by the relevant City departments to determine the feasibility and cost. Further community outreach will also be done.

Thank you.

------------- Forwaded message -------------
From: Logun, Elizabeth (NBCUniversal) <Elizabeth.Logun@nbcuni.com>
Date: Thu, Jan 18, 2018 at 6:35 PM
Subject: Proposal to build Hollywood sign - No!
To: "cd4.issues@lacity.org" <cd4.issues@lacity.org>
Cc: 

To Whom it May Concern:

I just read about a proposal to build a second Hollywood sign for tourists on the SF Valley side. What a truly AWFUL idea. In addition to the glaringly obvious fact that it would be a FAKE Hollywood sign and therefore have zero relevance, we already have enough congestion in the 101 /134/5 Universal City/ Toluca Lake/ Burbank/ Glendale area of the Valley, thanks to both residents, commuters who work at the studios (myself included), as well as tourists flocking to Universal Studios and Warner Brothers etc..

We also have Forest Lawn and Mount Sinai. Do people visiting their loved ones really need to be fighting tourist buses galore and an endless trek of tourists intruding on their sacred space? Not to mention the EYESORE a large Hollywood sign would be on the Burbank side of the Cahuenga Peak.

One of the great pleasures of living in the San Fernando Valley is that it is not Hollywood. We actually have an equestrian neighborhood in Burbank/Glendale, and access to the L.A. River and the L.A. Zoo and The Autry Museum – all of which gives us a rural feel in many places - and we would like to keep it that way.
Please – NO second Hollywood sign in the Valley.

I voted for David Ryu -- but rest assured I will not vote for him again if this proposal takes shape.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth

Elizabeth Logun
Submissions, Content and Production Risk

NBCUniversal

The opinions expressed in this email are strictly personal and do not represent in any way the opinions of NBCUniversal.
Best,

Elizabeth

---

From: Shannon Prior [mailto:shannon.prior@lacity.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 23, 2018 4:06 PM
To: Logun, Elizabeth (NBCUniversal)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Proposal to build Hollywood sign - No!

[Quoted text hidden]

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> Tue, Jan 23, 2018 at 4:44 PM
To: "Logun, Elizabeth (NBCUniversal)"

I am, too! I should also mention that some suggestions in the plan, including the duplicate sign, would need to undergo significant environmental review. Thanks.

[Quoted text hidden]

Logun, Elizabeth (NBCUniversal)
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Tue, Jan 23, 2018 at 4:46 PM

Very good to know! On all levels!

Thank you again.

---

From: Shannon Prior [mailto:shannon.prior@lacity.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 23, 2018 4:44 PM
To: Logun, Elizabeth (NBCUniversal)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Proposal to build Hollywood sign - No!

[Quoted text hidden]
Julie,

First of all let me again express my thanks and congratulations to you and your team for taking on this enormous knot of problems surrounding the Hollywood Sign, breaking it up into a series of individual challenges and tasks, and coming up with a variety of solutions for each one. Most of all, I appreciate the openness of this process and your good-natured respect and consideration for all perspectives.

I’m a participant in these meetings first as a representative of the Griffith Park Advisory Board. As such, my primary goal is supporting the board’s mandate of preserving the urban wilderness aspect of the park and especially the western part of the park, over which I’ve been running and hiking for more than 30 years. Second, this process is critical to me because I live just below the Hollywood Sign (my driveway, which I share with four other houses, ) and I’m more familiar than most with problems associated with ever-increasing numbers of tourists and hikers attracted by the Hollywood Sign.

In the interest of brevity, I’ll address the GPAB perspective in this first email and my perspective as a resident in a second one.

With a couple of exceptions, I’m impressed with how your strategies seem to limit tourist and hiker activities either to the periphery of the park or to well-traveled paths and roads, which I hope won’t much effect the wilderness parts of the park at all. The two exceptions would be 1) the Aerial Tram, about which we know nothing yet of tower and station locations, and 2) the suggested new routes to the Wonderview Trailhead.

The Tram idea has been kicked around for years and still sounds like it might heighten the popularity of the Sign and attract far more additional visitors than it would mitigate. Beyond that, I don’t see how the towers and stations and additional thousands of people accessing the interior of the park could be anything but a negative impact on the habitat there. I think our primary goal in managing the impact of the snap-shot-takers, both as it effects neighboring residents and park habitat, should be to offer them more convenient photo-opportunity sites down in Hollywood (as mentioned in your presentation) and not to give additional thousands of tourists new access to the wildest parts of the park.

As for the two alternate routes to the Wonderview Trailhead, I think both of these routes are problematic, particularly Option B, which goes through the heart of what currently serves as a sanctuary for P-22, our local mountain lion. You’re right, the powerline maintenance road is a trail of sorts and it heads up past the Toyon Tanks towards the Wonderview Trailhead. But that area is the heart of one of the most pristine places left in western Griffith Park (and neighboring DWP land). I’ve hiked in those hills for years and along that road I’ve discovered loads of lion paw prints, scat and a few kill sites. When P-22 was first trapped and fitted with a satellite collar, it was on that road. Last February, using a motion-activated trail camera, I got a shot of P-22 on that very road (which I attach). For obvious reasons this is not common knowledge and I hope you won’t publicize it. But I think that Option B should be quietly dropped as a possible route to the trailhead. It would be a disaster in terms of lost wilderness habitat. No doubt the lion is often on the move and would find other places to retreat to, but this one is particularly isolated and would be a shame to lose it if there are better alternatives.

Option A, the trail that would shadow Wonderview through the chaparral a few dozen yards below the road, strikes me as only a partial solution to the over-use of Wonderview as a hiker access to the park. Even with a new trail like Option A, parking issues on the incline above Lake Hollywood would only continue to get worse. I think the best solution to the Wonderview problem would be to move access to the trail out of the neighborhood altogether and, using the powerline maintenance road on the north side of Burbank Peak that traverses the hills above Warner Bros. Studios, access the trailhead from the Burbank side. (I’m happy to take anyone who’s interested on a quick back-country hike to show the habitat at stake there and possible alternatives).

Griffith Park is one of the world’s largest urban parks and was created for the use and enjoyment of the citizens of Los Angeles and our guests. I think we all have a responsibility to guard the park’s unique habitat and to preserve it for future
generations. I hope any steps we take to ease the burden of ever-increasing numbers of tourists and hikes will keep preservation of the park's wildness a priority.

Thank you again for all your hard work.

Chip Clements
Griffith Park Advisory Board (and resident of Hollywoodland)
Hi Shannon

Hope all is well and I look forward to seeing you in a few hours on Beachwood Dr.

I’m sure you’re inundated by emails, and I apologize for the last minute email, but I did want to share a few thoughts prior to today’s public discussion.

First - Thank you so much for sharing the draft & final report! This issue has become so contentious that full transparency is critical and your updates are wonderfully helpful.

Second - Councilman Ryu invested the people's resources to generate data that can inform the public debate, and objective data has been missing for a long time. For the most part, I found the report fair, frank and well balanced. I applaud this fact-based approach.

Third - Regarding the report itself, perhaps the Report authors will consider including some additional perspective regarding their comments on street classifications and ADT capacities? Without this notionation, the report is vulnerable to easy criticism.

Dixon observed that Beachwood is a "Collector", but upper Beachwood should be categorized as a "limited hillside street" with correspondingly lower ADT targets. The streets are designed differently, with mostly straight passage and sidewalks south of Ledgewood that do not exist between Ledgewood and Hollywood. Between Franklin and Beldon (at the Beachwood Village), Beachwood Dr is 50’ wide and at some locations it measures 60’. In contrast, the stretch of Beachwood Dr North of Ledgewood was never conceived as a Collector street in the original plan and with a width of less than 30’ LA municipal code classifies it as a Limited Street. planning.lacity.org/Cwd/GnlPln/MobiltyElement/Text/CompStManual.pdf

There is a fundamental misrepresentation in the characterization of Beechwood Drive is a Collector street. In fact, Beechwood Drive changes drastically south of the village when compared to the road dimension north of the village. According to LA city code the portion of Beechwood Drive that extends north of the village and up to the now closed gate should be classified as a limited local Street based on the existing street width, lack of sidewalk, etc. The ADT targets stated in the Dixon report grossly exaggerated the capacity limits of this type of street, without notation in the report.

Fourth - the usage data clearly establish that the closure of the Beachwood gate had nearly zero impact on the resident of Canyon Dr. In fact, the Canton Dr ADT and parking utilization are well below capacity, since the two lots within Griffith Park absorb the extra users.

Moreover, the ToD data suggest that primary users of Canyon Dr remain locals, and that the tourists who previously used the Beachwood gate are now going to Mullholland or Lake Hollywood.

Fifth - The data collected represent an off-peak season sample and there is a little attempt in the report to approximate typical tourist season usage. Beachwood/Ledgewood ADTs could be 50-100% higher during peak season.

Moreover there is no attempt in the report to forecast future increases in tourist traffic. Considering the triple digit growth in tourist usage over the last few years, driven by social media awareness of Beachwood Dr, the coming Olympic games and continued increase in general tourism to Los Angeles, will make most of the mitigation recommendations in the report folly.

Sixth - I strongly support the Lake Hollywood visitor center and the aerial tram ideas and would be willing to volunteer my time to further explore these constructive options. Please let me know how I can help :)

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfeade51e&jsver=Z-grDj2gpow.en.&view=pt&cat=Feedback%20Dixon%20study%20publish&search=cat&th=161303213b
Access, Safety & Mobility Study for Griffith Park & Hollywood Sign Released

Los Angeles, CA -- Today, Dixon Resources Unlimited, a transportation consulting firm, released a comprehensive study to improve safety, traffic, and tourist access around Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign. Councilmember Ryu introduced a motion instructing various City departments to study each strategy presented in the Dixon Resources Unlimited Study for its feasibility.

“Resolving issues of safety, traffic and responsible tourist and hiking access to our City’s most popular park and most famous icon have been a priority since the day I entered office,” Councilmember Ryu said. “I am very pleased to finally have this report after months of study by Dixon Unlimited.”

The study, created with input from various community stakeholders, offers a total of 29 strategies to improve access to Griffith Park and Trailheads, improve emergency vehicle access, expand transit options, enhance pedestrian safety, improve traffic flow & reduce congestion, increase parking efficiency and compliance rates and proactively manage visitors to the Park and Hollywood Sign. Data was collected through average daily traffic counts of both pedestrians and motor vehicles, occupancy of various trails, streets, and park areas, and by surveying visitors to the Park and Sign.

"The Department looks forward to working with Councilmember Ryu on resolving neighborhood concerns related to traffic, access and mobility," said Michael Shull, General Manager for Recreation and Parks.
"This study provides tremendous opportunities to achieve these goals by focusing on community concerns and potential strategies to improve the park and surrounding neighborhoods."

The report, conducted by Dixon Resources Unlimited, to address issues of traffic and safety around the sign, offers several recommendations such as developing a shuttle service up Beachwood Canyon, studying the feasibility of an aerial tram, establishing a Hollywood Sign Visitor Center, implementing a wayfinding strategy, installing new signage, and working with Google and Waze to communicate accurate access information.

Councilmember Ryu has held hundreds of meetings with community groups, local businesses and stakeholders to embrace ideas and find consensus leading up to the commission of this study, and has not taken a position on any particular strategy offered in the Dixon study.


"Fixing traffic and mobility issues surrounding Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign is incredibly important work," said Julie Dixon of Dixon Resources Unlimited. "Our priority was to work with the community and the park to develop a balanced solution that provides access and addresses safety, and our goal was to explore every possible route to find this solution."

The Dixon study marks the first time a comprehensive study, replete with data and strategies relating to visitor access to the Hollywood Sign and reducing negative impacts on nearby neighborhoods, has been made available to the City of Los Angeles. With the new information and visitor data, it is now possible for the City to analyze the possible solutions with accurate and up-to-date information.

"The Hollywood Sign and Griffith Park are being loved to death," Ryu added. "This is a world-renowned icon, and possibly the only one without proper access to it. It’s like having the Statue of Liberty without a visitor’s center, viewing platform, or even a sign telling you how to get to it. It is unsustainable and unsafe. I look forward to looking at the specifics of the feasibility of these strategies."

Councilmember Ryu’s motion today instructs various City departments to begin studying the feasibility of the various strategies proposed in the Dixon study. Councilmember Ryu will continue to seek input from community members throughout the process. No single proposed idea is preferred over another by Councilmember Ryu at this time.

Read the report [here](#).

Read the data collection & analysis [here](#).

Read the motion [here](#).

Read the FAQ [here](#).

###

Shannon Prior  
Field Deputy  
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu  
Office: 323.957.6415  
http://davidryu.lacity.org/  

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1  
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184  
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)  
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489  
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184  
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397  
- Other City issues: 3-1-1  

Scott Sangster  
President  
OrganicStartup LLC  
818-836-8088

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
To: Scott Sangster <scott@organicstartup.com>  
Cc: “david.ryu@lacity.org” <david.ryu@lacity.org>

Great to meet you tonight. Thank you for your thoughtful comments! Perhaps we can discuss them over the phone next week? I’m out of the office tomorrow so maybe Tuesday or Wednesday? I’m now at our Cahuenga Office at 323 852 2121

Sent from my iPhone

[Quoted text hidden]

Scott Sangster <scott@organicstartup.com>  
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
Cc: “david.ryu@lacity.org” <david.ryu@lacity.org>

Good morning :)  

Sounds great. Since we’re close, would you like to chat over lunch? I’m could come near you on Wednesday anytime 11:30-2p

S

[Quoted text hidden]

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
To: Scott Sangster <scott@organicstartup.com>  

Hey Scott,

I’m sorry that it’s been difficult to connect. In reviewing your comments, I wanted to point out that, for a number of reasons, Dixon did not use street classifications in their data analysis. They initially were looking at them for context but after further reflection and feedback, they discarded them. You can find their reasoning under the “Data Types” section of the final Data Analysis Report.

Thanks!

[Quoted text hidden]
In follow up to TJ,

There is also an entrance at Glendower with a trail to the Observatory and a 15 acre plot for sale near Green Oak place adjacent to the park.

James

Sent from my iPhone

Hi James,

I apologize if I am being dense but I'm not sure how those entrances will help visitors who specifically want to see the Hollywood Sign. Can you explain further?

Thank you.

[Quoted text hidden]
Fwd: Retro
2 messages

Florence-Isabelle Megginson <megginson.florence@lacity.org> Wed, Jan 24, 2018 at 1:08 PM
To: Julie Dixon <julie.dixon@dixonresources.net>, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Julie Dixon, Dixon Resources

Shannon Prior, LA City

This is a quick update with Photos to show the impact of LA CITY ORDINANCE NO. 183893/Earthquake Retrofit Constructions will have on the many, many buildings in Beachwood Canyon where this will be occurring. Essentially, it seems that heavy I-Beam metal frames have to installed in each Car Port.

The pictured building has 5 carports, expected construction time-line 4-5 months... they are moving very slowly, not working everyday!...
already passed the 4 months mark.

Please, we urge you, DO NOT ignore this on-going issue when implenting parking restrictions in Beachwood Canyon. Residents/renters are loosing their parking spaces for months! due to circumstances beyond their control. They should not be further penalized and inconvenieneced.

Many thanks for your consideration and recommendations. Do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Best,

Florence-Isabelle Megginson

Secretary, Beachwood Canyon Neighborhood Association

2 attachments
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Dan Pearce

To: [Redacted]
Cc: Emily Kwatinetz <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Julie Dixon <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Dear Ms. Megginson,

We appreciate you bringing to our attention this issue and sharing your photographs for our consideration.

Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited

From: Florence-Isabelle Megginson [mailto:]
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 1:09 PM
To: Julie Dixon <Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> Subject: Fwd: Retro

[Quoted text hidden]
Fwd: Your sunday visit in the beachwood canyon

2 messages

David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>  
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  

Tue, Jan 23, 2018 at 3:48 PM

MM

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: [redacted]
Date: Sun, Jan 21, 2018 at 6:20 PM
Subject: Your sunday visit in the beachwood canyon
To: councilmember.ryu@lacity.org

Dear Mr Ryu,

Just a note of thank you for visiting our neighborhood today. I think the meeting was not productive or answered any questions for me however. I do not feel the neighborhood represented themselves as I would of wished but personally I would sure be happy if there was something you could do to help keep this area quiet and safe. The collective studies really do not reflect what its like on a day to day basis with hoards of tourists and cars jamming the streets and that your should know. Save the bucks on the continued studies, help the homeless with it somehow. Just one man to another, I would simply say do your best to preserve our neighborhood and I will be thankful, Its much better now that the gate is locked, we have no vandalism now, streets are not full of people and that alone is a huge improvement. Thank you for that sir. I appreciate your help and consideration. Best to you. Jim Krantz

--

Thank You,

David E. Ryu
Councilmember
Los Angeles City Council, Fourth District

213-473-7004
www.cd4.lacity.org

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
To: jim krantz  

Thu, Feb 1, 2018 at 4:58 PM

Hi Jim,

Thank you for your email and comments. I regret that the meeting wasn't more productive. However, the Councilmember found it valuable to hear the feedback from the community. The Councilmember believes that the current situation is not sustainable and that other routes should be explored to find a balanced solution. He introduced a motion Jan 17 asking the City Administrative Office and various City departments to study the feasibility of the 29 strategies offered in the Dixon Resources study. After that, environmental review will required on some of the bigger ideas. I will keep you posted.
Thank you.
[Quoted text hidden]

--

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.957.6415
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1
Looking forward to actual progress. Time to actually do something after studying for a year!
Julie:

I've already sent you my thoughts on Tuesday night's strategy meeting from my perspective as a member of the Griffith Park Advisory Board. Now I'll address them from my perspective as a resident of Beachwood Canyon living on Mulholland Hwy. west of Durand.

First, let me reiterate how grateful I am for the amount of time and energy that you, Dan and Emily have spent in defining our traffic issues and grappling with how to mitigate them. Because this is such a heated topic and has been the cause of several neighborhood feuds and broken friendships, I'm also grateful for your all-encompassing approach that respectfully welcomes all viewpoints. The meetings have been a pleasure to participate in.

As was pointed out in the first meeting, we're dealing with two types of visitors (tourists and hikers) in the neighborhoods beneath the Sign, and both both types have very different objectives. I think you're on the right track with the hikers: green shuttles to park accesses in residential areas, and otherwise re-routing the cars of hikers to places outside of residential areas where there's parking, etc. The trickiest part of your challenge is devising ways to deal with the other cohort: the ever-increasing numbers of tourists wanting a snapshot with the Hollywood Sign. Los Angeles hosted more than 47 million tourists in 2016 and those numbers are only increasing...how many of them will want a selfie with the Sign? I live just below the Sign and I'm continually amazed (and sometimes delighted) at the visitors who come up for a picture. I've seen groups of mariachis, monks in saffron robes, Bollywood dancers, power rangers, rappers and even people dressed as The Village People. The Sign apparently strikes a chord with anyone in the world who loves entertainment (which is pretty much everybody).

We know we're going to have loads of tourists in our neighborhoods below the Sign no matter what we do...we can only try to minimize their numbers and to handle the crowds and traffic with increased management from park rangers and law enforcement. I enthusiastically endorse your proposed strategy of diverting tourists whenever possible to locations outside of our neighborhoods like the Hollywood/Highland visitors platform.

My favorite of your strategies is creation of a visitors center down on Hollywood Blvd. with a rooftop deck offering a great photo-op of the Sign. Beyond that, I think your visitors center should include a green-screen feature, where tourists could pose with closer and more unusual views of the sign that they can't get if they drive up the canyon.

I'm also a big fan of building a replica of the Sign on the other side of the hill, perhaps next to a parking lot in Universal Studios, where thousands of tourists might be satisfied with snapping their selfies the easy way instead of trekking up to the Scenic View.

The idea of making outside viewing sites more of an attraction by incorporating public artworks into them is wonderful. We need more public art in this city and these artworks would not only give additional value to the sign-photographing experience for tourists but would enrich the lives of Angelenos as well.

With regards to the tourists attracted to Mulholland Hwy. west of Durand, where I live, I would only say that your idea of planting view-blocking trees would make that stretch of highway much more passable and safer. You might notice that we've already tried planting pepper trees along that first straightaway west of Durand but they've grown slowly and haven't been much help. I think we need some fairly mature trees stretching down Mulholland about 150 yards west of Durand. If we can only afford immature trees, then maybe we can put up a fence for a couple of years until they are sufficiently grown to suit the purpose, which is keeping tourists on the move to the Scenic view and Lake Hollywood Park, where there are plenty of parking spots and photo ops.

Another Idea I thought was a great one is the creation of a Ride Share Zone near the Scenic View, where Uber and Lyft could drop off and pick up customers. One way of ensuring that those ride services use the assigned drop off zone would be to paint/repaint all the northside curb red between Durand and the Scenic View, at which point the drivers could tell their customers that the pickup/dropoff zone was the only legal place they could stop for them.
I don't really have negative feedback as much as I think a few of the strategies have complications that might prove to be problematic.

For example, the idea of merging all of upper Beachwood's PPDs into one so that we could all visit our neighbors sounds great. But as the homeowner's assn. public safety chair, I was involved in creating the PPD zones and there's a reason we couldn't have one giant PPD, namely, we were told by the councilman's office and city officials that it would take years of complicated environmental studies before our application might be approved. We were told that if we opted for PPDs on a "temporary" or "emergency" basis, in which each zone would be comprised of 5 street segments or less, that it would only take a few months to get approval and that we could easily renew them every year. That's why they are currently so fragmented. Maybe you've got enough inside influence with the city that you can shortcut the process, but otherwise the prospect of making upper Beachwood into one giant PPD will be a daunting one.

Another strategy I see as problematic is the "wayfaring signage" that might lead visitors up Beachwood and Ledgewood directly to the Scenic View. On its face it appears reasonable. But five years ago we tried posting signs leading to the Scenic View from Beachwood (up Ledgewood) and it was a disaster for anybody who lived along that route. The main problem seemed to be that as tourists come up the canyon to search for a photo site, they take lots of different routes and stop and lots of different sites along the way...they get disbursed throughout the upper canyon. But when you delineate one specific route to the Scenic View, "like breadcrumbs," Ledgewood and Mulholland become a long line of slow-moving tourist vehicles wondering if they're on the right track. Residents along that route got so furious with the signs that most of them disappeared within a week of going up. Once tourists have made it all the way up to Mulholland, I think it's fine to have signs leading them out of the residential area towards Lake Hollywood Park. But leading them up Ledgewood from Beachwood created chaos and I hope we won't see it happen again.

Finally, I wanted to comment on the proposed enhancement of sign-viewing locations. The list you presented at the meeting was a mix of residential locations and outside ones. I would agree that the Lake Hollywood Park location could be enhanced with public restrooms and traffic management personnel. But I wouldn't want to see it enhanced in a way that it becomes even more of an attraction than it already is. Additional enhancements should be devoted to viewing locations away from what are now the most heavily impacted places in residential areas. We want to minimize accesses in residential areas, not make them more attractive. The residential areas below the sign already have all the visitors they can handle and don't need more.

Again, thanks for all your hard work in solving this thorniest set of challenges. I look forward to implementation of some of these changes and a better safer experience in the hills for both visitors and residents.

Chip Clements
Griffith Park Advisory Board (and Mulholland resident)
Hi Shannon,

It was great talking to you last week.

As mentioned, I've put together my thoughts on the Dixon study. Please let me know if you would prefer something that is briefer or in a different format.

And as always, I look forward to further conversation on these and other issues.

Best regards,
Jason

---

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> Mon, Feb 5, 2018 at 9:57 AM

Hey, Jason. It was great chatting with you. Thank you for your thoughtful and well organized feedback. You raise some good issues to be vetted. I have shared with our senior staff. Thanks!

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.957.6415
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1
Initial Comments on Dixon Study  
Jason Greenwald, January 2018

General comments:

- Great work! I really appreciate the thought and care in examining many solutions. The seven main goals are all sound.
- The comprehensive nature of the report is important: These issues deserve solutions that work together, across neighborhoods.
- I am pleased to see safety as a key consideration, especially in residential areas where small children are present.
- As others have pointed out, all solutions should be viewed through the lens of who is using any given access point, what the needs of those users are, and how best to balance those needs with residential impacts.
- Sequencing will be key. Some solutions, if implemented first, may mitigate the need for other steps. Continued review over time will be important.
- As you’ll see, my recommendations for Bronson Canyon are informed by its dual role as both a neighborhood park and a regional hiking location.
- Given these dual roles, I am withholding judgment on several proposed solutions until more detailed analysis is available from City staff.
- Looking ahead, it might be helpful to keep the existing stakeholder group engaged – and/or to form smaller groups by issue or neighborhood – to vet ideas and monitor progress as more detailed plans take shape.

Safety:

- Clearly, many neighborhoods share similar issues related to resident, pedestrian and visitor safety. That said, each area is unique and may need its own solutions.
- The proposals in the safety section are all worth vetting for viability & cost.
  - Strategy #1, the Beachwood sidewalk bulb-out, appears to have merit; obviously it would require the input of residents there to examine impacts.
  - I would raise strategy #2, traffic calming, to high priority. Given the impacts across neighborhoods, these measures could provide immediate safety benefits at relatively low cost.
    - To that end, as the father of a small child and frequent park-user, I would be happy to be part of any efforts to examine specific solutions for Brush Canyon and Canyon Drive.
    - Signage, striping and other roadside improvements could make an immediate difference in neighborhood safety while other solutions are examined over time.
  - Strategy #4, Canyon Drive sidewalk, ought to be considered an essential long-term tool to mitigate safety impacts at Brush Canyon. Importantly, separating pedestrians and vehicles at the narrow roadway park entrance should take place prior to considering transit strategies such as a shuttle.
Access:

- **Strategy #1**, electric shuttle to Beachwood, is an outstanding idea that deserves immediate vetting by city departments.
  - This shuttle could enable both residents and visitors to reach the Hollyridge Trail, restoring an important access point to Griffith Park.
  - It would also provide relief to the many neighborhoods that have been impacted by the Beachwood Gate closure.
- **Strategy #2**, alternate access trail, is worth vetting, too. If this more complete access is feasible and legal, it would be of benefit to park visitors and residents.
  - Once the shuttle is operating, it will be worthwhile to review the shuttle’s impacts, usage and benefits before proceeding with alternate trail access.
  - In order to allow the best, most timely analysis, City officials could examine trail feasibility in the near-term while shuttle plans are developed.

Transit:

- In concept, additional transit as a means to access Griffith Park is both sound policy and something that should have widespread support.
- In practice, it is important to examine the particulars of each solution at a given location.
- For strategy #1, the idea of shuttles at Brush Canyon raises a number of issues:
  - Safety – adding large vehicles to a narrow roadway where many families bring their children ought to receive very careful consideration.
    - It would be important to install a sidewalk at the Canyon Drive park entrance before shuttles are allowed to operate.
    - Other safety measures (crosswalk, road-striping, signage, etc.) should be in place beforehand, too.
    - Any drivers ought to be hired directly by City of LA and trained to anticipate children who may dart into the roadway inside the park.
  - Feasibility – It would be helpful for City staff to examine the following:
    - Is the roadway inside the park wide enough to accommodate shuttles (even small electric ones) when there is two-way traffic?
    - Given that the overwhelming majority of visitors are local hikers and families, would a shuttle serve the core users of this park?
  - Impacts – in addition to safety, the following should be examined:
    - Would on-street parking within the park need to be sacrificed to allow shuttles to travel when there is two-way traffic?
    - How many parking spots would need to be removed inside the main parking lot, and would the resulting loss of parking be worth the benefits, given the park’s user-base as noted above?
    - What will be the impacts on congestion near and inside the park, given that large vehicles will necessarily travel slowly?
    - Would it make sense to wait until initial demand-reduction strategies are in place before exploring a shuttle at this location?
  - I look forward to further conversation once these questions are answered.
• For strategy #2, ridesharing, I would ask these questions for Canyon Drive:
  o Where would a designated zone be located? Where would drivers (legally) turn around? Would this zone require a reduction in parking, and would the trade-off be worthwhile?
  o What measures can be undertaken to ensure pedestrian safety? If a ridesharing zone is inside the park, this may add to the number of unfamiliar drivers who are in potentially close contact with pedestrians.
  o Given the low number of ridesharing visitors to this location (as indicated by the intercept study), would the creation of a ridesharing zone possibly add to demand, rather than simply meeting it?

Traffic and congestion:

• Strategy #2, Wayfinding, is an excellent idea. It also raises some questions: Where and how should visitors be guided? What are the primary designated viewing points for the Hollywood Sign? What are the recommended hiking locations?
• Strategy #3, discouraging illegal maneuvers, also applies in other neighborhoods. Along Canyon Drive, for example, and inside Bronson Canyon Park, illegal U-turns, speeding drivers and other infractions have become commonplace.

Parking:

• For strategy #3, any consideration of paid parking at Bronson Canyon Park ought to include careful cost/benefit review.
  o As part of this review, it is important to note the number of local families who currently use the park on a regular basis.
  o Further, any consideration of paid parking ought to be tailored to peak periods (i.e. weekends and holidays).
  o While PPD’s are not an ideal solution, it is clear that they would be needed if paid parking is to be implemented.
  o I would look forward to further discussion/analysis of this issue.
• Strategy #4 properly notes the importance of compliance with smoking laws in all neighborhoods. Increasing citation amounts, designating the amounts and adding signage are all valid. Smokey the Bear signs, while costly, are especially effective.

Optimizing visitor opportunities

• Strategy #1 addresses an essential point: All solutions ought to be tailored to the specifics of each neighborhood. Viewing and hiking locations are different.
• Strategy #2, Visitor Center, will be an important part of any long-term strategy.
• Strategy #6, website, ought to be put in place, too. Social media (#7) is a good idea, depending on cost and funding.
• Strategy #8, restrooms, is worthwhile so long as public safety, curbing illicit behavior and locking facilities at nighttime are all addressed.
Data collection:

- At the outset, it would be worthwhile to footnote the report to indicate that Labor Day 2017 weekend had unusually hot weather (100+), as well as nearby fires, both of which likely contributed to significantly lower-than-usual park usage.
  - Speaking from experience, park usage at Canyon Drive was much lower than usual, and residents in other areas have reported similar findings.
  - It stands to reason that many fewer hikers were out in the extreme heat and poor air quality conditions during Labor Day weekend.
  - By point of comparison, on the recent MLK holiday weekend, parking rates on Canyon Drive and the parking lots appeared to be well over 95%.
  - Footnoting the data collection report would make for better comparison over time.
- The visitor survey provides good data regarding usage patterns and motivations.
  - For Brush Canyon, it confirms local experience that most visitors are hikers, many of whom are from nearby areas.
  - It is likely that the proportion of hikers would be even higher if other Sign-viewing locations such as Beachwood were once again open & accessible.
  - It is worth noting that these surveys were taken at the trailhead and therefore would not likely include local residents who use the park.

Conclusions:

- The Dixon report presents a number of smart, thoughtful solutions; the issues are well-framed.
- The proposed strategies and underlying data (with notes above) will serve as an important foundation for further review.
- It is hoped that City staff analysis will enable more detailed review of a number of the solutions, so that policy-makers can make well-informed decisions.
- Ultimately, the balance of neighborhood, park and visitor interests will be key; in each location, the specific needs may be different.
- I look forward to continuing to work toward solutions in all neighborhoods.

# # #
With further research it's evident from these maps that trails currently exist that connect Brush Canyon to Mullholland and Hollyridge trails - They are fairly inhospitable at the moment - but certainly would not require carving out new trails - rather making existing ones more hospitable. Please consider and add this to the list of considerations. Distance wise opening access to these trails creates a distance comparable to that of hiking from Beachwood which is no longer accessible, while giving the hiker a place to park and at the moment port a potty and water access. christine PS - this makes my recommendation #2 below moot and is certainly less costly and since trails alerady exist - may not require CEQCA protocol? Let me know - and please confirm receipt of this email.

On Thu, Jan 18, 2018 at 10:19 AM, Christine Kent wrote:
Dear Dixon Team - I read with great interest the report that was published yesterday. Unfortunately with the holidays and such I was unable to meet with you but would still appreciate the opportunity to point out some areas and different ideas to you. What would it take to get these included into the mix - or have they already been vetted and rejected? I'll quickly point out two below:

1) The Bronson caves - located at the end of Canyon to the right of the Brush Canyon trail head: Perhaps you didn't get into that area during the data collection - but not only are the caves super cool - there's a wonderful view of the Hollywood sign from this vantage point. The access is in place, it's an easy walk to get that photo, a shuttle could even bring photo seekers in there - or the upper lot could be metered and used for short term parking. This are could also be a otential site for a welcome center, concession and the permanent restrooms that were recommende for that area.

2) Accessing the Hollyridge trail from/near the Girls Camp - similar the the idea presented at Lake HW to provide Wonderview some relief - new trails could be created from within Girls Camp/on the perimeter to connect with the Hollyridge trail and connect well beyond anyone's home - like the Wonderview idea this would require the same study/care - except this land is already RAP land - not DWP. Having this option in addition to Brush Trail would provide a shorter route to the sign - that is in keeping with the distance from the top of Beachwood that is no longer allowable.

I look forward to your reply - and I'm glad to physically show you these areas as well as provide topo maps for both areas.

On Tue, Dec 5, 2017 at 5:49 PM, Emily Kwatinetz wrote:
Hi Christine,

We could do tomorrow at 3 or 4pm, Thursday at 3pm, or Friday at 11am. Let me know what works best for you all, and I will send a calendar invite with a conference call number.

Thank you,

Emily Kwatinetz
Dixon Resources Unlimited
Hi Emily - checking in with you to see what your avail is this week. Some of my neighbors may want to call in as well. Please give us a few days/time to work with - thanks! Christine

On Tue, Nov 28, 2017 at 9:13 AM, Emily Kwatinetz wrote:

Hi Christine,

Are you available this Thursday at 2:00pm for a phone call? Or I have a decent amount of availability next week. Feel free to suggest a time.

Thanks,

Emily Kwatinetz
Dixon Resources Unlimited

On 11/28/17, 6:52 AM, "Christine Kent" wrote:

Thank you Julie and I look forward to hearing from you Julie. Christine Kent.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Nov 26, 2017, at 7:53 PM, Julie Dixon wrote:
> > Hello Christine
> > I am copying my colleagues on this response. I will be on the road this week, but will ask Emily to coordinate a time to talk with you. Hopefully, I will be available, but regardless, Emily will be able to follow up with you.
> > > Thanks
> > > Julie Dixon
> > >
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Christine Kent [mailto:<mailto:Christine Kent>]
> > Sent: Sunday, November 26, 2017 10:47 AM
> > To: Julie Dixon
> > Subject: Beachwood survey
> >
> > Hi Julie. You were given (in a Hollywood land Facebook thread) in Kris Sullivan's post as the contact for the recent survey. I live at the very end of beachwood and would like to meet with you. I will be in Los Angeles next week. Can we set up a call some time next week. Thank you. Christine
> >
> > Sent from my iPhone

---
Hi Christine,

I wanted to take a moment to thank you for providing feedback, and for your participation during Tuesday's stakeholder meeting. I hope that you found discussions around the recommendations we're proposing insightful, and that Julie provided the answers you were looking for during the meeting.

I think it is important that residents in the community continue suggesting ideas such as yours to District 4 Staff. The purpose of our report, was to develop a multitude of recommendations based on sound data and a process that worked closely with stakeholders to solve the unique issues in the area. Certainly, new ideas may arise and are encouraged. We look forward to seeing District 4 Staff continue to work with residents to implement many of the recommendations in the report, which we are confident will alleviate many of the current issues related to the park and sign.

Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited
From: Christine Kent
Date: Friday, 19 January 2018 at 10:18
To: Emily Kwatinetz, Prior Shannon

Thank you Dan -

Shannon - what is the process to put forth ideas that are not within the current report? I was unable to attend Tuesday's meeting as I had a work commitment I could not rearrange. Did the recommendations I suggested come to the table on Tuesday? Should I be copying RAP leadership and RAP commissioners and the Councilmen? Please advise - thanks - christine

Shannon Prior
Mon, Jan 22, 2018 at 9:17 AM

Hi Christine, I have forwarded your suggestions to RAP so they can be considered. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

Christine Kent
Mon, Jan 22, 2018 at 9:33 AM

Thanks Shannon. Christine
Oaks response to latest Dixon proposals for Griffith Park Access

2 messages

Linda Othenin-Girard <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
Wed, Jan 24, 2018 at 10:14 AM  
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
Cc: Joe Salaices <joe.salaices@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>, Oaks Board <boardmembers@oakshome.org>, Lucinda Phillips <jason.greenwald@lacity.org>, Jason Greenwald

Dear Shannon,

Please see the attached letter in response to the latest proposals made in the Dixon plan for access to Griffith Park and traffic management of the Park and surrounding neighborhoods.

Thanks so much for your time and consideration.

Best regards,

Linda

Linda Othenin-Girard

Access Study proposals letter.docx
239K

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
Thu, Jan 25, 2018 at 6:44 PM  
To: Linda Othenin-Girard <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
Cc: Joe Salaices <joe.salaices@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>, Oaks Board <boardmembers@oakshome.org>, Lucinda Phillips <jason.greenwald@lacity.org>, Jason Greenwald

Thank you so much for your participation and feedback, Linda.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

Linda Othenin-Girard
January 24, 2018

Hi Shannon,
Thank you so much for including Bob Young and me in the presentation of the Access, Safety & Mobility Study for Griffith Park & the Hollywood Sign. We would like to offer our initial response to the proposals that are most relevant to our neighborhood and the concerns of the Oaks residents.

We are, above all, interested in reopening the Beachwood gate to the Hollyridge Trail. The closing of that gate last year has resulted in increased traffic and disruption at the remaining access points to the Park, and particularly to Canyon Drive/Bronson Park (Brush Canyon). The re-opening of the gate and the establishment of the proposed alternate access path to the Hollyridge trail would go a long way toward mitigating the bottlenecks that are occurring elsewhere. We strenuously disagree with Dixon’s characterization of the alternate access trail as a "Low" Priority. Keeping our city’s largest public park open to the public should always be the highest priority.

We are in favor of an electric shuttle or DASH Bus (whichever is appropriate) that would run up Beachwood Canyon bringing hikers, visitors, and residents to the Hollyridge Trailhead. We would also favor an electric shuttle that could bring hikers and visitors up Canyon Drive to Bronson Park (we would not propose a DASH bus for this route as this larger vehicle would likely require too much of our Bronson Park parking lot for its turnaround).
We also support the idea of putting a sidewalk in Bronson Park to help pedestrians who enter the park on foot through the Canyon Drive gate.

Only after these measures are enacted and their results studied and evaluated would we consider the introduction of paid parking in Bronson Park and/or PPDs on Canyon Drive and the surrounding streets. Those measures would likely be rather disruptive to the life of the Park and nearby residents and we should only undertake them if we’re convinced they are needed.

We look forward to collaborating with your office on these important issues that concern our community. Please feel free to contact me with any thoughts or questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Linda Othenin-Girard
President
Oaks Homeowners Association
My comments on the Access, Safety & Mobility Study for Griffith Park & Hollywood Sign

2 messages

Kris Sullivan <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Mon, Jan 29, 2018 at 7:00 PM

Hi Shannon and Julie,

I and many others were very impressed with Julie’s presentation on the 16th. It was really gratifying to see that so many of the stakeholders’ views were incorporated in the report. That fact encourages us all to “buy in” to the plan and hope that the City can find the funds to implement it.

I do have a couple of concerns.

Under public safety:

The bulb-out on Beachwood might cause excessive traffic and parking issues. The construction would take away a number of parking places which are already scarce for the nearby apartment residents. Since parking is at a premium already, those wanting a photo would have to find parking and walk to the bulb-out. Some would undoubtedly double park and stop traffic. I could see this might be considered traffic calming, but would really be a traffic mess. There might be parking signs or other mitigation measures that might make this proposal work smoothly. On first glance, it seems problematic.

The walkability signs are a great idea and should be installed prominently and frequently! Their information could also be on the website and social media.

Under improve access to Griffith Park and Trailheads

The electric shuttle possibility is one that many of us have thought would solve a lot of the traffic and pedestrian concerns that some folks have brought to your attention. Your plan to have the shuttle travel from the subway station in Hollywood up Beachwood to the start of the Hollyridge Trail is a great one. You mention that the City has rights to the easement road so that shuttles could go through the Beachwood Gate up to the Hollyridge Trail. Since there already is a constructed trail at the point where a shuttle would turn around, there would be no need for another alternative trail to be constructed. However, there needs to be a way that neighbors can access the trail, too, so that would need to be worked out.

I worked on the Alternate trail plan and as you probably know, we devised this plan in response to a judge’s order in the Ranch v. the City lawsuit. If the shuttle plan is not implemented, it would be very important to keep access to the Park and the alternate trail is the strongest possibility in the area.

In addition, another access point to the Park will take off some of the pressure of traffic that the Beachwood closing caused in other areas.

Under Parking Efficiency:

The idea of consolidating PPDs so everyone in the neighborhood has the same district number is an excellent one.

I think that the idea of having only one side of Beachwood Drive north of Ledgewood for parking would enhance safety for pedestrians, too.

Under Optimize Visitor Experience:

Creating another sign for viewing? I think that most tourists want a photo of the real sign and they will find a way to see it. This idea is not practical.

Finally, getting out information about viewing the sign, parking, and the eventual shuttles and Dash extensions is vital. As you mentioned in the meeting, most people use websites for information to get to the sign. Having the most robust and searchable website is required. Experts know how to get the most “hits” on Google and those are the next people who should be hired to implement this. It can happen sooner than a lot of the other proposals.
Thank you for listening and for all the effort you have made to create solutions.

Kris Sullivan

On Jan 23, 2018, at 2:37 PM, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> wrote:

I don't believe you received my below email last week following up on the stakeholder meeting. I think it didn't go through because of the size of the attachments. My apologies. Here is the email sans the attachments. You can find the report and the data analysis using the links below. Thank you.

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Date: Wed, Jan 17, 2018 at 11:51 AM
Subject: Access, Safety & Mobility Study for Griffith Park & Hollywood Sign
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Hello -

Thank you all for your thoughtful participation last night and throughout this process. We look forward to continuing the conversation.

Please see the press release below, which contains links to the study, data report, and council motion filed today. The PowerPoint presentation from last night can be found HERE.

Please send your feedback to me, and let me know if you have questions.

- Shannon

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

January 17, 2018

Press Contact:
Estevan Montemayor
estevan.montemayor@lacity.org
213.605.4145

Access, Safety & Mobility Study for Griffith Park & Hollywood Sign Released

Los Angeles, CA -- Today, Dixon Resources Unlimited, a transportation consulting firm, released a comprehensive study to improve safety, traffic, and tourist access around Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign. Councilmember Ryu introduced a motion instructing various City departments to study each strategy presented in the Dixon Resources Unlimited Study for its feasibility.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfeade515e&jsver=Z-grDj2gpw.en.&view=pt&cat=Feedback%20Dixon%20study%20publish&search=cat&th=1615005aa5
“Resolving issues of safety, traffic and responsible tourist and hiking access to our City’s most popular park and most famous icon have been a priority since the day I entered office,” Councilmember Ryu said. “I am very pleased to finally have this report after months of study by Dixon Unlimited.”

The study, created with input from various community stakeholders, offers a total of 29 strategies to improve access to Griffith Park and Trailheads, improve emergency vehicle access, expand transit options, enhance pedestrian safety, improve traffic flow & reduce congestion, increase parking efficiency and compliance rates and proactively manage visitors to the Park and Hollywood Sign. Data was collected through average daily traffic counts of both pedestrians and motor vehicles, occupancy of various trails, streets, and park areas, and by surveying visitors to the Park and Sign.

"The Department looks forward to working with Councilmember Ryu on resolving neighborhood concerns related to traffic, access and mobility," said Michael Shull, General Manager for Recreation and Parks. "This study provides tremendous opportunities to achieve these goals by focusing on community concerns and potential strategies to improve the park and surrounding neighborhoods."

The report, conducted by Dixon Resources Unlimited, to address issues of traffic and safety around the sign, offers several recommendations such as developing a shuttle service up Beachwood Canyon, studying the feasibility of an aerial tram, establishing a Hollywood Sign Visitor Center, implementing a wayfinding strategy, installing new signage, and working with Google and Waze to communicate accurate access information.

Councilmember Ryu has held hundreds of meetings with community groups, local businesses and stakeholders to embrace ideas and find consensus leading up to the commission of this study, and has not taken a position on any particular strategy offered in the Dixon study.


"Fixing traffic and mobility issues surrounding Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign is incredibly important work,” said Julie Dixon of Dixon Resources Unlimited. “Our priority was to work with the community and the park to develop a balanced solution that provides access and addresses safety, and our goal was to explore every possible route to find this solution.”

The Dixon study marks the first time a comprehensive study, replete with data and strategies relating to visitor access to the Hollywood Sign and reducing negative impacts on nearby neighborhoods, has been made available to the City of Los Angeles. With the new information and visitor data, it is now possible for the City to analyze the possible solutions with accurate and up-to-date information.

“The Hollywood Sign and Griffith Park are being loved to death,” Ryu added. “This is a world-renowned icon, and possibly the only one without proper access to it. It’s like having the Statue of Liberty without a visitor’s center, viewing platform, or even a sign telling you how to get to it. It is unsustainable and unsafe. I look forward to looking at the specifics of the feasibility of these strategies.”
Councilmember Ryu’s motion today instructs various City departments to begin studying the feasibility of the various strategies proposed in the Dixon study. Councilmember Ryu will continue to seek input from community members throughout the process. No single proposed idea is preferred over another by Councilmember Ryu at this time.

Read the report [here](#).

Read the data collection & analysis [here](#).

Read the motion [here](#).

Read the FAQ [here](#).

###


---

**Shannon Prior**  
Field Deputy  
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu  
Office: 323.957.6415  

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: **9-1-1**
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): **213-485-4184**
- Police non-emergency: **877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)**
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): **800-773-2489**
- Traffic control (signal light out): **213-485-4184**
- Dept. of Water & Power: **800-342-5397**
- Other City issues: **3-1-1**

---
Thank you for taking the time to share your feedback, Kris.
response to the Dixon study
2 messages

Christine OBrien  To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>,
                        [email redacted]  Tue, Jan 30, 2018 at 2:59 PM

  dixon comments doc.docx
  13K

Shannon Prior  To: Christine OBrien [email redacted]
              Cc: Julie Dixon [email redacted]  Tue, Jan 30, 2018 at 3:28 PM

Thank you, Christine.

2018-01-30 14:59 GMT-08:00 Christine OBrien [email redacted]

--

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.957.6415
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1
Dear Councilman Ryu and Ms. Dixon:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the Dixon Comprehensive Strategies Report.

This study was a marketing feasibility/ focus group developed for the purpose of promoting tourism, hiking and use in Griffith Park. There was little recognition of the property ownership/value issue. The traffic specifics, safety were not addressed qualitatively through a professional traffic engineer. In addition, there was no reference to the facts relative to study areas in Hollywoodland including:

• No legal park entrances (access) adjacent to the Hollywoodland, Lake Hollywood Estates and Hollywood Knolls residential neighborhoods.

• Neighborhood physical constraints including substandard width streets, SEA (Significant Ecological Area), VHFSZ (Very High Fire Severity Zone), steep elevation grades, the court order from Sunset Ranch vs. City of Los Angeles, historical landmarks, the main communication tower for the city, numerous private ingress/egress easements, trespassing of private property inside the park and the unauthorized, illegal alterations made in the park that created many of the traffic issues.

• There was little recognition of the Hollywood Community Plan or the zoning of these R-1 neighborhoods immersed and adjacent to the park open space.

Below are my specific concerns and questions about the study.

Page 4 Please define the term “wayfinding”. There was no correction of earlier concerns (earlier report) about the odd metrics and incomplete data collection in phase one of the study. Please explain.

Page 5 Please explain why there is a need to promote the Hollywood sign? Please clarify if parking revenue goes into the general fund or to respective council districts. I believe all parking meter money goes to respective council districts, is the reason for the suggestion of meters in the village and at Canyon Lake Drive?
Were stakeholders asked if they felt entry into the park was appropriate and safe if entry was through unauthorized access points or through residential communities?

Please, also recognize your intercept surveys can not be considered statistically because your sample size is too small.

Page 6, Figure 2. Please note these are official, authorized accesses into the park: Canyon Drive, Fern Dell Drive and Vermont Drive. Lake Hollywood/wonderview, Lake Hollywood, Beachwood and Ledgewood Deronda and not official, legal entry points. I was happy to see you did not recognize Upper Mulholland/Ledgewood as agentry point. The unsafe issues associated at those locations should be reviewed.

Page 7 Figure 3. To recognize your seven goals you must first acknowledge the facts: what are legal accesses? what is pedestrian safety, should there even be congestion if there are not legal entry points? is transit legal relative to the community plans? What about property rights?
Please clarify compliance regulations. Please define “project team”.

Most of these ideas have been discussed over the years and appear to be more “brainstorming” ideas rather than concrete, feasible solutions.

Page 8 Please share where “pull outs “are currently used in the city. What are their safety track record and what type of liability is there for the city? What is the safety criteria relative to national DOT standard for the bulb and the suggested traffic circle? How and who will regulate the “5 minute” rule? Would this suggestion muster the approval of a traffic safety engineer?

Page 10 Please restate Canyon Drive in Bronson/Brush Canyon.

Page 11 Please note Canyon Drive (Brush Canyon) there is a walking shoulder bordering the roadway. There are comparative suggestions for Wailuka, Hawaii. Does this area have sidewalks and what is the street width or is this an apple and orange situation? These suggestions benefit visitors, but really do not benefit the voters and property owners who live here.

Page 13/16 Please understand there was a quantifiable traffic study conducted for the Sunset Ranch lawsuit by a traffic engineer. Suggestions offered here will be refuted based on that data. In addition under the past administration a public hearing was entertained at the transportation committee. The idea of a tram traversing Beachwood Drive through the easement road was rejected. A legal opinion identifying reasons for rejection was also offer by Luna and Guishon. Beachwood Drive dead-ends into the easement road. This is not an official entrance into the park. That unauthorized entry point was bootlegged by the previous councilman along with the 20 space parking lot and the switchback commencing from the easement road cresting to the Hollyridge bridle path. Any endorsed use would be met with environmental challenges. One safety issue identified in the Sunset Ranch versus city legal is the collection of people in this narrow canyon (non-paved pathway/roadway) that would create a fire trap for visitors. In addition, promotion and opening of this area would constitute a zone change and violation of the Hollywood community plan.

Page 18 Wonderview Drive is not a legal opening into the park. By funneling people through this narrow street you are creating a fire trap. It is also a violation of zoning.

Page 22 Brush Canyon, Canyon has always been the official opening into the Sherman Gift. This 444 acres (in tract 6450) was given to the city of Los Angeles in 1944. It surrounds 85% of the perimeter of the Hollywoodland community. The official entrance originally included train tracks that shipped gravel from the quarry to the base of Franklin. That rock, gravel was used from Sherman’s electric streetcar system and many of the roadways in early Hollywood. There are fascinating, interesting historical stories to be told about Bronson Canyon and the Sherman enterprises, including a riffle range, ranch, etc. This is a perfect setting for accessing the park trails and legal to boot!

Page 24 You are ignoring zoning and community plan criteria. This type of activity constitutes commercial use in a residentially zoned community. This is a mechanism for funding revenues for the city, while ignoring property rights of homeowners.

Page 25 No zone change, no ride sharing in Hollywoodland.

Page 27, Yes, to a circulation system, but keep it in the legal original entrances into the park.
Page 27 Suggestion to seek photos opportunities has been discussed since 1988, please review historical documents in RAP commission hearing files. See Chuck Welch write up and RAP commission submission

Page 31 The vista and the pathways along Mulholland Hwy were developed without RAP commission approval, public comments and proper environmental clearance.

Page 33 Yes, please replant the illegal vista and the adjacent pathways with native plans per Tomas O’Grady landscape plan, era 2014 (4 years ago)! Also, pls consider opening Mt. Hollywood Drive to generate a north south roadway use and flow. It is an existing park road with fire hydrants and not paper work to legally close it. It was an arbitrary department decision. Historically the road has been opened longer than it has been closed (unofficially).

Page 34 Signage is inaccurate and misleading. The Hollywood Chamber and Sign Trust has tried this in the past and it only caused ill will as well as a violation of zoning. The city must take the revenue source away from the Chamber or at the very least request a concessioners agreement.

Page 35 Please do not burden residential communities with more traffic.

Page 37 Yes, please consider. If very liberal San Francisco can do this certainly LA could too!

Page 38 One problem with the one way streets is the configuration of the retaining walls not allowing an adequate safe swing/radius into garages and driveways. Each household’s garage entry point would have to be cleared for appropriate safe, entry.

Page 40 Why are the property owners being imposed on so the city can continue to promote tourism. Please manage it so it is outside of residential communities!

Page 49 Your chart is misleading. We do not know how many citations are given in each area, only locations, pls clarify or did I miss something?

Page 51 Again, please deal with facts! recognize where there are official access points.

Page 54 Take all the revenue from the sign service mark and use it to assist in developing a visitor center in Hollywood.

Page 56 Mt. Hollywood is perfectly legal! Yes!

Page 57 My memo to the previous councilman suggested opening Mt. Hollywood and having a kiosk there with sign history. Replicate the letter H in scale and size allow people to touch, climb it etc. Make something interactive outside residential neighborhoods through official access points.

Page 58 The current signs not historic. It has nothing to do with the original sign except 9 new letters and their footings are on the approximate original spot of the historic HOLLYWOODLAND sign. The 1978 version of the 9 letters and the land are owned by the city, but the Chamber and the Sign Trust retain all the revenue from the service mark. There is no concessionaire’s agreement and the city is looking foolish! Handing over CASH to a private entity! Pls think out of the box on this!

Page 62 No rest rooms in Lake Hollywood Park.
Dear Mr. Van Dusen,

I wanted to take a moment to thank you for providing feedback, and for your participation during Tuesday's stakeholder meeting. I hope that you found discussions around the recommendations we're proposing insightful, and that Julie provided the answers you were looking for during the meeting. I think it is important that residents in the community continue suggesting ideas to District 4 Staff. We look forward to seeing District 4 Staff continue to work with residents to implement many of the recommendations in the report, which we are confident will alleviate many of the current issues related to the park and sign.

Kind Regards,

Dan Pearce

Dixon Resources Unlimited

Julie, Joe: Attached is the map that we discussed tonight (email that went with it is below). The main points:

1. The Hollyridge trailhead is closed by court order and there is no way to mitigate the traffic and crowds in that area even with a shuttle if it is open.
2. Canyon Drive is wide, with speedbumps and sidewalks and can accommodate a DASH bus.
3. The DASH can enter the park and turn around in the small parking lot at the end.
4. There appear to be one or two possible trails to the Hollyridge Trail from the catch basin next to the bat caves. This could be the "Trail to the Hollywood Sign".

Jim

Jim Van Dusen
Joe,  There are options being proposed for Hollyridge Trail access and I don’t know if the following one  has been presented (please see the attached map). It appears to me that a trail from the catch basin in Bronson Park up to the Hollyridge Trail would be an option. I’ve drawn two lines, a blue and red one for the path of the trails. The blue trail would bring people to just below the stables which might be a problem as those crowds may just go up to take a picture and then go down to the gate at Beachwood to exit rather than hike to the Hollywood Sign which puts them on the easement road. The red trail would put hikers at just above the stables and it looks like the distance from the catch basin to the Hollyridge Trail is almost the same as from that point on the trail to the gate at Beachwood Drive. I walked to the catch basin last Saturday afternoon and was impressed by the extent of the park facilities, trees, etc. as it has been some time since I have gone to that park entrance (I was also impressed by how open it was. There were not that many people there at 4:30pm on a Saturday). Either trail would follow the natural ridge lines.

It also appears to me that it would be easy to run a DASH bus or shuttle from Canyon and Franklin Blvd. to Bronson Park. It could go into the park and let people off at the kid’s playground if people just wanted to picnic and then let the hikers off at the closed end of the road. You could move 5 automobile parking spaces out of that small parking lot and the DASH/shuttle could turn around in that lot, drop people off and go back down Canyon. The advantage that Canyon Drive has over other roads in the area is that it is a wide, fairly straight street with sidewalks and ample room for a DASH/shuttle, automobile traffic and walkers. The only additional infrastructure needed would be a stop light at Canyon and Franklin, something the residents in The Oaks have been requesting for several years.

The only drawback that I can see with the new hiking trail would be that it could deposit a lot of people near the ranch as we are seeing that while hikers do not enter the easement road from Beachwood Drive, many hikers are exiting the park through that gate. Bringing more people up by DASH/shuttle to Bronson Park to hike up the new trail would then allow the hikers to walk down the ranch easement road and exit through the Beachwood gate below the ranch and walk down Beachwood Drive to catch the DASH at the Hollywoodland market area. This crowd would only increase over time which might cause more problems on the easement road in light of the legal decision just made as well as bring all the issues about crowd control on Beachwood Drive back to the front burner as cars are still coming up thinking they can drive to the Hollywood Sign or take a picture of it. Adding more hikers to that mix puts us back into the safety issues that we have been grappling with for the last 6 years.

Although I’m not convinced that this new trail idea is a good one, I wasn’t sure if it had been proposed to RAP and I thought I’d forward this to you just in case it has not.                     Jim

Jim Van Dusen
**The Dixon Mobility Report**

**7 messages**

**Tj Escott** Sat, Jan 20, 2018 at 12:05 PM
To: David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseau <sarah.dusseau@lacity.org>, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Cc: Michael Shull <michael.a.shull@lacity.org>, joe.salaices@lacity.org, Tracy James <tracy.james@lacity.org>, rap.commissioners@lacity.org

Good morning to you, when Ms. Prior posted the report, she asked for comments from your constituents. Here are mine: the report emphasizes ACCESS, not so much on the wellbeing of the tax payers that live in the neighborhoods that would be impacted the most. The study, emphasis on access is telling and unacceptable. There was no thought given to other alternatives, that might mitigate the dangerous flow of traffic through all of these neighborhoods. There are other entrances that don’t appear in the study. There is a trailhead at Green Oak that accesses the Observatory and I believe the Hollyridge trail. There is a legal entrance at the end of Commonwealth that could be reaccessed. What has happened to the road that lead to the old zoo? These are just some examples that need to be explored, I’m sure there are many other. This study once again seems to be the City trying to put a square peg into a round hole for its own benefit. The pleasure of a reply is requested.

Thank you,
TJ Escott

Sent from my iPad

---

**Shannon Prior** Mon, Jan 22, 2018 at 9:05 AM
To: Tj Escott, David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseau <sarah.dusseau@lacity.org>, Michael Shull <michael.a.shull@lacity.org>, Joe Salaices <joe.salaices@lacity.org>, Tracy James <tracy.james@lacity.org>, rap.commissioners@lacity.org

Thank you for your comments, TJ. The strategies in the report are designed to manage the access and mobility in and around the park and, especially the Hollywood Sign.

As you will see in the study, a “transit hub” on the north side of the park is suggested as a strategy to pull cars out of the hillside neighborhoods. The proposed hub would be off of the 134 freeway and have plenty of parking so that visitors can leave their car behind and hop on a shuttle or other mode of transportation to access the Park. The roads within the Park that will be used in this strategy have not been fully contemplated. The Councilmember has asked for the relevant city departments to study all of the strategies presented and report back on their feasibility.

The RAP folks can correct me if I am incorrect but Commonwealth is a currently accessible entrance to the Park and is used to allow traffic to flow during Greek Theatre show nights. It is another entrance that is at the top of a narrow residential street and runs parallel to the much larger Vermont Ave. The east portion of the Park was not included in this study.

I believe the wilderness at Green Oak is an undeveloped private property.

Thank you. I will let you know when the city departments report back.

Sent from my iPhone

---

**Tj Escott** Tue, Jan 23, 2018 at 3:11 PM
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

---

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfestade515e&jiver=Z-grDj2gpow.en.&view=pt&cat=Feedback%20Dixon%20study%20publish&search=cat&th=1612f0fc2ed
Shannon, thank you for your response. As to the entrance on Commonwealth, it has been my experience that when trying to access it during daylight hours it's been closed. Lo and behold today it was open. However, the sign to the right in the picture above, suggests, that there is no entrance at Commonwealth. I think the folks in Hollywoodland and surrounding environs would love to have some of these signs in our neighborhoods!

As to the trailhead at on Green Oak; the fence and signage are RAP'S and although there may some part of the property that is private, there are number of us that believe that it's park property. Witness the young hiker. This needs to be fully vetted.

With reference to the road that runs east and west from the old zoo and connects to MT. Hollywood Dr. You have the ability to park many cars at the old zoo and allow hikers and tourists to access the Hollyridge trail across the horse trail. As I indicated in my original email I believe there many other areas like these that need to be explored. The favor of a reply is requested.

Thank you,

TJ Escott

---

> On Jan 22, 2018, at 9:05 AM, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> wrote:
> 
> Thank you for your comments, TJ. The strategies in the report are designed to manage the access and mobility in and around the park and, especially the Hollywood Sign.
> 
> As you will see in the study, a "transit hub" on the north side of the park is suggested as a strategy to pull cars out of the hillside neighborhoods. The proposed hub would be off of the 134 freeway and have plenty of parking so that visitors can leave their car behind and hop on a shuttle or other mode of transportation to access the Park.
> 
> The roads within the Park that will be used in this strategy have not been fully contemplated. The Councilmember has asked for the relevant city departments to study all of the strategies presented and report back on their feasibility.
> 
> The RAP folks can correct me if I am incorrect but Commonwealth is a currently accessible entrance to the Park and is used to allow traffic to flow during Greek Theatre show nights. It is another entrance that is at the top of a narrow residential street and runs parallel to the much larger Vermont Ave. The east portion of the Park was not included in this study.
> 
> I believe the wilderness at Green Oak is an undeveloped private property.
> 
> Thank you. I will let you know when the city departments report back.

Sent from my iPhone

> > On Jan 20, 2018, at 12:05 PM, Tj Escott wrote:
> >
> > Good morning to you, when Ms. Prior posted the report, she asked for comments from your constituents.
> > Here are mine: the report emphasizes ACCESS, not so much on the wellbeing of the tax payers that live in the neighborhoods that would be impacted the most.
> > The study, emphasis on access is telling and unacceptable.
> > There was no thought given to other alternatives, that might mitigate the dangerous flow of traffic through all of these neighborhoods.
> > There are other entrances that don’t appear in the study.
> > There is a trailhead at Green Oak that accesses the Observatory and I believe the Hollyridge trail.
> > There is a legal entrance at the end of Commonwealth that could be reaccessed.
> > What has happened to the road that lead to the old zoo?
These are just some examples that need to be explored, I’m sure there are many other.
This study once again seems to be the City trying to put a square peg into a round hole for its own benefit.
The pleasure of a reply is requested.
Thank you,
TJ Escott

Sent from my iPad
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Tony Fisch <tony.fisch@sagon-phior.com> Tue, Jan 23, 2018 at 6:46 PM
To: Christine OBrien
Cc: Tj Escott   James Mykytenko
Jeanne Clark   Crosby Doe
Alison Zanetos <fincom,
Annette and Ken York
Lester Kiss <shannon.prior@lacity.org,  com,
Pual Rusconi <shannon.prior@lacity.org,
l

If CD 4, and Dixon had done some historical background research including looking at the landslides in Lake Hollywood and Cuhenga Peak in 2005, and the City Council's own motion history regarding shuttle busses running up Beachwood they would have saved, or would save money and time not doing feasibility studies. The tram and shuttle ideas are not possible. I can detail reasons. None of their ideas effect us short, or mid term, and their ideas do more to grow tourism, and traffic on Sign adjacent, substandard streets then mitigate traffic, reduce parking nightmares, and assure public safety. This is stuff Ryu promised to change when he ran for office. This is about delaying any real solution to accommodate Garcetti's plan to attract more visitors to LA, and Ryu is an insider do nothing CM.

Please excuse the grammar. Apple auto correct gets it wrong from time to time.
Thank you.
Tony

On Jan 23, 2018, at 3:28 PM, Christine OBrien < wrote:

Thank you TJ the pictures tell the real story! Pls send to CD4!

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 23, 2018, at 3:19 PM, Tj Escott < wrote:

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Tj Escott
Date: January 23, 2018 at 3:11:41 PM PST
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Cc: David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>, Michael Shull <michael.a.shull@lacity.org>, joesalaires@lacity.org, Tracy James <tracy.james@lacity.org>, rap.commissioners@lacity.org
Subject: Re: The Dixon Mobility Report

<image1.jpeg>
Shannon, thank you for your response. As to the entrance on Commonwealth, it has been my experience that when trying to access it during daylight hours it’s been closed. Lo and behold today it was open. However, the sign to the right in the picture above, suggests, that there is no entrance at commonwealth. I think the folks in Hollywoodland and surrounding environs would love to have some of these signs in our neighborhoods!

As to the trailhead at on Green Oak; the fence and signage are RAP’S and although there may some part of the property that is private, there are number of us that believe that it’s park property. Witness the young hiker. This needs to be fully vetted.

With reference to the road that runs east and west from the old zoo and connects to MT. Hollywood Dr. You have the ability to park many cars at the old zoo and allow hikers and tourists to access the Hollyridge trial across the horse trail.

As I indicated in my original email I believe there many other areas like these that need to be explored.

The favor of a reply is requested.

Thank you,
TJ Escott

Sent from my iPad

Christine OBrien
Wed, Jan 24, 2018 at 4:35 PM

Good points Tony. What is interesting is the Ranch attorneys hired experts in traffic, traffic engineers. Those specifics convinced the judge. There is nothing in Dixon’s credentials to indicate they can professionally interpret the poorly retrieved data. First their sample size is too small and their metrics and comparative measurements are bogus. This was a marketing feasibility study not a study that actually considered the safety related pedestrian traffic components that could be quantifiably measured. I am still working on my write up. Keekee

Sent from my iPad

Tony Fisch <tony.fisch@sagon-phior.com>
Wed, Jan 24, 2018 at 4:43 PM
Christine, it also appears the Ryu, and Dixon paid absolutely no attention to the meaning of the courts decision.

Please excuse the grammar. Apple auto correct gets it wrong from time to time.

Thank you.

Tony

[Quoted text hidden]
The Dixon Plan
2 messages

To: davidryu@lacity.org, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Sun, Jan 21, 2018 at 8:25 AM

Attached is my letter to you as you consider the fate of the residents of HOLLYWOODLAND. It contains 5 points.

Thank you for your careful consideration of these 5 points. ~ SK

And pasted here, for your convenience

January 21, 2018

Dear People of CD 4:

Here is a response to “The Dixon Report.”

1. A “Bulb Out” will require a full time officer to control. Who will comply with the “5 min” without full time traffic control? It will draw people, litter, graffiti, and noise. It is unfair to homeowners on that block. It provides no “turnaround”; thus, it prompts a continuation up Beachwood Drive. The “traffic calming” is based on wishful thinking only – not on empirical evidence. It will cost a lot even though it seems simple. It is a rather shocking proposal given that it proposes to make a tourist destination out of a residential block. One wonders how the City can even contemplate this kind of encroachment for its tourists, not for its residents.

2. Various times in the Dixon report it is mentioned that money from increased enforcement will go to neighborhood enhancement: does the City have the operational and legal means to divert this $$$ from the general pool to “neighborhood enhancement”? Page 49 shows all citations given in one year. How much $$$ was collected and where is it? Show us that money and show us where it went.

3. The residents of Hollywoodland have already responded with a clear “No” to the idea of a bus or a motor tram up their main artery. Is the message to us from The City, “We know better what is good for you and we have the power to enact our dreams over yours.” Please clarify your relationship to us: do you want input or “rolling over” in silent compliance with consultants’ imagination? Do you envision riling up the neighborhood a second time with this bus idea to get residents once again to come downtown and once again oppose it—hoping that sooner or later there will be fewer “old timers” remaining with a memory of a peaceful residential neighborhood?

4. You propose to solve or mitigate the problem that arose in the past 7 years with increased traffic to the HOLLYWOOD by making more HOLLYWOOD signs? Mini Hollywood signs designed by local artists and placed here and there? More magnets? More attention on The Sign? This is nonsense.

5. With the current lack of faith in government that we see all over the Western world, could the City take a moment to feel what their first governmental mandate is, which is to protect the constituents. With this report, “the City” mistakes its mandate. The City wants to act like an entrepreneur and develop a tourist business–like a product, to sell. We are trying to live here and be quiet. The stance behind this report is almost comical were it not for the impact on one’s home.
It is disheartening to read a report on one’s own neighborhood that seeks to make it nice for tourists rather than to allow it to continue to be livable and familiar to long term residents.

When will you hear that residents want less development, not more?

Sincerely,

Soren Kerk
Hollywoodland

---

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
To: sorenkerk@sorenkerk.com
Sun, Jan 21, 2018 at 9:24 AM

Thank you for your comments, Soren. The Councilmember has not endorsed any of the strategies proposed in the report. The relevant City departments have been asked to study them and report on their feasibility. There will be future opportunities for the affected neighborhoods and lovers of the Park to weigh in. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

<To CD4.docx>
Hi Shannon: I'm sure your getting barraged with e-mails so here's one more. I didn't see any study or fix for one of the hottest spots up here the corner of Ledgewood and Mulholland known as Dirt Mulholland with a tiny little dead end street with no turnaround and only 6 houses back here. During the holidays with enforcement here they were all parking down at the Vista and walking back here I had 250 to 400 people a day walking past my house and many many trespassing on private property. Enforcement should have been kept in place until January 7, 2018 New Years day was on a Monday and that week there were still masses of people coming up here still in holiday mode. Still no sign at the blind corner (sent you a picture previously) tow away no parking requested sign
Thank-You
Diana  Mulholland Hwy

-----Original Message-----
From: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Sent: Wed, Jan 17, 2018 12:09 pm
Subject: Access, Safety & Mobility Study for Griffith Park & Hollywood Sign Released

Hello,

Please see the press release below, which contains links to the study, data report, and council motion filed today.

Please send your feedback to me, and let me know if you have questions.

- Shannon

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
January 17, 2018
Press Contact:
Estevan Montemayor
estevan.montemayor@lacity.org
213.605.4145

Access, Safety & Mobility Study for Griffith Park & Hollywood Sign Released

Los Angeles, CA -- Today, Dixon Resources Unlimited, a transportation consulting firm, released a comprehensive study to improve safety, traffic, and tourist access around Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign. Councilmember Ryu introduced a motion instructing various City departments to study each strategy presented in the Dixon Resources Unlimited Study for its feasibility.

“Resolving issues of safety, traffic and responsible tourist and hiking access to our City’s most popular park and most famous icon have been a priority since the day I entered office,” Councilmember Ryu said. “I am
very pleased to finally have this report after months of study by Dixon Unlimited.”

The study, created with input from various community stakeholders, offers a total of 29 strategies to improve access to Griffith Park and Trailheads, improve emergency vehicle access, expand transit options, enhance pedestrian safety, improve traffic flow & reduce congestion, increase parking efficiency and compliance rates and proactively manage visitors to the Park and Hollywood Sign. Data was collected through average daily traffic counts of both pedestrians and motor vehicles, occupancy of various trails, streets, and park areas, and by surveying visitors to the Park and Sign.

"The Department looks forward to working with Councilmember Ryu on resolving neighborhood concerns related to traffic, access and mobility," said Michael Shull, General Manager for Recreation and Parks. "This study provides tremendous opportunities to achieve these goals by focusing on community concerns and potential strategies to improve the park and surrounding neighborhoods."

The report, conducted by Dixon Resources Unlimited, to address issues of traffic and safety around the sign, offers several recommendations such as developing a shuttle service up Beachwood Canyon, studying the feasibility of an aerial tram, establishing a Hollywood Sign Visitor Center, implementing a wayfinding strategy, installing new signage, and working with Google and Waze to communicate accurate access information.

Councilmember Ryu has held hundreds of meetings with community groups, local businesses and stakeholders to embrace ideas and find consensus leading up to the commission of this study, and has not taken a position on any particular strategy offered in the Dixon study.


"Fixing traffic and mobility issues surrounding Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign is incredibly important work," said Julie Dixon of Dixon Resources Unlimited. "Our priority was to work with the community and the park to develop a balanced solution that provides access and addresses safety, and our goal was to explore every possible route to find this solution."

The Dixon study marks the first time a comprehensive study, replete with data and strategies relating to visitor access to the Hollywood Sign and reducing negative impacts on nearby neighborhoods, has been made available to the City of Los Angeles. With the new information and visitor data, it is now possible for the City to analyze the possible solutions with accurate and up-to-date information.

“The Hollywood Sign and Griffith Park are being loved to death,” Ryu added. “This is a world-renowned icon, and possibly the only one without proper access to it. It’s like having the Statue of Liberty without a visitor’s center, viewing platform, or even a sign telling you how to get to it. It is unsustainable and unsafe. I look forward to looking at the specifics of the feasibility of these strategies.”

Councilmember Ryu’s motion today instructs various City departments to begin studying the feasibility of the various strategies proposed in the Dixon study. Councilmember Ryu will continue to seek input from community members throughout the process. No single proposed idea is preferred over another by Councilmember Ryu at this time.

Read the report here.
Read the data collection & analysis [here](#).

Read the motion [here](#).

Read the FAQ [here](#).

---


---

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu

Office: 323.957.6415

http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: **9-1-1**
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): **213-485-4184**
- Police non-emergency: **877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)**
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): **800-773-2489**
- Traffic control (signal light out): **213-485-4184**
- Dept. of Water & Power: **800-342-5397**
- Other City issues: **3-1-1**

---

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> Tue, Jan 23, 2018 at 3:40 PM

To: Diana Knoll <diana.knoll@lacity.org>

Hello Diana,
We will keep your suggestion regarding extended enforcement in mind for next year. The study suggests a wayfinding strategy and walkability signage that will direct visitors away from areas that cannot handle the capacity. They also suggest planting and fencing the northern portion of Lake Hollywood Park that runs adjacent to Mulholland Highway which will help to keep pedestrians from walking up Mulholland. Another suggestion is close certain streets during high peak periods. They also proposed a Griffith Park transit hub on the north side of the Park off of the 134 that will draw visitors to that side rather than the western residential neighborhoods. As the Councilmember said at the Hollywoodland meeting, all of the strategies will be further studied by the relevant City departments to determine their feasibility. More to come...

I will circle back with DOT regarding the no parking sign.

Thank you.
Hi Ben,

Thank you for your participation and thoughtful feedback. All of the strategies in the report will be studied further by the relevant City departments and, in some cases, significant environmental review will be needed. I look forward to your continued participation in the process.

Take care,

On Sun, Jan 21, 2018 at 9:08 AM, Ben Sheffner < wrote:

Dear Councilman Ryu and staff:

I want to thank and commend you for commissioning the Dixon report, which I’ve had the chance to read. As you well know, there are no easy solutions to the issues around the Hollywood sign and park access from Beachwood Canyon. Providing reasonable access to hikers, tourists, and other visitors, while mitigating the effects on residents, will require compromise from all parties. The Dixon report offers a long list of ideas to improve the situation on all fronts. I'm sure everyone in the neighborhood -- myself included -- has things they like in the report, and things they don't. But I hope the constructive recommendations in the report can at least move us all past the point of pushing for unrealistic, unhelpful ideas that amount to nothing more than "shut the entire neighborhood off to visitors," and instead help us seek reasonable compromises.

I do want to comment specifically on one aspect of the Dixon report that is of particular interest to me: "Implement the Alternate Access Trail Plan at Beachwood Drive" (pages 17-19). While the report does mention this idea, it seems to downplay it. I want to voice my support for the idea, which would greatly enhance access by hikers and others to Griffith Park from Beachwood -- in a way that would avoid any potential interference with the stables’ business, by keeping pedestrians off the road north of the gate. There are also other ideas to be explored for re-opening the gate and separating pedestrians from vehicles north of the gate, including by construction of a sidewalk, railings, crosswalk, striping, bollards, etc. -- which would similarly obviate the problems that led to the gate’s closure. I also urge you to study the idea, endorsed by Anthony-Paul Diaz of RAP in a June 20, 2017 email (obtained via PRA request), for the city to purchase the stables, through eminent domain if necessary. Such a purchase would eliminate the issue that led to the closure of the trailhead in early 2017, and the land could be used in various ways to accommodate visitors, including parking, access to Griffith Park and the various trails, a Hollywood Sign viewing/photo platform, etc. I hope that serious consideration of this idea will be part of further discussions on this topic.

One other related issue that I believe deserves more rigorous attention is the alleged crime and fire danger caused by visitors. The Hollywoodland Facebook page is filled with dire reports of crimes and fire danger, for which visitors are often blamed. Certain residents cite this supposed public safety crisis to justify their quest to shut the neighborhood to visitors. I have studied the actual LAPD crime statistics, as well as the public statements of LAFD officials about emergency access to our neighborhood, and it is crystal clear that the data and expert opinions do not justify the alarmist rhetoric from some residents. The fact is that serious crime is virtually non-existent in this neighborhood; indeed crime rates in LA are at or near 60-year lows -- a fact that we should all be celebrating, while of course remaining vigilant that the bad old days do not return. I would strongly urge you to publicly provide regular, accurate data about crime in the neighborhood, to combat the fearmongering, exaggeration, and argument by anecdote that unfortunately dominates the discussion of this topic. I would also urge you to have LAFD officials speak out publicly about the situation in our neighborhood, to allay unnecessary fears. As I’ve pointed out previously, when LAFD officials do speak up, they consistently state that visitors are not a significant public safety risk and do not impede emergency access. E.g., http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/war-hollywood-sign-pits-wealthy-761385 (2015 comments of LAFD officials John Vidovich and Charles Butler).

Thank you again for your work on this issue, and I look forward to further discussions.

Best,
How to increase access to the Park

First, it is important for city leaders, including Councilman Ryu and RAP, to publicly affirm their strong support for public access, and to vocally oppose any further restrictions on access, including closure of the remaining access points from Beachwood Canyon into Griffith Park.

Second, I support re-opening the gate at the north end of Beachwood Drive, to provide pedestrian access to the Hollyridge Trail. I believe this can be done consistent with the court's Feb. 3, 2017 order in the Sunset Ranch v. City of LA case. The court's concern was that pedestrians on the road north of the gate, to which the stables has an easement, were interfering with the stables' business. The problem identified by the court could be solved without the drastic step of closing the gate and re-directing hikers to Bronson Canyon. I don't claim to have a definitive answer as to the single best way to do this, but there are several options that should be explored, including: 1) providing pedestrian access north of the gate while separating pedestrians from vehicles, including by construction of a sidewalk, railings, crosswalk, other striping, bollards, etc.; 2) moving the access point to the south (but still north of the gate), while constructing a stairway or short trail connecting the road to the Hollyridge Trail, thus minimizing pedestrian interaction with vehicles (this option may necessitate moving the pedestrian gate to the east side of the road); and 3) permitting access to the Hollyridge Trail from Hollyridge Drive, through the gate immediately south of 3180 Hollyridge Dr. I realize that all of these options would cost money, and some may present other challenges, but they are all much less drastic solutions than closing the Beachwood access point altogether, and would be in full compliance with both the letter and spirit of the court's Feb. 3 order.

Lastly, I think it is worth exploring whether the city should purchase the stables, through eminent domain if necessary. Such a purchase would eliminate the issue that led to the closure of the trailhead in early 2017, and the land could be used in various ways to accommodate visitors, including parking, access to Griffith Park and the various trails, a Hollywood Sign viewing/photo platform, etc. I was happy to see Anthony-Paul Diaz of RAP endorse this idea in a June 20, 2017 email (obtained via PRA request).

How to increase safety for residents and visitors

The premise of this question appears to be that there is a particularly acute safety issue in Beachwood Canyon, or at least that hikers and tourists present a significant threat to safety in the neighborhood. I question whether this premise is valid. While safety is of course important, it is an issue that should be evaluated based on data and the expertise of LAPD and LAFD officials -- not exaggerated or invented claims by residents eager for justification for their quest to rid the neighborhood of visitors.

Crime. The data that I have seen shows that Beachwood Canyon is an extremely safe, low-crime, neighborhood. Crime data provided by the LAPD reveals that Beachwood (and especially Upper Beachwood) is virtually free of serious crime: https://www.crimemapping.com/map/ca/losangeles -- and that other neighborhoods suffer much more, and worse, crime. To be sure, there are crimes here; residents report occasional car break-ins, vandalism (graffiti, eggings), and residential burglaries. While these acts are unfortunate, and I wish the crime rate here was zero, the fact is that we live in a city of over 4 million people, and some crime is inevitable. And I know of no evidence whatsoever that hikers and tourists -- the main target of certain residents’ ire -- are the perpetrators of any of the reported crimes here.

One type of "crime" I do witness frequently in this neighborhood is speeding and failure to stop at stop signs. This could be mitigated by increased enforcement, including by installation of stop-sign cameras to augment police patrols. Also, it is worth noting that my personal observation is that residents -- who know these streets well -- tend to drive much faster than visitors, who are often confused by the narrow, winding roads, and drive extremely slowly while consulting the maps on their phones as they attempt to reach a spot to view the Hollywood Sign. The problem of visitors driving too slowly could be mitigated by better signage directing them to the area around Lake Hollywood park, which provides excellent views of the sign.

Fire. No doubt, fire is a very serious issue in Beachwood, as it is in all hillside neighborhoods in LA. And the particular geography/topography of Beachwood, as well as our narrow streets, counsels particular vigilance. That said, every public statement I have ever seen from LAFD officials reiterates that hikers and tourists are not the cause of heightened fire risk in Beachwood. As LAFD officials told the Hollywood Reporter, visitors are not the cause of the fire danger, and have not reduced the ability of firefighters to respond to emergencies.
“We have talked to our field emergency responders, and they haven’t had any problems getting up
there,” says Los Angeles Fire Department assistant chief John Vidovich, who implements policy
related to departmental code. Battalion chief Charles Butler, who oversees the unit that works the
area around the sign, elaborates that residents are partly responsible for the spatial challenges the
department faces: “Those streets are narrow, but the homes there were originally built for families to
have one car. Now they have multiple, and they often use their garages for storage and park on the
streets. I don’t know that the tourist issue is actually a main factor. It’s a multipronged issue.”

See Gary Baum, “War Over Hollywood Sign Pits Wealthy Residents Against Urinating Tourists: ‘One of These
om/news/war-hollywood-sign-pits-wealthy-761385). I also refer you to the very thoughtful email of Dec. 29,
2015 from LAFD official Joseph Castro, which begins at page 438 of this document and continues on page
437: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B2k1PlL55YeqlOE54T0tWd2Zva2s/view In this email, Mr. Castro explains
how: 1) traffic issues are not unique to Beachwood, and have not interfered with LAFD’s operations here; and
2) various mitigation tactics have successfully prevented any major fires in the Santa Monica Mountains for at
least three decades. While we should never be complacent about fire risk, nor should we let opponents of
public access to Griffith Park use invented or exaggerated fire risk from visitors as a scare tactic to further
restrict access.

Thank you for convening this meeting, and I look forward to seeing you Wednesday.

Best,

Ben Sheffner

--

[Contact information for Shannon Prior, Field Deputy for Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu]

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1
Hi Shannon,

I'm reaching out to see what's new? What has come of the study? Will the Beachwood entrance to Griffith Park be restored? Or a new one created?

I can tell you that each and every weekend day, Canyon Drive is inundated with traffic and parked cars. We can barely get out of our driveway safely... We all know what this exponential increase in traffic is caused by. And it has gotten worse with time.

Finally, when is the city re-opening the request for speed bumps program? I want to make sure our request gets properly filed this time.

Thank you.

Michael

--

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> Thu, Jan 25, 2018 at 7:47 PM
To: Michael Zelniker <michael.zelniker@lacity.org>
Cc: Alexander Heineman <alexander.heineman@lacity.org>

Hello Michael,

Good to hear from you. I was actually thinking about you because the speed hump application window is approaching! It will start at 8am on Feb. 15th. As in the past, they will only be allowing 30 applications per Council District and they go fast! Of these 30 applications, LADOT will be selecting only 2 streets per council district. For more information on the process, please see DOT's information page HERE. Please read the requirements HERE and evaluation guidelines HERE.

The study was released last week and can be view on our website HERE. Scroll down to find the links to the study and the data analysis.

I look forward to your feedback and/or questions.

Thank you.

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Shannon Prior
Michael Zelniker <mailto:mailto@gmail.com> Fri, Jan 26, 2018 at 12:01 PM
To: Shannon Prior <mailto:shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Cc: Alexander Heineman

Hello Shannon,

Thank you for your email. I just read the entire study. I found some of it quite informative and potentially useful. I’m very disappointed at how little of the study is focused on the prospect of re-opening an access point to the park and the sign off of Beachwood Canyon. Given that the closure of that access point is what has caused so many collateral problems for all the surrounding neighborhoods, it seems to me an oversight of this study.

When will further discussion take place concerning the prospective solutions proposed in the study? I would very much like to be involved in those conversations. Unfortunately, at this point, I think it has become necessary to designate a restricted parking area along Canyon Drive between Spring Oak and the park. We also need speed humps along that block as trying to get out of our driveway has become a safety hazard.

What is next? I intend to be involved.

Thank you.

Michael

Alex Heineman
Fri, Jan 26, 2018 at 12:08 PM
To: Michael Zelniker <mailto:mailto@gmail.com>
Cc: Shannon Prior <mailto:shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Thanks Michael and Shannon,

I have to say that if we have restricted parking on Canyon, we will also need it on Spring Oak Drive as well. Spring Oak also gets many cars on weekends as it is.

I am also surprised to see in Beachwood that the residents there still have restricted parking on Beachwood drive even though the park is closed now. Shouldn’t that be revoked?

Best,

Alex

Shannon Prior <mailto:shannon.prior@lacity.org> Tue, Jan 30, 2018 at 4:48 PM
To: Alexander Heineman <mailto:mailto@gmail.com>
Cc: Michael Zelniker

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfeade51e&jsver=Z-grDj2gpow.en.&view=pt&cat=Feedback%20Dixon%20study%20publish&search=cat&th=16149b0046

Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.957.6415
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1
The Councilmember has requested for the implicated City departments to report back on the feasibility of the strategies proposed in the report. There will be future opportunities for public comment once further information is provided by the departments.

DOT doesn't allow for one block PPDs so if a PPD is proposed on the northern stretch of Canyon, Spring Oak will be given an opportunity to join. Actions taken related to PPDs will depend on which strategies from the report are implemented.

Thank you.
Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Response to Dixon Study Results
3 messages

Bill Doyle > Fri, Feb 2, 2018 at 2:05 PM
To: bill doyle >
Cc: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Jason Greenwald >

Hi Shannon,

Thank you for sending a copy of the final report on "Improving Access, Safety and Mobility Around Griffith Park & the Hollywood Sign". As a stakeholder I was impressed by the scope and breadth of Dixon’s study efforts and the difficult and multi-dimensional problems that the study revealed. As I dug further into the report regarding the problems and the recommended solutions presented I began to fully understand there are going to be immense challenges for implementing the recommended solutions, especially in regards to cost and timing. It would take a decade or more to enact some of these solutions and cost in the tens if not hundreds of millions of dollars when trams and Gondolas are added into the mix.

This got me thinking about the initial study questionnaire which asked us to think "outside the box", and that perhaps there was an alternative solution that deserves some consideration. Has anyone suggested relocating the sign? I’m sure knee jerk reaction to this would be negative but when you consider cost, timing and that relocation of the sign would immediately eliminate all or most of the problems in the residential neighborhoods and make it safely accessible to visitors, it seems like an idea worth some discussion.

The signs original purpose as a real estate advertisement is now obsolete. Today it's main use is to draw people from around the world for an infamous selfie. Why not make it safe and easy to access by moving it to Universal or Warner Brothers? Or both? A partnership with these venues would provide existing infrastructure including safe entry, handicap accessibility, parking, trams, shuttles, bathrooms, concessions and of course their own attractions. It would be a one stop shop for tourists, enhancing their experience of Los Angeles. It would also provide a permanent solution to the safety and congestion issues in neighborhoods while helping to conserve the park.

And it could be done in the near future and at a fraction of the cost.

My main fear is that the recommendations of the study are merely managing symptoms and not treating the cause of the problem which I have come to realize is the location of the Hollywood Sign. When you consider every year tourism grows, more homes are built in the hills, the yearly increase of local car ownership and our cultural shift to Uber/Lyft for transportation it is an unfortunate reality that our best efforts to solve the congestion, safety and park conservation issues today will be outpaced by the expanding demands of tomorrow.

With the Olympics on the horizon I feel strongly that any solutions must incorporate anticipated future growth of the current congestion levels. Once the Visitor Center, which I fully support, is constructed it will only serve to direct more visitor traffic into Griffith Park and the surrounding hillside communities.

Adding Shuttles is a good idea, if Beachwood is reopened as the sole terminus, but it completely misses the target audience which is comprised of car owners, car renters and Uber/Lyft users. Visitors will continue to drive their own cars and most Uber/Lyft users simply won't use a shuttle. To them it is like going back to dial up from high speed internet. Perhaps this folly lies in the demographic of our stakeholder group. We are all white and most over 40, generously. I would refer you to the LA Times article on mass transit by Laura J. Nelson dated Jan 25th. stating "Ridership Falls To Lowest Level In More than a Decade", due to Uber/Lyft and people buying more cars.

When I think of the affordable housing crisis in our city which has fostered an explosion of the homeless population, as laid out clearly this week in the LA Times article "Crisis Decades In The Making" by Gale Holland, I feel the millions of dollars saved by moving the sign to a new location could be allocated to build affordable housing for the homeless. Do we want to be known as "Tent City" or a city that takes care of its own?

We need to accept we are part of a city and start thinking as a community on all the issues. Working to solve problems in a vacuum is no longer tenable or sustainable when it comes to the health and well being of our city as a whole.

So let's think way outside the box. Let's consider moving the sign to a safe designated area that offers access to tourism and relief to our hillside communities. And let's use the remaining funds toward affordable housing for our homeless.
Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
To: Bill Doyle < >  
Cc: Jason Greenwald < >

Hello Bill,

Thank you for taking the time to review the study and share your thoughts. You make a very compelling case and I have shared your feedback with our senior staff. The Sign was designated as a historic cultural monument in 1973. I speculate that its designation was at least partially justified because of its location. I don’t know what the process is for relocating a cultural monument and what level of environmental review would be required.

The Observatory DASH has been wildly successful and has shown us that visitors will take public transportation. However, that doesn’t mean that the cars have stopped coming. It is a matter of incentives. In the case of the Observatory, perhaps parking rates need to increase.

I love the perspective of looking at the city as whole. Of course doing that means that we need to consider that many Angelenos love the Hollywood Sign and consider it to be a symbol of the promise and romance of this City, to them it is not just an old real estate advertisement.

Thank you.

Hi Shannon.

Thank you for your thoughtful response regarding the relocation of the Hollywood Sign.

I realize moving the sign would present a different set of challenges for the city. I’m glad that it will at least receive some consideration as a possible comprehensive solution as the city prepares for the Olympics.

In regards to the Dixon’s study recommendations, I will send you my detailed response.

Thanks Again!

Bill Doyle

On Thu, 2/8/18, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> wrote:
Hi Julie,

Yesterday I walked on Mulholland Highway where the Vista is. One of the items in the report includes planting the area along the road to dissuade viewers from stopping to take photos. If the planting were to take place, there would be no place for pedestrians (local folks, too) to walk. It is really quite dangerous to walk on the narrow road and not be able to see traffic around the curves. I hadn’t realized this would be a problem until I saw the area in person.

Thanks for listening!

Kris Sullivan
Hi Steve,

Yes, the report mentions the Sign Trust's website and that it could be further developed and promoted.

There are no plans to build a fence at this time.

Thank you.

On Wed, Jan 17, 2018 at 2:37 PM, Dr. Steven Alper wrote:

Hi Shannon. Happy new year.

Looking forward to reading the report. In the contents I see there is a recommendation for something that already exists - a dedicated Hollywood sign website. wwwhollywoodsign.org is maintained by the Hollywood chamber. It even boasts of live feeds from the sign itself. Importantly, it's the first item when I search "Hollywood sign" on google.

I'll let you know if anything else is confusing.

By the way did you get a chance to follow up with RAP about a fence?

Best steve.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 17, 2018, at 3:09 PM, Shannon Prior wrote:

Hello,

Please see the press release below, which contains links to the study, data report, and council motion filed today.

Please send your feedback to me, and let me know if you have questions.

- Shannon
Hi Shannon,

I spent some time with the Dixon report. Attached you will find all my comments, but honestly, I don’t care if you look at any of them...Except one...

That is, a (demand based, electric) shuttle that loops from downtown Hollywood to the Hollywood Sign - along with strict neighborhood-wide restricted parking.

I think CM Ryu will agree that the ‘Sign’ issue breaks down into two basic needs. #1) Residents need a reduction in car traffic. #2) Tourists need access to the sign.

How can we easily accomplish both?

As the Dixon report alluded to, a shuttle to the sign is the best solution. Make the shuttle convenient - and people will take it! Conversely, make parking inconvenient, and people will refrain from driving. I think there are better routes than the ones Recommended in the report.

If you skip to page 13-15 in the attachment, you can see my two recommended routes. I personally love the idea of a stop at Yucca and Argyle. From the Metro stop on Hollywood it’s just a block north, past the Capitol Records building, then one block east.

Knowing that one shuttle every five minutes is way better than 10 rental cars over the same period, I think logical Hollywoodland residents will quickly see how much a shuttle could improve the quality of life in our neighborhood.

FYI, neither of the routes I suggest require a turnabout for the bus. Both are uni-directional, but they do require paving parts of already mapped and graded roads (Lindforth and “upper dirt” Mulholland.)

And...it gets better. We could implement a shuttle like this AND pave the roads, without any investment from the city. None!

Uber, Lyft, Tesla, Waze, Waymo/Google or Amazon even - which one wouldn’t want to operate the first AI based, demand modulated, electric public bus/shuttle taking tourists from downtown Hollywood to our global icon - the Hollywood Sign? The city can easily set all the terms for this. BTW residents can use this form of public transportation too.

Indeed, we are way outside the typical bureaucratic process with but the situation is unique. We are Hollywood after all, if any community should benefit from product placement, shouldn’t it be ours?

Can we please chat about this?

Thanks,

Steve
Hi Steve,

Thank you for your thoughtful feedback. I've sent your comments to senior staff. The strategies are now being studied by the relevant departments and they will report back on their costs and feasibility. There are still many details that will need to be worked out before any of the recommendations move forward. More to come...

Thanks.

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.851-2121
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1
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Introduction

Background

Beginning in the Summer of 2015, Dixon Resources Unlimited (DIXON) worked with the Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) to develop the Griffith Park Transportation and Parking Action Plan. The project focused on circulation improvements that would reduce congestion and improve access in and around Griffith Park, while protecting the natural environment. In addition to community stakeholders, the project team worked extensively with Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) Transit Services DASH and Metro to expand a shuttle service into the Park. Due to popularity and demand, the schedule has expanded to provide daily service carrying visitors from the Red Line to the Greek Theatre and the Griffith Observatory. The change in traffic patterns has improved traffic flow and access, allowing DASH to provide reliable service. Paid parking was also implemented near the Griffith Observatory in the Spring, and it is anticipated that the generated revenue could fund RAP’s goal to implement a parkwide circulator.

In March of 2017, the Los Angeles City Council approved Councilmember David Ryu’s request for a comprehensive study for improving access, safety, and mobility in and around Griffith Park and around the Hollywood Sign. Based on DIXON’s existing project with RAP in Griffith Park, Councilmember Ryu’s office reached out to DIXON to inquire of services for the comprehensive access and mobility study. As such, DIXON was retained and completed an initial site visit to the neighborhoods within District 4 and Griffith Park on July 3rd, 2017. An overview of the study’s components is summarized below.

Data Analysis Report

In conjunction with this Comprehensive Strategies Report (CSR), DIXON completed a separate Data Analysis Report. The Data Analysis Report discusses the data collection methodologies and includes the data analysis results from each round of data collection. Some of the data analysis results are referenced in this CSR to support the recommended strategies. An overview of the data collection efforts is outlined below:

Data Collection: Round 1

DIXON procured the services of National Data & Surveying Services (NDS) to complete the data collection. Round 1 data collection consisted of a two-week period in September 2017. Week 1 comprised Friday, September 1st through Monday, September 4th, and Week 2 comprised Friday, September 15th through Monday, September 18th. Data collection included average daily traffic (ADT) volume counts, on- and off-street vehicle occupancy counts, and pedestrian and bike counts. The study areas are outlined below:
Stakeholder Meeting
The Los Angeles District 4 stakeholder meeting was held on November 11, 2017. This meeting included participants representative of the community and nearby Griffith Park including residents, business owners, and community organizations. Attendees were invited to be updated and briefed on the progress of the project, the results of data collection efforts, and solicited for feedback on proposed short-term recommendations. It was widely agreed among stakeholders, that a comprehensive approach is needed to address the issues facing the hillside neighborhoods directly, so that problems do not migrate to other areas.

Much of the group discussion focused on wayfinding, Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs), street classifications, and cellphone service. Stakeholders agreed that wayfinding would be a useful tool in mitigating many of the neighborhood’s parking and mobility issues that arise from tourists visiting the Hollywood Sign. A wide range of PPD opinions were expressed. Several stakeholders wished to extend coverage and hours of PPDs, while others were completely opposed to PPDs altogether. One stakeholder wished to see any proposed changes to PPDs in the neighborhoods justified with data to demonstrate how they would mitigate both vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

A key theme that surfaced in the stakeholder meeting was the need for additional data collection efforts before determining final recommendations. Several participants
promoted the idea of conducting an intercept survey. This survey would be designed to identify details like from where tourists visited, their chosen mode of transport, and identify how they located their destination. Stakeholders suggested an additional survey of potential recommendations distributed to a wider audience of residents to gauge interest in each proposed recommendation. Finally, there was consensus among many in the group about the need to collect more average daily traffic (ADT) data in additional locations.

Meeting participants provided feedback on preliminary recommendations and presented various other recommendations to DIXON and District 4 Staff. Potential recommendations discussed will be considered moving forward with the project. Finally, stakeholders were encouraged to reach out to DIXON to discuss any recommendations and concerns via email.

Stakeholders were supportive of:

- Developing a comprehensive **Wayfinding Plan** that identifies sign locations, ideal vista and photo opportunities, and rideshare pick-up/drop-off zones. Such a plan would also create a recognizable Hollywood Sign brand, installing digital messaging to redirect drivers, and with special attention to how pedestrians can safely enter and exit the neighborhood.
- Developing a dedicated **Hollywood Sign website** drafted by the community that contains information about parking access, sign history, and other relevant visitor information. This website would ideally be promoted on other travel sites.
- **Implementing or extending PPD hours** at certain locations including Deronda Drive and Tahoe Drive. Some stakeholders also wished for a way to visit neighboring areas without the need for a guest pass.
- **Tailoring recommendations to different groups.** Participants that there are two distinct groups of visitors who pass through their neighborhoods - those viewing the Hollywood Sign, and those visiting Griffith Park.
- **Replicating the Hollywood Sign** on the Burbank-facing hillside of Griffith Park and installing smaller signs at different locations. These signs would draw visitors to other locations and provide additional photo opportunities.
- Developing the **Vista Site at Lake Hollywood Park** for visitors to include restroom facilities and parking meters, possibly staffed with a full-time LADOT officer during the summer months. Parking meters could be a source of revenue for neighborhood improvements projects.
- **Relocating access points** to share visitor traffic across the area. One location promoted for alternate trail access was the top of Beachwood Drive south of the current gate.
- **Adjusting the service of the Griffith Park Circulator (DASH)** to alleviate residents’ concerns about pedestrian safety and congestion. Several stakeholders suggested extending service to Canyon Drive, N Beachwood Drive, and possibly Ledgewood Drive.
- Presenting recommendations in list form based on **impact versus cost**.

**Fits well with “LA is so fake/plastic” narrative.**
Data Collection: Round 2

Round 2 of data collection consisted of a one-week period in December 2017 commencing Thursday, December 14th through Monday, December 18th. The locations selected for this round of data collection were based upon stakeholder feedback and potential report recommendations. During this round of data collection, a combination of pedestrian and bike counts, ADT volume counts, and intercept surveys were collected. The intercept surveys were meant to discover where visitors are traversing from, how they traveled to each location, their purpose for visiting, how they found out about it, and how long they planned on staying. The following map outlines the data collection locations:

Round 2 notes: A) Both the Vista and Dirt Mulholland have equal percentage of reporting participants wanting a picture of the Hollywood Sign. B) Unlikely accurate, as survey interviews were probably conducted in English only (at tourist sight in Los Angeles - how were non English speakers resolved?)

Figure 2. Data Collection Study Areas and Types: Round 2
Report Overview

The CSR is organized based on seven main goals (Figure 3). These goals are not ranked in any particular order. The goals have been identified by the project team, and together they are meant to improve access, mobility, and safety in and around Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign. For each goal, there are several potential strategies for consideration. These strategies each include a suggested implementation timeline, organized into short-, mid-, and long-term steps. The implementation steps are meant to be realistic and actionable. It is important for the City to take a comprehensive approach to implementing recommendations; in many cases, the strategies will complement one another for improved effectiveness. There are also steps that the City can take in the short-term to adequately prepare for some of the longer-term solutions.

The strategies are each assigned either low, medium, or high priority. The relative cost is also identified for each strategy from $ to $$$$. There are many factors that will influence cost and there may be different levels of ongoing expenditures. The relative cost attempts to compare the strategies to each other, and does not identify a particular dollar amount or range. Their prioritization is based upon the estimated costs versus the potential benefits. This has been gauged through a mix of extensive stakeholder outreach, data analysis, industry best practices, and prior experience. The prioritization in this report is not a definitive guide for the City. Public and City Council review, environmental analyses, engineering evaluations, and cost appraisals, among other factors, will ultimately influence whether a strategy is viable, the prioritization, and a feasible timeline for implementation.

This report’s discussion of possible environmental or CEQA requirements is for idea generation, and is not a definitive statement of required environmental compliance.

Figure 3. Report Goals

1. Enhance Pedestrian Safety
2. Improve Traffic Flow and Reduce Congestion
3. Improve Access to Griffith Park and Trailheads
4. Improve Emergency Vehicle Access
5. Increase Parking Efficiency and Compliance Rates
6. Expand Transit Opportunities
7. Actively Manage and Provide Optimized Visitor Opportunities
## 1. Enhance Pedestrian Safety

### Strategy #1. Install Sidewalk Bulb-Out Along Beachwood Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations</td>
<td>Traffic flow, spillover parking, construction impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overview

People often stand in the middle of the street along Beachwood Drive to take a picture with the view of the Hollywood Sign. To address the pedestrian safety concerns along Beachwood Drive, the City should consider implementing a sidewalk bulb-out. A bulb-out on the east side of Beachwood Drive near Glen Holly Street would allow pedestrians to stand on the projecting sidewalk to safely take a picture of the Hollywood Sign without standing in the travel lane. The sidewalk bulb-out would also have the added advantage of traffic calming, which could help make the intersection safer. Upon further analysis, if there is not space for the bulb-out, the City could also consider installing a traffic circle. This would allow pedestrians to stand in the traffic circle out of the way of traffic, but it would still require photo seekers to cross the street for access at a designated crosswalk.

Time limits can be an effective way to regulate visitor behavior. The City should also consider converting some parking spaces and clearly identifying this location, near the bulb-out, to short-term, 5-minute parking spaces to give visitors a space to park for a quick photo. Locating the 5-minute spaces on the same side of the street as the bulb-out would minimize the number of people crossing the street, therefore improving safety. The spaces on the opposite side of the street would then likely be utilized by longer-term parkers such as the residents. This can be achieved through the use of signage and curb paint to indicate the applicable areas.

Hollywood and Vine to Glen Holly is a 20-25 minute walk. The city could promote just walking there from downtown Hollywood.
Benefits
➢ Gives visitors a safe location to take a picture
➢ Reduces the number of traffic obstructions and improves traffic flow
➢ Traffic calming effect would likely improve safety
➢ More sidewalk space promotes walkability

Implementation

Short-Term
1. Conduct a traffic engineering study to determine the feasibility of implementing a sidewalk bulb-out along Beachwood Drive.
2. Develop construction specifications and plans.
3. Construct sidewalk bulb-out and repaint travel lanes.
4. Install 5-minute time limit signage on the same side of the road as the bulb-out.
   a. Coordinate construction and time limit conversion with the potential PPD extension.
Strategy #2. Implement Traffic Calming Measures in Problem Areas

Overview
Cars speeding or missing stop signs on residential streets can cause a pedestrian safety issue. Adding speed humps or radar speed signs to problem areas may help to slow down traffic. The City should also consider adding crosswalk striping or flashing lights at intersections to improve visibility. However, flashing lights are not recommended in residential areas due to the light pollution they can cause.

One potential location to consider for traffic calming measures is the intersection of Tahoe Drive and Canyon Lake Drive. The crosswalk is unmarked here, and there is a view of the Hollywood Sign that may be distracting for some drivers. The City should solicit resident input on the type of traffic calming measures that would be appropriate for this location, if any. It should also be considered that speed humps can reduce emergency vehicle response times. The City’s Department of Transportation has Speed Hump Evaluation Guidelines\(^1\) that must be considered when evaluating potential locations. Feasibility relies on factors such as street type, roadway grade, drainage, and traffic volume.

Another location to consider is along Canyon Drive within the Park next to the playground. There is currently a marked crosswalk, but it lacks striping. This may make it less noticeable to drivers. The City should also consider painting the word ‘SLOW’ on the roadway at this location as a reminder to drivers. Signage could also be included to

---

\(^1\) LADOT, “Request Speed Hump”: http://ladot.lacity.org/how-do-i/request-speed-humps
remind drivers to share the road – further along Canyon Drive, pedestrians must walk in the roadway where there is no sidewalk space.

**Benefits**
- Reduces the speed of traffic and improves pedestrian safety
- More drivers may notice stop signs and intersections

**Implementation**

**Short-Term**
1. The City should work with residents to determine locations that may need traffic calming measures.
2. Paint ‘SLOW’ near the crosswalk along Canyon Lake Drive near the playground.
3. Additional signage should be posted where necessary.
4. Crosswalks should be fully marked in problem areas with stripes.

**Strategy #3. Post Walkability Signage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations:</td>
<td>Visual Impact, ability to post unofficial signage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview**
Pedestrians currently have limited guidance on where to walk, how long it will take, and the ideal routes. Walkability signage can help improve the overall pedestrian experience throughout the community. Wailuku Town in Maui has a good example of simple temporary directional signage that indicates the walk time to popular destinations (Image 2). This is a low-cost signage solution that adds a significant amount of place-making value. Similar signage could be posted to encourage walkability in and around the Park entrances. Just as in Maui, the **QR code** included in the signage can also be used to link users to walking directions, maps, and information about the City and/or Park.

The San Francisco Maritime National Historic Park has another example of walkability signage (Image 3). This signage has simplified branding and information, including pictograms to communicate general Park rules. Walking distances are listed along the right side of the sign. Similar signage could be installed...
in and around locations like Lake Hollywood Park to communicate walking distances to popular destinations and hikes.

**Benefits**
- Encourages visitors to walk and provides helpful information
- Outreach opportunity for the City

**Implementation**

**Short-Term**
1. Create a comprehensive list of popular destinations in and around Griffith Park
2. Develop City-branded walkability signage, or work with WalkYourCity to develop and install walkability signage throughout the community.
   a. Visit walkyourcity.org for more information.
3. Use QR codes to promote desired information about the City and/or Park.

**Strategy #4. Install a Sidewalk Along Canyon Drive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations:</td>
<td>Visual Impact, roadway width</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview**
Currently there is no sidewalk leading towards the Canyon Drive Gate or continuing through the park, which impacts the ability of pedestrians to safely enter the park and utilize the playgrounds and access the Brush Canyon Trailhead. The City could consider installing a sidewalk along one or both sides, depending on roadway width. Initially, the City could install the sidewalk from the Park gate to the playgrounds. As a longer-term solution, Council staff could work with the City’s Bureau of Engineering (BOE) to install a sidewalk leading up to the Park gate on the east side of the street.
Benefits
➢ Improves walkability and pedestrian safety

Implementation

Short-Term
1. Recreation and Parks (RAP) should install a sidewalk from the Canyon Drive Park entrance to the playgrounds.

Mid-Term or Long-Term
1. Work with BOE to install a sidewalk leading to the Park gate on Canyon Drive.

2. Improve Access to Griffith Park and Trailheads

Strategy #1. Implement an Electric Shuttle Service Connecting Nearest Metro Station with Beachwood Drive Park Entrance

- Category: Park Access
- Priority: High
- Cost: $$
- Considerations: Traffic flow, staffing, route impacts
Overview
The recent closure to pedestrian access at the Beachwood Gate limited one access point to the Hollyridge Trail in Griffith Park. Because the City still maintains rights to the easement road north of the Beachwood Gate, an electric shuttle could be used to transport visitors through the gate to the Hollyridge Trail. This shuttle route would allow the City to transport visitors to the Hollyridge Trail without requiring any roadway or trail reconfigurations. The shuttle could originate from a nearby Metro station, and there is also an opportunity for a shuttle to connect locations like the Hollywood and Highland Center or Hollywood and Vine. The shuttle could also have a stop within the residential area near the Beachwood Gate to allow nearby residents easier access to the trail.

The Beachwood shuttle could play a narration of the history of Hollywoodland and the Hollywood Sign as it travels to the Gate. This would be similar to the narration by Jeopardy’s Alex Trebek on the shuttle that carries visitors to Hearst Castle. This would be a method to improve the overall visitor experience.

Benefits
➢ Opens another access point to the Hollyridge Trail
➢ Encourages the use of public transit
➢ Minimal environmental review likely required
➢ Does not require the level of construction as proposed in the Alternative Access Trail Plan (See Strategy #2)

Implementation
Short-Term
1. Determine shuttle route and stops, route frequency, and cost.
2. Dedicate adequate turn-around space at the end of the route within the Park.
3. Begin education and outreach process about upcoming shuttle program.
   a. Outreach should focus on nearby residents and visitors.
   b. Information about the shuttle cost, route, frequency, operating hours, and the Hollyridge Trail should be included in outreach materials.
4. Purchase shuttle vehicle(s) based upon estimated ridership levels and desired route frequency. Ideally, the shuttles should be small, electric vehicles to ensure minimal environmental impact.
   a. If desired, develop a Hollywoodland narration to be played on the shuttle(s).
5. Identify and allocate necessary staffing for the management of the shuttle program.

Mid-Term
1. Implement shuttle route along with posted signage.
Assess ridership levels to determine any necessary program adjustments.
A better terminus for the shuttle bus might be the triangle at Yucca and Argyle. This way the shuttles avoid congested Hollywood Blvd, but the stop is still close to the sb...
Strategy #2. Implement the Alternate Access Trail Plan at Beachwood Drive

Overview
As stated above in Strategy #1, the recent closure to pedestrian access at the Beachwood Gate limited one access point to the Hollyridge Trail. While Strategy #1 is recommended as the ideal solution, Strategy #2 is another potential solution for the City to consider. The Alternative Access Trail Plan has been proposed by stakeholder groups. This proposal suggests bypassing the existing gate to Sunset Ranch with a new, nearby gate. The proposed access point would require removing a panel of the existing fence near the gate.

Drawbacks
Due to the steep elevation, the proposed trail would likely have switchbacks, possibly with stairs, to bypass the Sunset Ranch gate and connect the hill with the Hollyridge Trail. A significant amount of engineering and construction work would be required to assess and implement this option. This proposal will also require environmental review to ensure compliance with CEQA regulations. This would likely be a lengthy and expensive process for the City. There could also be significant litigation costs incurred by the City from ongoing or future lawsuits. The amount of time and resources required to assess the alternative access plan means that this plan should not be considered as a short-term solution.

It’s unlikely that the engineering and construction to cut a trail in the park will be that significant.
Benefit

➢ Opens another access point to the Hollyridge Trail

Implementation

Short-Term

1. Pursue strategy #1 as the ideal short-term solution for access to the Hollyridge Trail.

Mid-Term

1. Conduct the necessary engineering, construction, and environmental assessments to determine the feasibility of the Alternative Access Plan.
   a. This plan will likely require an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per CEQA regulations.
2. Litigation issues will need to be addressed.
3. Finalize plans.
4. Solicit community feedback.

**Long-Term**
1. Construct connecting trail and replace fence panel with a new pedestrian gate.

**Strategy #3. Relocate the Wonder View Trailhead and Install a Pedestrian Gate on Lake Hollywood Drive**

**Category:** Park Access  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Cost:** $$$  
**Considerations:** DWP easement, environmental impacts, traffic and pedestrian flow

**Overview**
The existing Wonder View Trailhead is located along a residential portion of Wonder View Drive. This narrow stretch of steep road is precariously impacted with blind turns and it sometimes can be congested with cars, pedestrians, and large shuttle busses or vans. Congestion in this location is a safety issue for pedestrians and for emergency vehicle access. Down the hill, along Lake Hollywood Drive, there may be an opportunity to create a new access point and connecting trail near the Toyon Tanks. This would be a more accessible location for visitors and would help to reduce congestion along the upper end of Wonder View Drive.

There are two potential trail routes that may be considered (See Figure 8). Further north, Option A is located closer to the majority of the parking spaces along Lake Hollywood Drive. It also would create a trail that has a similar distance to the existing Wonder View Drive route. Additionally, it may minimize the environmental impact by limiting the amount of impacted land. On the other hand, Option B would utilize a portion of existing trail which could reduce construction costs for the City. Both proposed locations may extend through the Department of Water and Power’s (DWP) parcels B and C. If necessary, the City should work with DWP to determine the viability of extending the trail through their property. An environmental review to ensure compliance with CEQA regulations will also likely be required.

If the City proceeds with the relocation plan, the existing gate should be closed to minimize congestion along Wonder View Drive. A new gate or fence would have to be
constructed to effectively close this access point. Additionally, a **marked crosswalk** may improve pedestrian safety leading up to the gate across Lake Hollywood Drive:

![Image 4. Proposed Crosswalk Location for Relocated Trailhead](image)

**Benefits**

- Would likely reduce the number of vehicles and pedestrians traversing up Wonder View Drive
- Because there are no residences located along Lake Hollywood Drive near the proposed entrance, this could become an ideal location to promote to visitors
- This area may be able to safely handle more congestion and parking demand in comparison to other access points to the Park
- More accessible location for shuttle and tour buses to drop-off and pick-up passengers than Wonder View Drive

**Implementation**

**Short-Term**

1. Develop project specifications and begin environmental analysis to determine project feasibility per CEQA regulations.
   a. Determine optimal trail route.

**Mid-Term**

1. Construct the trail.
2. Close off the existing gate and install a new access gate for the trail extension.
3. Post signage.
4. Relocate any existing ridesharing zones and/or shuttle stops (see pages 21 and 26) closer to the new entrance point.
It appears that option A, a new trail from a proposed gate on Lake Hollywood Dr, to the existing gate on Wonderview Dr., is solely to keep pedestrians off Wonderview?

Option B is probably way more cost effective.
3. Expand Transit Opportunities

Strategy #1. Extend DASH Lines or Shuttle Routes to and from Highly Congested Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Traffic &amp; Congestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations</td>
<td>Traffic flow, staffing, route impacts, parking space reductions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview

In certain Hollywood Sign viewing and hiking locations, there is limited accessibility by public transportation. The City should consider conducting a traffic engineering evaluation to determine the viability for DASH service extensions or shuttle routes. Some of the underserved locations have limited roadway space, which means that any DASH extension would likely require engineering and environmental review, depending on the impacts. This means that shuttle routes may be the optimal solution to minimize construction and environmental impacts. Smaller shuttles could allow for easier access to areas with less turn-around space. The City could treat the shuttle route similarly to a bus route, including designated shuttle stops for ease of understanding and use.

When determining any route additions, the City should consider that the success of public transportation routes will depend on a number of factors including route convenience, frequency, reliability, ridership levels, and cost. The City is planning to expand the DASH operating hours from 6 to 7 days per week.

Wonder View Trailhead

During the December 15-18 data collection, over 2,000 cars were counted each day along Lake Hollywood Drive near Wonder View Drive. There is currently no public transportation route that services this location. LA Metro Bus 222 stops along Barham Boulevard at the Lake Hollywood Drive intersection. This route can be accessed from the Hollywood and Highland Center. Unfortunately, this bus stop is approximately a 0.7 mile walk to the Wonder View Trailhead. Typically, between 0.25 and 0.5 miles is considered a reasonable walking distance for public transportation use. To improve access by public transit to the Wonder View Trailhead, the City could consider extending a shuttle route from this Metro bus stop to Lake Hollywood Drive closer to Wonder View Drive (See Figure 9).
Ideally, this bus stop should include a shelter or overhang for shade, along with a bench. This would improve the visitor experience for those transferring at this location to the shuttle. Additionally, if the City proceeds with the proposed relocation of the Wonder View Trailhead (Page 18) there may be an opportunity to locate a shuttle stop near the new entrance. A traffic engineering study may be required to determine route feasibility.

**Brush Canyon Trailhead**

There are no public transit stops located within reasonable walking distance to the Canyon Drive Park entrance and Brush Canyon Trailhead. The Hollywood DASH route stops at the intersection of Franklin Avenue and Bronson Avenue, a block before Canyon Drive. This stop is approximately a 1 mile walk from the Canyon Drive Park entrance. Also, the Beachwood Canyon DASH stops at Beachwood Drive and Westshire Drive, which is approximately the same distance from the Park.

The City may want to consider extending a shuttle route from one of these nearby DASH stops to service the Canyon Drive Park entrance. Currently there is minimal roadway width to accommodate a turn-around area along Canyon Drive. One solution could be to dedicate a portion of one of the Canyon Drive parking lots for shuttle use. While this would eliminate a number of parking spaces, the shuttle route could potentially reduce the parking demand. During the December 15-18 data collection, over 300 cars were typically counted in each direction at Canyon Drive (north of Carolus Drive) each day.
**Beachwood Drive**
The City should consider extending the existing DASH line or a shuttle route further north along Beachwood Drive. Currently DASH goes along Beachwood Drive until Westshire Drive. There may be an opportunity to implement an electric shuttle route to access the Hollyridge Trail. It is recommended that this shuttle originate from a nearby Metro station. This recommendation was described in more detail on page 13.

**Ford Theatre Trail**
With the upcoming implementation of the Ford Theatre Trail, the City should consider adding a DASH or shuttle stop near the new trailhead. See page 52 for more information on the Ford Theatre Trail.

**Griffith Park Transit Hub**
See Page 27 for more information on the recommended development of a Griffith Park Transit Hub.

**Benefits**
- Congestion reduction
- Encourages the use of public transportation and may reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trips
- Improves access to Griffith Park and/or Hollywood Sign viewing locations
- Improves public safety

**Implementation**

**Short-Term**

1. Conduct a traffic engineering study to determine the viability of extending public transit lines and/or implementing shuttle routes to and from highly congested areas.
   a. Any locations that would require roadway reconfigurations for turnaround space may require environmental review to be compliant with CEQA regulations.
2. Finalize upcoming route and bus/shuttle stop locations, operating hours, and frequencies.
3. Distribute outreach and marketing materials about upcoming DASH or shuttle routes.
4. Determine fleet and staffing requirements.
Mid-Term
1. If necessary, procure additional fleet vehicles.
2. Develop a staffing schedule and allocate the required staff.
3. Install bus/shuttle stops and signage.

Long-Term
1. Consider conducting periodic ridership counts to determine any necessary route adjustments including stop locations, operating hours, and frequencies.
2. If the City develops the recommended Griffith Park Transit Hub (page 27), the City should extend bus and shuttle routes to service this location.

Strategy #2: Implement Ridesharing Zones

| Category: | Traffic & Congestion |
| Priority: | High |
| Cost: | $ |
| Considerations: | Reduction of parking supply, difficulty of enforcement, longer walking distances for users |

Overview
There are several popular destinations throughout Hollywood that are being accessed with ridesharing applications. Ridesharing applications can supplement public transportation routes, providing an efficient alternative to underserved locations. Alas, ridesharing vehicles sometimes stop in the middle of the road or in no parking zones, and drivers also can be seen queuing up, waiting for passengers. While parking demand can be eased by the number of ridesharing vehicles, they can also have a negative impact on roadway congestion and traffic.

The City should take a proactive approach to managing the impact of ridesharing throughout Hollywood and Griffith Park by designating drop-off and pick-up zones for ridesharing companies, including taxis, in popular destinations. Unfortunately, it can be difficult to enforce parking regulations such as red curb violations for ridesharing vehicles, because they only remain at their drop-off or pick-up location for a short period of time. Drivers and passengers are also not incentivized to utilize ridesharing zones if it will extend the length of their session, due to the cost of the service. Most ridesharing applications also rely on a rating system for reviewing their drivers, so drivers will often favor efficiency and convenience for their passengers, over utilizing a designated ridesharing zone. That is why it is important for any ridesharing zones to be conveniently located in order to encourage their use. The main goal of having ridesharing zones should be to ensure that there is adequate space available for safe drop-offs and pick-ups. Without ridesharing zones, high parking occupancy rates may lead drivers to drop
off or pick up their passengers in the travel lane, which can cause issues with traffic congestion.

Ridesharing companies have a track record of working closely with cities to address their ridesharing concerns and issues. For example, Lyft recently worked with the City of Las Vegas to develop a parking solution for the Life is Beautiful Festival. The festival was located in the heart of Downtown Las Vegas, with approximately 150,000 attendees. Lyft worked with the City to establish drop-off/pick-up zones to service the festival, as well as appropriate queuing areas. Service features like in-app geo-fencing, signage, and marketing channels can sometimes be used to improve event planning and management. Drivers can also be incentivized to service certain areas of a city. The City should work with popular ridesharing companies like Lyft and Uber to request trip data for impacted destinations. This will allow the City to better understand the impact of ridesharing on congestion throughout the City.

The City could consider carrying over the design of the LAX ride service signage into any ridesharing zones implemented throughout the City. Many visitors utilizing ridesharing applications to get around the City may have first used it upon their arrival at the airport. By carrying the signage design throughout the City, the zones may become more recognizable and understandable for visitors. The City could also work with nearby hotels to encourage the establishment of hotel drop-off and pick-up zones for ridesharing. This will allow visitors to more easily utilize ridesharing services throughout their stay.

**Lake Hollywood Park**

Lake Hollywood Park is a common destination due to an ideal view of the Hollywood Sign. At times, ridesharing vehicles can be seen stopping in the travel lanes or u-turning along Canyon Lake Drive and Mullholland Highway. The Intercept Survey data shows that between 10% and 13% of those surveyed at Lake Hollywood Park and the Mullholland Highway Vista utilized a ridesharing application to get there. The simplest solution would be to convert a number of existing on-street parking spaces along Canyon Lake Drive into ridesharing drop-off and pick-up zones that incorporate no idling and no stopping regulations and signage.

Parking occupancy rates around Lake Hollywood Park did not reach 85% during the September data collection. This could be a result of high turnover rates, or the use of ridesharing to access this location. Ridesharing vehicles dropping off or picking up passengers were not counted towards the parking occupancy numbers during this study if the driver did not exit the vehicle to park. The highest rates observed along Canyon Lake Drive were from Arrowhead Drive to Mulholland Highway, which peaked at 77% at noon. Therefore, there may be space to substitute a number of parking spaces with designated ridesharing zones on each side of the street. However, spillover parking in

Alternatively, prohibit all ridesharing in the “zone” that doesn’t include a ride origination or termination. Then it becomes illegal for an Uber to drive a client up to take the picture wait and return. Uber/lyft know where their cars are. This is easy for them to implement. A city fee could be automatically charged through service app.
the neighborhoods is still a potential impact, which is why a PPD zone has been suggested for consideration in this location (see page 40).

**Canyon Drive**

Another location to consider for a ridesharing zone is near the Brush Canyon Trailhead. One or two parking spaces either on- or off-street could be converted for use by marked ridesharing vehicles, including taxis. This would give drivers a convenient place to drop off and pick up passengers when parking spaces may otherwise be full. This would also give drivers a safe area to turnaround without obstructing traffic. On Thursday of the December data collection, 20% of those surveyed at the Brush Canyon Trailhead indicated that they used a ridesharing application to get there.

**Lake Hollywood Drive**

The City should also consider implementing a ridesharing zone along Lake Hollywood Drive near the entrance to Wonder View Drive. The Intercept Survey results showed that on Thursday, 5% respondents utilized a ridesharing application to access the Wonder View Trailhead, increasing to 12% on Saturday. A ridesharing zone would allow passengers to conveniently access the Wonder View Trailhead, but it would hopefully discourage the ridesharing drivers from continuing up the hill along Wonder View Drive. With an easy to notice ridesharing zone, drivers may be more likely to utilize the designated space. During the September data collection weeks, on-street parking occupancy along Lake Hollywood Drive (between Wonder View Drive and the gated DWP area) did reach above 85% in the morning during Week 2. However, due to the proximity of the Wonder View Trailhead, the parking was likely more heavily occupied at the top of the hill. Therefore, a designated ridesharing zone may be beneficial for ridesharing and taxi accessibility.

**Griffith Park Transit Hub**
See Page 27 for more information on the recommended development of a Griffith Park transit hub.

**Benefits**
- Potential for improved traffic flow
- Safer drop-off and pick-up locations available
- Improves public safety

**Implementation**

**Short-Term**
1. Work with popular taxi and ridesharing companies, such as Uber and Lyft, to request ridership data at popular destinations, including Lake Hollywood Park.
2. If possible, collaborate with the ridesharing companies to establish designated drop-off/pick-up zones at Lake Hollywood Park, Lake Hollywood Drive and Canyon Drive as described above.
a. Determine locations that are convenient and easy to notice. Ideally, the designated zones should be immediately adjacent or within a short walking distance to encourage compliance. A traffic study may need to be conducted to determine viable locations.
b. If possible, the ridesharing application should automatically direct drivers to the designated zones.
c. When users request a ride, they could be instructed through the app to meet their driver at the designated zone like at the LAX airport.

3. Implement a significant fine for violating the ridesharing regulations. This fine amount should be posted on signage.
4. Install signage and road markings to indicate the drop-off/pick-up zones.
   a. Consider designing signage to be consistent with the ride service pick up signage at LAX.

**Mld-Term**

1. Utilize any provided or collected data to determine any necessary adjustments to drop-off/pick-up zones. Additionally, the City should continue to implement ridesharing zones in impacted locations.

**Long-Term**

1. Integrate ridesharing opportunities with any future development of a Griffith Park Transit Hub (see page 27).

**Strategy #3. Supplement the Griffith Park Circulation System with an Aerial Tram**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Tourism, Traffic &amp; Congestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations:</td>
<td>Construction impacts, environmental concerns, traffic flow, maintenance and upkeep, partially obstructs Hollywood Sign view</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview**

Many of the Hollywood Sign viewpoints are in fairly inaccessible locations. Visitors often wander into residential neighborhoods in search of a good photo of the Hollywood Sign. The narrow residential streets cannot always safely accommodate the resulting level of congestion. But, the City cannot legally close these streets to public access – Instead, the City must encourage visitors to seek their photos elsewhere. The best way to encourage them may be to give them an option for a significantly better view. **Currently, there is not an up-close view of the front of the sign, which leaves many visitors disappointed.** Many visits wander into residential neighborhoods in search of a good photo of the Hollywood Sign. The narrow residential streets cannot always safely accommodate the resulting level of congestion. But, the City cannot legally close these streets to public access – Instead, the City must encourage visitors to seek their photos elsewhere. The best way to encourage them may be to give them an option for a significantly better view. **Currently, there is not an up-close view of the front of the sign, which leaves many visitors disappointed.**

**Seriously? There is a close up view of the sign. It is at the end of Dirt Mulholland!!**
visitors also find themselves confused or uninformed about the best and legal locations to view the Hollywood Sign or hike in Griffith Park.

If the City were to construct a **Griffith Park Transit Hub**, there would be opportunities to expand **multi-modal access** to serve various areas of the Park. This could include an aerial tram, which would allow the City to create an improved viewpoint of the Hollywood Sign that does not interfere with the residential areas. The aerial tram would become part of the broader circulation system of Griffith Park. A Transit Hub and aerial tram would give the City the ability to promote this centralized location as the ideal way to access Griffith Park and view the Hollywood Sign. It would be easier to understand and navigate for visitors, and it would allow the City to promote alternative modes of transportation.

Currently, there is a significant amount of underutilized land in Griffith Park near the **Martinez Arena**. This area is **conveniently positioned next to the CA-134 Freeway** exit 4, which leads to Forest Lawn Drive. Sitting across from this plot of land is the Department of Water and Power’s (DWP) **Headworks Reservoir**. In a partnership with the DWP, the City could evaluate the feasibility of constructing the Griffith Park Transit Hub at this location. There would be sufficient space for a park and ride lot, loading zones, transit connections, and amenities. There could be connections at this location to Metro bus routes, DASH, community buses like Glendale’s Beeline Bus and the BurbankBus, shuttles and tour buses, bike-share, ridesharing zones, and potentially an aerial tram. From this location, visitors would have easy access to information about the Park and City, and there could be connections to some of the Hollywood Sign viewing locations and popular hiking trails. As explained on page 54, this location could also be considered for a **Hollywood Sign Visitor Center**. Depending on the location of the Visitor Center, it should provide transportation or access to the aerial tram.

The City could consider installing an **aerial tram**, originating from the north or northeast side of the Park, that would travel towards the **base of Mount Lee**. Potential origins to consider are:

- the proposed Griffith Park Transit Hub near the Martinez Arena,
- near the Los Angeles Zoo, or
- near the Wilson & Harding Golf Courses

The aerial tram route could also reach a viewing platform to allow visitors to spend time outside to take their photos with the Hollywood Sign. From this location, visitors would have the **best possible photo opportunity** of the Hollywood Sign. Providing this viewpoint may ultimately have the greatest impact on visitor behavior, and it has the potential to significantly decrease the level of congestion in some of the residential streets.

Outside locations such as Universal City, have been suggested by a number of stakeholders. However, the route from this location would not be entirely over RAP property. Ideally, the aerial tram should not pass over private property to avoid jurisdictional limitations.

It is difficult to imagine an aerial tram that originates at one of the suggested locations and ends anywhere but at the top of Mt. Lee. The top of Mt. Lee provides a view from **BEHIND** the sign. Can a view of the back replace the view of the front? ??

---

**TOP???

What Location??

Better than dirt Mulholland, the Vista and Deronda... where people already are going?
south of Griffith Park. This approach could also relocate the majority of the traffic to the opposite side of the Park. By identifying this as the primary access point, wayfinding signage and freeway exit signs could be adapted to direct visitors to this location.

Even with the potential construction of the aerial transit system, the City should not abandon other public transportation options. Instead, the aerial tram should be developed to supplement the Griffith Park circulation system. A more comprehensive and efficient set of multi-modal options will help reduce the number of drivers in and around Griffith Park.

**Extensive environmental analysis and engineering work** will be required to determine the feasibility of constructing a Griffith Park Transit Hub and an aerial tram. The City should consider conducting a study to evaluate the potential of these recommendations.

The aerial tram origins do not provide a visual of the sign. Generally trams should be straight. Curves add significant construction and environmental costs.

*Was Tonyon Canyon Reclaimed Landfill considered?*
*Less environmental impact as land is reclaimed. *Road access exists (may need some improvement). *Provides easy tram access to top of Mt Lee.*
**Benefits**

- Would encourage the use of public transportation in and around Griffith Park
- The Griffith Park Transit Hub could include connections to a variety of transit options for multi-modal use
- An aerial tram and viewing platform for the Hollywood Sign would likely decrease neighborhood congestion by becoming the optimal viewing point and experience
- A Griffith Park Transit Hub could be easily promoted to visitors as the preferred way to access the Park and Hollywood

**Implementation**

**Short-Term**

1. The City should consider conducting a study to evaluate the feasibility of a Griffith Park Transit Hub and aerial tram.
   a. Environmental impacts will need to be assessed to ensure compliance with CEQA regulations.
   b. An engineering assessment will be required to determine structural viability.
2. If feasible, the study should determine the ideal Transit Hub location and aerial tram route.
   a. The route should not interfere with the cemeteries or any nearby residential areas.
   b. If necessary, the City should work with DWP to ensure feasibility of building around the underground Headworks Reservoir.

**Mid-Term**

1. After a rigorous evaluation process, the project designs should be finalized. This should include plans for sufficient parking, loading zones, transit connections, and amenities.
   a. The City should work with nearby communities like Burbank and Glendale to identify potential public transportation route additions or adjustments for the Transit Hub.

**Long-Term**

1. The City should construct and implement the Griffith Park Transit Hub and the aerial tram. These should be integrated with the overall Griffith Park circulation system.
2. Public transportation routes should be implemented to service this location.
3. Extensive education and outreach should be conducted to promote this Transit Hub as the ideal location to access Griffith Park and view the Hollywood Sign.
4. Ideally, the Hollywood Sign Visitor Center should be located near the Transit Hub. See page 54 for more information.
4. Improve Traffic Flow and ReduceCongestion

Strategy #1. Obscure Views of the Hollywood Sign from the Smaller Vista Points Along Mulholland Highway

Overview
Mulholland Highway, from Lake Hollywood Park to Durand Drive, is often congested with cars and pedestrians. Due to the view of the Hollywood Sign traveling along Mulholland Highway, some drivers stop their car in the roadway illegally to capture a quick photo, blocking traffic or causing a safety hazard. Some visitors even drive their cars onto the dirt vistas.

To improve the traffic flow, the City should **plant the smaller vistas** to obscure the Hollywood Sign view from vehicles that are traveling southbound along Mulholland Highway. **Native plants**, such as the Tecate Cypress or the Tipuana Tipu Tree, should be used to ensure minimal upkeep and watering requirements. The Tipuana Tipu Tree has the added benefit of a full and fast-growing canopy. The City should also consider installing **fencing** to physically prevent vehicles from entering the dirt vista points. This is a more immediate solution to address the issue. However, the plants are still recommended to obscure the view.
Many visitors also walk up the road from Lake Hollywood Park to access the dirt vista points for photo opportunities slightly closer to the Hollywood Sign. With only a small dirt path, some pedestrians choose to walk in the street to traverse to the vistas. This can cause further congestion, and it is a safety concern. Additionally, some pedestrians wander further up into the neighborhood in search of better photo opportunities. If the views of the sign are obscured along Mullholland Highway, this may reduce the number of people walking up Mullholland Highway into the residential areas.

**Benefits**
- Improved traffic flow and safety
- Possible reduction in the number of pedestrians wandering into the neighborhood up the hill

**Implementation**

**Short-Term**
1. Install fencing.
2. Hire a landscape planner to determine the appropriate native plant(s) to adequately obscure the Hollywood Sign from vehicles driving southbound on Mullholland Highway.
3. Consider any potential environmental impacts.
4. Ensure that the chosen plants will require minimal watering and upkeep.
5. Determine the appropriate plant positions.
6. Determine any upkeep requirements.
7. Plant the vistas once the landscape design is finalized and the plan is approved.

**Mid-Term and Long-Term**
1. Continue to maintain the landscaping.

Sidewalks are desperately needed for safety. Once one walks here, this becomes readily apparent.

I hate walking here, dirt sidewalk with road on one side and a cliff on the other.
Strategy #2. Implement a District-Wide Wayfinding Strategy

Overview
Inconsistent signage throughout the neighborhoods can be confusing to visitors. Some signage is inaccurate or misleading. There is no consistent brand or message and it can be complicated for visitors to follow along with the limited existing signage or discern particular routes. The City should take a comprehensive approach to developing a wayfinding strategy. The goal is to minimize the number of drivers that are wandering, lost, or confused and to promote a positive experience.

The strategy should include the development of a consistent and recognizable brand. Ideally, the signage should be consistent with the wayfinding design implemented in downtown Hollywood. However, the design may be tweaked slightly between the locations to distinguish between the various interest points. For example, the wayfinding signage for viewing the Hollywood Sign could incorporate design elements related to the Hollywood Sign. A consistent brand helps ensure reliable messaging for easier understanding.

To develop a wayfinding strategy, the primary interest and vista points, as well as the common routes that drivers traverse to access these locations, should be identified. Once the common and preferred routes are identified, it will be important to outline the road jurisdictions to determine the appropriate groups that will need to be involved for implementation. Signage should be posted along main arterials and in easy to notice locations along the routes. The City can also determine routes that may be able to handle more congestion relative to others. Finally, wayfinding signage can be used to direct visitors to the desired routes. This will impact certain neighborhoods more than others based on prioritization of routes and the identification of ideal locations.

Digital messaging signage can also be an effective tool for the City to promote real-time wayfinding and traveler information. Digital signage can also be more noticeable than typical wayfinding signage. In-ground vehicle counters can relay real-time traffic data and allow the City to promote certain routes during peak congestion periods. Traffic data would also allow the City to better understand traffic impacts and determine any necessary adjustments to the wayfinding approach. The City could also better determine when temporary soft road closures are needed in certain locations to address safety concerns. More information on temporary road closures can be found on page 37.

Category: Traffic & Congestion
Priority: Medium
Cost: $$
Considerations: Visual impact, traffic flow, maintenance and upkeep
Benefits
➢ Potential for improved traffic flow
➢ Ability to influence driver behavior and direction of travel
➢ Consistent signage and messaging may be more noticeable and effective
➢ Recognizable brand could be beneficial for education and outreach campaigns

Implementation
Short-Term
1. Consider hiring a branding consultant to develop the signage and brand. Ideally, the design should be consistent with the design implemented in downtown Hollywood. This will allow the comprehensive wayfinding signage system to have a unified and consistent brand that is easily recognizable.
   a. This branding should be utilized on all directional wayfinding signage related to the Hollywood Sign, and it can be used in any relevant marketing or outreach material.
2. Identify the ideal Hollywood Sign viewing locations throughout the City that will be the least impacted by congestion issues relative to others.
   a. The City should also identify the neighborhoods that do not have access to Hollywood Sign views or hikes to adequately deter visitors.
3. Identify the ideal locations to install signage where drivers will notice the signs and have enough time to react and influence the direction of travel.
4. Install branded wayfinding signage to direct visitors away from inaccessible areas to encourage optimal Hollywood Sign viewing locations.
5. Determine the appropriate locations for digital messaging signs based on peak demand periods. Locations that are heavily impacted with congestion during peak demand periods can benefit from digital messaging that discourages drivers from visiting these locations.
6. Purchase and install the signage.
7. Consider installing in-ground vehicle counters to collect real-time traffic data. This data can be referenced for digital sign messaging purposes.
8. Signage should be utilized during peak demand periods based on historical data and real-time information.

Strategy #3. Discourage Illegal Maneuvers along Mulholland Highway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Traffic &amp; Congestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations</td>
<td>Visual Impact, enforcement, maintenance and upkeep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview
Some cars turn around illegally along Mulholland Highway near Lake Hollywood Park, which can block or slow down traffic during congested periods. Some ridesharing vehicles likely turn around after picking up or dropping off passengers, and other drivers may turn around after capturing their photos of the Hollywood Sign. ‘No U-Turn’ signage could be posted along Mullholland Highway and Canyon Lake Drive to discourage drivers from u-turning. Additionally, the signs could include the fine amount to encourage compliance. Enforcement would be difficult, but the signage could serve as a helpful deterrent to drivers. Another issue along Mullholland Highway is that some drivers pull their car directly onto the dirt vistas. As discussed on page 31, fencing can be installed in these locations to physically prevent this issue.

Benefits
➢ May improve traffic flow
➢ May improve safety

Implementation
Short-Term
1. Install fencing to block drivers from entering the dirt vista points along Mullholland Highway.
2. Install ‘No U-Turn’ signage along Mullholland Highway and Canyon Lake Drive.
   a. Signage should include the fine amount to encourage compliance.

Strategy #4. Collaborate with Google and Waze to Communicate Accurate and Helpful Information

Category: Traffic & Congestion
Priority: Medium
Cost: $
Considerations: City versus company priorities, user base

Overview
Google and Waze are common navigation applications that visitors use to access Griffith Park, hiking trails, and a variety of Hollywood Sign viewing locations. In the past, there have been instances of erroneous information displayed through these applications. Additionally, some of the routing choices may increase congestion to certain neighborhoods. These services learn what people tell them and each other on the internet/social media. The city has a voice, but on the internet so does everyone. If the city says one thing, yet everyone is saying another, backed by geotagged photos, etc., then that’s the information Google wants to provide.
The City should consider designating a staff member to periodically work with Google Maps and Waze staff to ensure that information is accurate and reflective of current conditions. The staff member should be responsible for checking the District 4 area details posted on Google Maps and Waze at least once per month. This routine verification process will help ensure consistency and allow the City to contact Google/Waze to resolve potential issues more promptly. Ideally, the applications should not direct drivers to at-risk areas, including roads that may be temporarily closed on red flag days. More information on the potential for temporary road closures can be found on page 37. **Road closure information** can be utilized to re-route drivers before they get close to the closure site. The City may also consider sharing up-to-date information and data with Google and Waze for problem areas. For example, Waze’s [Connecting Citizens Program](#) may allow the City to have more input about the routing offered. Shared parking restriction data may be helpful to promote parking regulations and information to drivers.

**Benefits**

- Visitors using Google or Waze for navigation or trip planning could be provided with helpful information to improve access, safety, and efficiency
- A strategic partnership between the City and Waze/Google could be beneficial to systematically address traffic and transportation issues

**Implementation**

**Short-Term**

1. Designate a staff member to check the District 4 conditions on Google Maps at least once per month.
   a. Add the task to the staff member’s schedule to ensure consistency and allow the City to contact Google/Waze to resolve potential issues.
   b. Consider increasing the number of staff checks to once per week during peak demand times such as during the Summer or Spring Break.
2. Consider applying to join Waze’s Connecting Citizens Program.
   a. Once involved, the City can choose to share and receive relevant data.

**If other strategies work, this will follow.**
5. Improve Emergency Vehicle Access

Strategy #1. Temporarily Close Narrow Streets with the Highest Safety Risks During Peak Periods

Overview
Due to the roadway width and configuration, congestion can become more of an issue on certain streets during peak weekends and holidays, which inhibits emergency vehicle access. The City cannot permanently restrict public access to any public streets per the California Vehicle Code. However, temporary street closures due to safety concerns may be permitted. Due to the legal complexities of the California Vehicle Code, the City will need to assess the legality of any potential street closures. At a minimum, the City may be able to close roads that are impacted on red flag days. However, some of the peak congestion times may not occur on red flag days. Any further road closures related to safety may require an amendment to the California Vehicle Code.

In 2014, the City of San Francisco temporarily closed Lombard Street, known as the “Crooked Street” on Saturdays and Sundays from June 21st through July 13th, and on Friday, July 4th. This street is a popular destination and its congestion has caused safety hazards for motorists, residents, and pedestrians. For the pilot, SFMTA closed the street to all public vehicle access; only residents, taxis, and emergency vehicles could access the street on the restricted days. The City Attorney should be consulted regarding this option to determine viability in Los Angeles.

Benefits
➢ Improves emergency vehicle access by reducing congestion
➢ Improves public safety

Implementation
Short-Term
1. The City Attorney should be consulted regarding permissible temporary road closures with relation to safety.

Vehicle access is not the same as public access...Pedestrians were allowed access.
a. Any allowable road closures will be dependent on the California Vehicle Code.
b. At a minimum, red flag day closures should be pursued to improve emergency vehicle access during days with high fire risk.

2. The City should identify and allocate the necessary staffing resources to manage road closures and enforcement.

Strategy #2. Convert Some Narrow Two-Way Streets to One-Way Streets

Overview
The City should consider studying the feasibility of converting overcrowded two-way streets into one-way streets, with an emergency vehicle lane. Traffic impacts would have to be thoroughly assessed in a traffic engineering study to determine the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods in any considered locations. A temporary adjustment or pilot may be required to determine the impact on traffic flows. By converting an existing two-lane road to a one-way road, the remaining lane could allow for emergency vehicle access. This may improve emergency vehicle response times significantly. The lane could be blocked off with retractable bollards that would provide emergency vehicle drivers the ability to lower them on-demand. Bollards could also be lowered during non-peak congestion hours however, depending upon on scheduling and coordination this could cause confusion.

Another benefit of roadway conversions is the improved level of pedestrian safety and walking space. By blocking one of the travel lanes from traffic, this emergency vehicle lane could be safely utilized by pedestrians as well. This would be particularly beneficial in areas that do not currently have sidewalks, or where existing sidewalks are narrow.

Benefits
➢ Emergency vehicle access improved
➢ Improves pedestrian access and safety
➢ Eliminates the ability for cars to U-turn
Implementation

Short-Term
1. The City could conduct a traffic engineering study to identify and assess potential roadway conversion locations.
   a. Any location should be thoroughly assessed to determine the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods and traffic flow.
   b. Stakeholder outreach should ideally be a significant component of this study.

Mid-Term
1. Any potential locations identified in the traffic engineering study, with the support of the impacted stakeholders, could be trialed or piloted with temporary cones and signage. This would allow the City to measure traffic congestion patterns and levels before and after the roadway reconfigurations.
   a. The locations to be permanently converted to one-way streets should be finalized.

Long-Term
1. Update roadway paint, install retractable bollards, and updated signage.
   a. Bollards could be lowered during non-peak congestion periods.
   2. Continue to assess traffic flow impacts to determine any necessary adjustments.

6. Increase Parking Efficiency and Compliance Rates

Strategy #1. Adjust Existing Preferential Parking District Time Limits and Days of Operation

Overview  
Canyon-wide, 10am to 5pm?

Data analysis shows that, in some locations, current PPD restrictions do not span all peak demand periods. Some locations may benefit from permit restrictions that apply 365
days per year. The PPD adjustments recommended in this report should not be implemented without the support of the impacted residents. Recommended adjustments are based on Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volume counts, stakeholder feedback, and proposed recommendations that may impact residential parking availability. It is important to take a comprehensive approach to parking management to ensure that parking resources are adequately and efficiently managed for all uses.

**PPD 192**
Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volume counts were conducted along Deronda Drive just south of Mt. Lee Drive during September. Total ADT peaked at 579 vehicles on Sunday, September 17th, but the preceding Friday was not significantly less, at a total of 544 vehicles. Additionally, 333 vehicles counted on Monday, September 4th and 405 on the Monday the 18th. In addition to the ADT counts, pedestrian counts were conducted at the Deronda Drive Trailhead. In both weeks, more pedestrians were observed on Monday than on Friday. Pedestrian counts peaked at 467 on Sunday, September 17th. The high ADT volumes and pedestrian counts indicate that the residents around Deronda Drive could benefit from the expansion PPD 192 to include weekday restrictions and enforcement.

**PPD 195**
In September, ADT volume counts were also collected along Mullholland Highway within PPD 195. ADT peaked on Saturday, September 16th at 992 vehicles, but there were still a significant number of vehicles counted on the weekdays of data collection. For example, the day before on Friday, September 15th, there was an ADT volume count of 785. With the amount of traffic passing through this area, PPD 195 may benefit from weekday restrictions.

**Lake Hollywood Park**
The recommendation to replace some parking on Canyon Lake Drive with ridesharing zones could increase the on-street parking occupancy rates in the surrounding residential streets. Additionally, if the City decides to implement paid parking around Lake Hollywood Park, this may cause further spillover parking. Based on data collection results, there may be sufficient supply to handle this issue as it is today. However, the City and nearby residents may decide to take a proactive approach to managing spillover parking. The residential streets near Canyon Lake Drive may benefit from PPD restrictions. These streets include Innsdale Drive, Lake Hollywood Drive, Tahoe Drive, and Arrowhead Drive. During September data collection, on-street occupancy rates in this area were higher on Sunday than Friday and Monday during Week 2, but during Week 1 (Labor Day Weekend), Monday experienced the highest parking occupancy rates. This data indicates that the residential areas around Lake Hollywood Park may benefit from weekend and holiday PPD restrictions.

**Canyon Drive**
If the City proceeds with the suggested implementation of paid parking near the Brush Canyon Trail (page 44), there could be spillover parking impacts in the surrounding
residential streets. Currently there are no PPD restrictions along Canyon Drive or the surrounding streets.

**Benefits**
- Safeguards the neighborhoods from spillover parking and the influx of visitors during peak periods
- May prepare residential areas for the potential impact of proposed recommendations

**Implementation Guide**

**Short-Term**
1. Engage impacted residents about potential PPD boundary and operating hour adjustments to get community feedback and solidify a plan.
2. Identify proper enforcement resources for expanded hours of operation.
3. Implement updated PPD regulations.
   a. Install updated signage.

**Long-Term**
1. Continue to assess parking occupancy rates in impacted residential areas to determine any necessary adjustments.

**Strategy #2. Consolidate Preferential Parking District Regulations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations:</td>
<td>Enforcement adjustments, signage, determining optimal operating hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview**
Existing PPD zones have a variety of operating hours and days. The inconsistent policies are more difficult for drivers to understand and it complicates parking enforcement. The City could consider consolidating PPD zone restrictions so that operating hours are consistent. With the current program, permit holders are also restricted to parking within one zone only. Residential permit policies could be enhanced to allow residents to park within any PPD restricted area rather than being restricted to a single PPD zone. This could allow residents to bypass the need for a guest permit when visiting other residential areas. For consistency, PPD restrictions could apply 7 days per week in all
locations. However, depending on the severity of spillover parking and tourism impacts, each location could have a different level of enforcement on weekdays versus weekends to address the peak demand periods. The option of converting all PPD zones to one type of permit would need to be thoroughly vetted with the City and with the residents.

**Benefits**
- Simplified PPD restrictions are easier to understand and enforce
- Potentially more convenient for residents
- May allow residents to bypass the need for guest permits in other PPD zones
- Standardized signage
- May be easier to adjust PPD boundaries when necessary

**Implementation Guide**

**Short-Term**
1. The City should engage in stakeholder outreach to determine whether residents would prefer existing or consolidated PPD restrictions.
2. Residents should be involved in deciding on potential standardized PPD restrictions.
3. Upon agreement, the City should identify the areas that will be impacted and will require updated signage.
4. The City should update any necessary parking ordinances to streamline PPD regulations.
5. Impacted residents should be notified about upcoming program adjustments.
6. Parking enforcement beats should be adjusted to accommodate updated PPD restrictions and operating hours.

**Mid-Term**
1. Updated PPD signage should be created and installed where necessary.
2. Enforcement beats should be adapted to ensure consistent enforcement.
3. The City should continue to solicit resident feedback to assess the new program and identify any potential areas for improvement.

**Long-Term**
1. Continue to assess parking occupancy rates in impacted residential areas to determine any necessary adjustments.
Strategy #3. Implement Paid Parking and/or Time Limits in Popular Tourist Destinations

Overview
Paid parking can be an effective management tool to encourage parking space turnover in impacted areas. Additionally, paid parking may encourage some visitors to utilize alternative modes of transportation. The industry standard for the target occupancy rate is 85%. At this level, there are typically enough vacant parking spaces to minimize congestion from drivers searching for a space. At the same time, the 85% rate ensures that a location is not providing too much parking supply, which can be considered an inefficient and costly use of valuable land. Occupancy rates have effectively been managed using paid parking programs. Paid parking revenue can be an opportunity for cities to invest monies directly within the impacted community and provide program enhancements. For District 4, paid parking revenue could be dedicated for neighborhood mitigations, and it could help support projects or programs that improve access, mobility, and safety in and around Griffith Park and the surrounding neighborhoods.

Single-Space vs. Multi-Space Meters
The convenience and ease of use of single-space meters is what makes them effective for dense, high-turnover areas. Smart single-space meters accept credit card (and therefore debit card) payments and are enabled with back office tools and real-time access to information and data. This would allow the City to monitor the meters and be notified of any maintenance issues. The selected equipment must meet the Payment Card Industry (PCI) security standards for credit card transactions to make sure only the last four digits of each card number is stored. Additionally, all payment information can be tracked and audited to ensure proper revenue reconciliation during collections. Most single-space meter vendors offer meter management systems to edit the display screen, manage rate structures and run reports. Smart single-space meters range in price from around $400 to $600 per meter mechanism plus approximately $250 to $400 for the meter housing and pole (not including shipping). There is an ongoing $6 to $8 per meter per month for data management in addition to transaction fees.

Multi-space pay stations, depending on configurations, are approximately $8,500 per unit with monthly data management fees of approximately $70.00 per pay station per month. This pay station rate estimate does not include installation and freight. The City should consider including the optional added features such as a motion-controlled light bar and
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a tilt board security feature with a siren. The typical pay station vendor also provides a meter management system that provides **real-time access** to pay station information and maintenance support requirements. Additionally, following year one, the City should budget approximately $30.00 per month for each pay station warranty. While not required, the warranties are recommended to safeguard the program and ensure equipment performance and system uptime. Pay stations typically **support 7 to 12 on-street parking spaces**, depending upon geographic conditions. A typical off-street surface lot requires 1 to 4 pay stations, depending upon the configuration and number of access points.

There are three main operational configurations for multi-space pay stations: pay and display, pay by space, and pay by plate:

- **Pay and Display**: The driver parks, purchases parking session time at the pay station, and then returns to their vehicle to display the receipt on their dashboard.
- **Pay by Space**: The driver parks in a numbered space, and then pays at the pay station using the parking space number. The driver is not required to return to their vehicle because their payment is electronically tied to their space number. Parking enforcement is able to use a web application to verify payment status by parking space number.
- **Pay by Plate**: Similar to pay by space, but the driver enters their license plate number at the pay station to record their payment. This method does not require drivers to return to their car as well and, similarly, parking enforcement verifies payment status by license plate using a web application.

**Canyon Drive**

The City could consider implementing paid parking near the entrance to the Brush Canyon Trail within the Park on Canyon Drive and within the two parking lots. The City could implement pay stations that allow visitors to pay a small hourly fee or pay a maximum daily rate, like the Griffith Observatory parking lot, to park for the day while hiking. A pay by plate configuration would require visitors to enter in their license plate number, and the pay stations can be integrated with law enforcement for added security. Paid parking revenue could be used for **enhanced security**. Ideally, the surrounding neighborhoods should be safeguarded with PPD restrictions to prevent spillover parking. More information on PPD recommendations can be found on page 39.
Lake Hollywood Park

Another location to consider for paid parking is surrounding Lake Hollywood Park. Parking meters could be a source of revenue for investment in neighborhood improvement projects. Paid parking may increase spillover parking into the surrounding residential streets, which is why a PPD has been recommended for this area (page 40). Based on the parking occupancy data collected in September, there is likely sufficient parking supply to handle spillover parking for now, but if this becomes a problem, PPDs restrictions could be added. Additionally, the recommendation to replace some parking on Canyon Lake Drive with ridesharing zones could raise the on-street parking occupancy rates in the surrounding area (page 24).

Beachwood Drive

Paid parking or time limits could also be considered along Beachwood Drive near the proposed sidewalk bulb-out (page 8) and surrounding the Beachwood Market. The average parking occupancy for the Beachwood Study Area during data collection was approaching 85% at certain points during the day. Beachwood Drive from Woodhaven Drive to Belden Drive, and from Westshire Drive to Glen Oak Street came under the heaviest strain in terms of parking availability. Both street segments exceeded 85% occupancy during the 9:00am and 12:00pm time periods. Additionally, Belden Drive from Beachwood to Woodshire Drives is another location where parking availability should be monitored. At certain times occupancy at this location came close to exceeding 80%. With the proposed installation of a sidewalk bulb-out, parking spaces will likely be lost. Marked 5-minute time limited spaces are recommended that are adjacent to the sidewalk bulb-out to provide photo-takers a place to park for a short amount of time. Ideally, these time limited spaces should be on the same side of the road as the bulb-out to minimize the number of pedestrians crossing the street. In addition, the City could consider implementing 2-hour time limits immediately surrounding the commercial area to promote turnover and create more availability for patrons.

Benefits

➢ Paid parking can create a revenue stream for the communities for investment in program and community enhancements
➢ May promote parking space turnover and efficient utilization
➢ Could encourage more public transit, ridesharing, or carpooling use
Implementation

Short-Term and Mid-Term

1. Based on parking occupancy data, stakeholder feedback, and the proposed recommendations, the City should identify the location(s) for paid parking and/or time limits.

2. Begin education and outreach about the upcoming implementation of paid parking and/or time limits in the identified location(s). This should include notification of the planned rate structure and how to use the paid parking equipment.

3. Consider a paid parking pilot program. Parking technology vendors typically offer municipalities a 60-day pilot to test their equipment solutions. The upfront costs would include shipping, installation, training, paper (if applicable) and software fees. If the pilot is successful, the City would have the opportunity to purchase the paid parking technology at a discounted rate, or begin a 3-year leasing agreement.

4. Draft and issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) for paid parking technology. Equipment should primarily accept credit/debit card only and pay stations should be in the ‘Pay by Plate’ configuration. The vendor solicitation should be a turnkey solution that includes the following services:
   a. Communications testing,
   b. Installation,
   c. Level 2 maintenance support,
   d. Signage, and
   e. System testing

5. Parking technology should be installed.
   a. A thorough assessment by the selected vendor should be conducted to determine the specific locations for the pay stations or single space poles. Safety and accessibility should be considered in the evaluation.
   b. Ground preparation: When choosing the equipment locations, the level of traffic, customer accessibility, and safety should be considered. The pay stations should also be mounted on concrete with appropriate anchoring.
   c. Accessibility: In order for the paid parking equipment to be ADA compliant, they must have a clear floor space of at least 30” x 48” for wheelchairs.

Strategy #4. Increase Citation Amounts in High-Impact Tourist Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations:</td>
<td>Enforcement, legislative ability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview
By increasing citation fine amounts, the City may be able to achieve higher compliance rates with parking, driving, and smoking regulations. Instead of raising fine amounts for the whole City, there may be an opportunity to update the ordinances to apply a higher amount only to certain high-impact locations, like moving violations in a freeway construction zone. This should be considered based on the level of safety impacts that may result. Additionally, because certain areas are impacted more heavily by tourism, the citation revenue differential could be allocated to fund additional enforcement resources. Even if the risk of being caught is low, some drivers and pedestrians may be less likely to take risks if the fine is higher, especially if the fine amount is included on posted signage as a deterrent. The City should consider raising the citation amount of violations such as red curb violations, no u-turning, and no smoking regulations.

Benefits
➢ Improved compliance with posted signage
➢ Improved public safety
➢ Citation revenue resulting from high-impact locations could fund increased enforcement resources or program enhancements in impacted areas

Implementation
Short-Term
1. Work with the City Attorney to determine the viability of establishing high-impact tourist zones to be eligible for higher citation fine amounts.
2. Determine appropriate fine amounts that will properly encourage compliance.
3. Identify and establish high-impact zones based on factors like the level of tourism, congestion, and public safety risks.

Mid-Term
1. To encourage compliance, posted signage should indicate citation fine amounts for the adjusted fees.

Strategy #5. Increase Parking Enforcement in Impacted Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations</td>
<td>Staffing and equipment needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Overview**

Most of the visitors driving into the neighborhoods and congesting the streets are doing so to try and find the best photo opportunities of the Hollywood Sign. Any parking or standing restrictions that are put in place within the neighborhoods are ultimately difficult to enforce. This is because visitors may just pull over their car to take a photo for a short amount of time. Without having enforcement officers posted on every block throughout the day, many visitors will can violate the rules with minimal chance of being caught. The City could increase parking enforcement staff resources or assign existing staff directly to impacted areas during peak times. Part-time staff could be utilized primarily during weekends and holidays to provide additional resources.

The following map highlights the areas where parking citations were issued in 2016 (Figure 15). 17,432 citations were issued in 2016 for the area shown in the map. While it is valuable to see where citations were commonly issued, it is important to consider that this data is based upon the enforcement staffing and routes utilized in 2016. Any adjustments to the enforcement operation could impact which areas receive a higher volume of citations. Furthermore, the lack of citations in certain areas does not necessarily indicate that there was parking compliance. There could have been violations occurring that were not captured. An increased frequency of beats/routes in impacted areas throughout the neighborhood could be considered. Locations to consider include Beachwood Drive, Deronda Drive, Ledgewood Drive, Canyon Lake Drive, Mullholland Highway, Wonder View Drive, and Lake Hollywood Drive. Enforcement areas should be prioritized based on safety concerns.
NOTE
Three highly concentrated areas (Note overlapping markings)
- Mulholland Hwy
- Deronda
- Upper Beachwood

Figure 15. Citation Issued in 2016
Benefits
➢ Higher compliance rates
➢ Increases in citation revenue
➢ Improves public safety

Implementation
Short-Term
1. Existing enforcement staff beats/routes can be evaluated to determine any adjustments that would increase the level of enforcement in impacted areas.
   a. Areas that are considered for increased enforcement should be prioritized based upon safety and congestion levels.
   b. The City should also consider how program changes, based upon the recommendations in this report, may impact the need for enforcement in certain areas.

Mid-Term and Long-Term
1. If the City proceeds with the implementation of paid parking in the locations recommended in this report (page 43), a portion of the paid parking revenue could be allocated for additional enforcement staff.
2. The City should continue to evaluate citation data to determine any necessary adjustments to enforcement routes/beats.

7. Actively Manage and Provide Optimized Visitor Opportunities

Strategy #1. Enhance the most Accessible and Safe Hollywood Sign Viewing Locations and Hikes

| Category: | Tourism |
| Priority:  | High    |
| Cost:      | $$      |
| Considerations: | Traffic flow, education and outreach, access and congestion |

Overview
Many visitors wander through the neighborhoods in search for Hollywood Sign photo opportunities. An effective way to reduce congestion in the neighborhoods may be to
motivate the visitors to capture their pictures elsewhere, therefore **dispersing the impact of tourism**. Rather than trying to prohibit certain locations, which can be difficult to enforce, **influencing behavior with positive experiences** could be more effective. The ideal locations for hiking to and taking photos of the Hollywood Sign should ultimately be determined by the City based on accessibility, safety, and parking availability. Then, the focus can be on making sure that these designated locations will be attractive and safe for visitors.

Visitors can be influenced to take their photos of the Hollywood Sign and hike in certain areas using **art installations** that will improve the photos and make them into their own recognizable destinations. Each designated location could have a different theme or style. Some potential installations could be a large frame for the Sign or colorful pedestals for guests to stand on. For example, the Black Sun sculpture within Volunteer Park in Seattle is a popular destination to take a picture of the Space Needle. This is because the sculpture, from the right angle, frames the Space Needle from afar.

The proposed wayfinding strategy could also provide a method for the City to direct drivers to desired locations. More information on the wayfinding strategy can be found on page 33.

**Lake Hollywood Park**

There is a view of the Hollywood Sign from Lake Hollywood Park and the vista point where Canyon Lake Drive transitions into Mullholland Highway. This is a common location that to take photos of the sign. There are ways to enhance this location with amenities that will improve the visitor experience (see page 62). The recommendation to plant the smaller vistas could improve visitor safety and reduce the impact of tourism on the residential areas up the hill (page 31).

**Brush Canyon Trail**

Canyon Drive leads to the Brush Canyon Trailhead, where hikers have another opportunity to reach views of the Hollywood Sign. This hike is considerably longer than some of the other hiking locations mentioned in this report. The City should consider enhancing this area, potentially with permanent restroom facilities (page 62) and a sidewalk (page 12). Additionally, the recommended implementation of paid parking may encourage turnover and allow the City to fund security and safety improvements (page 44).

**Wonder View Trail**

From the Wonder View Trailhead, hikers can reach a view of the backside of the Hollywood Sign only. This location is more accessible than others because of the amount of parking spaces along Lake Hollywood Drive. Unlike in other destinations, paid parking is not suggested along Lake Hollywood Drive. With the proposed relocation of the Wonder View Trailhead (page 18), this becomes one of the more accessible and safe locations for hiking. Lake Hollywood Drive, at this location, is not a residential street, which minimizes the impact on the residents.
Griffith Park
Next to the Griffith Observatory, in Griffith Park, there is an iconic view of the Hollywood Sign, and it should be promoted as among the best locations to view the sign. This location does not require a hike and is easily accessible. It is also already supported by the existing DASH shuttle system that connects with the Metro’s Sunset/Vermont stations, as well as ridesharing locations. Viewing the sign in this location provides the added appeal of visiting the Griffith Observatory in the same trip, which also provides some of the best views of the City basin. By promoting the Griffith Park experience, this may encourage some visitors to avoid the surrounding residential streets.

Ford Theatre Trail
Council District 4 is currently working with County Supervisor Sheila Kuehl’s office on funding the development of a new hiking trail. The Ford Theatre Trail project will provide spectacular views of the Hollywood Sign, Hollywood Reservoir, Griffith Observatory, Hollywood Bowl, Downtown Los Angeles, and the Pacific Ocean, among many other landmarks. A portion of the trail will be ADA accessible and facilities will include shaded rest areas, ADA compliant restrooms, and parking.

Hollywood and Highland Mall
It is important that this location is ‘picture worthy’ to compensate for the fact that it is a further distance from the Hollywood Sign than the neighborhood streets. There should be a focus on the complete visitor experience at this location, with more to attract visitors than just a viewing area. Artistic installations and unique food and art vendors at the location could help make it a desirable destination to view the sign. It will be important for the City to promote this location online, through travel organizations, at the airport, and in flyers.

What about the two photographically best locations?

Dirt Mulholland
Deronda Gate

Both of these locations are where people are currently going. The reason is that these locations offer the best photographic opportunities of the sign. This is why we see a high concentration of parking enforcement at those areas.

Why are these most desirable locations not discussed?

Common sense and past experience tells us that a fair number of people will continue to go where the best photo is, even if provided other, more convenient locations.
Benefits

➢ Could reduce the demand for some problem areas G, H?
➢ Amenities and strategies could improve visitor safety
➢ Viewing the Hollywood Sign could become a more positive experience

A more positive experience for whom? For many, its positive because its not so easy to get that close up photo. It’s special to them. It is important to keep in mind that there will always be a difference in pictures based on location, and therefore a difference in the desireability of locations.
Implementation

Short-Term
1. Implementation steps are dependent on the City’s identification of ideal hiking and Hollywood Sign viewing locations. The City should work to enhance a variety of locations to improve accessibility, safety, and improve the visitor experience.
2. Safety enhancements should be prioritized in the short-term.
3. The City could hire local artists to develop design plans for any artistic installations that may enhance visitors’ photos.

Mid-Term
1. Continue to implement amenities, safety enhancements, and art projects.

Strategy #2. Develop a Hollywood Sign Visitor Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations:</td>
<td>Construction, environmental impacts, staffing, upkeep, access, traffic flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview
Currently there is not a visitor center where tourists can visit to learn about the Hollywood Sign and the history of the area. A Hollywood Sign Visitor Center should ideally have a view of the Hollywood Sign, but at a minimum, it should include an option to take a shuttle to view the Hollywood Sign. Binoculars could be provided for an up-close look. The Visitor Center should be designed like an information center or museum with information about the history of the Hollywood Sign and the community. Interactive exhibits could be provided for children. Brochures, maps, and information about Los Angeles and Griffith Park shuttles should be available in multiple languages. The Visitor Center could have a small admission fee.

One location that could be considered as a short-term solution is near the Hollywood and Vine Metro Station near the Vine Street Garage. There is a vacant storefront and the DOT parking garage has 5 levels. This location could be ideal because of its proximity to Griffith Park, and the nearby public transportation routes. The existing bus loading zones could also be utilized for a shuttle route from this location. When determining a
location, the City should also consider proximity to downtown, the Walk of Fame, Metro transit lines, and hotels.

A shuttle could be utilized to connect the Visitor Center with a future aerial tram route. This would allow for a more comprehensive and connective transportation system that ties in the visitor center and aerial tram. If the City proceeds with the recommended development of a Griffith Park Transit Hub near the Martinez Arena (page 27), this could eventually become the ideal location for the Visitor Center.

**Benefits**

- Promotional opportunity for the City to educate and inform visitors.
- May decrease the number of visitors entering the neighborhoods to see the Hollywood Sign
- Revenue from the Visitor Center could be allocated to support community mitigations.

**Implementation**

**Short-Term**

1. Identify and secure a location for a Hollywood Sign Visitor Center.
2. Develop center layout designs, informational content, and interactive exhibits.

**Mid-Term**

1. Construct the Visitor Center and hire/train staff.
2. Begin education and outreach campaign about the Visitor Center, as well as public transportation and/or shuttle route opportunities.

**Long-Term**

1. Eventually, the Visitor Center should be tied into any future aerial tram system (page 54). This would likely be a shuttle that patrons can utilize to reach an aerial tram access point. This would give visitors to ability to view the Hollywood Sign up close, while connecting them to a broader transportation network.

**Strategy #3. Build a Hollywood Sign Viewing Platform**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations:</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, maintenance and upkeep, traffic flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Viewing platforms already exist. Hollywood/Vine and Griffith Observatory. Yet, people still go the illegal vista, dirt Mulholland, and Deronda. *Why would this change?*
Overview
Currently there is no formalized location for the City to promote as the ideal Hollywood Sign viewing spot. Unfortunately, some of the best views of the Hollywood Sign can be found within residential neighborhoods, located along winding narrow streets. This causes an issue with neighborhood congestion, which inhibits emergency vehicle access and causes a safety concern. The City should consider constructing a Hollywood Sign viewing platform that can be promoted to visitors.

One location to consider is along Mount Hollywood Drive. The Recreation and Parks Department previously opened a portion of Mt. Hollywood Drive to traffic, and had mixed reactions from the public. The Department should consider the impacts that a viewing platform in this location may have on bicyclists, pedestrians, and traffic congestion. This viewing platform could be an exciting experience for visitors, and could help encourage more people to view the Sign from within the Park rather than within the residential areas. While this would be an expensive project, it could help mitigate traffic impacts and improve the visitor experience. Any revenue resulting from a viewing platform could be allocated to support neighborhood mitigations. Please see pictures of the sign from this location. It will be hard to convince people that Mt Hollywood is the ideal viewing location.

Another option to consider is that the viewing platform could be constructed in conjunction with the proposed aerial tram (page 27). This could be a tremendous asset for the City to promote to visitors, therefore decreasing neighborhood congestion. The aerial tram could give visitors the ability to exit their pods onto a viewing platform to take pictures and enjoy the view of the sign. This route and platform would not be accessible by foot, and it should be positioned to not interfere with the nearby residential areas.

Where could this platform be located? See end of report.

Benefits
➢ Could become a draw for the Park and it could help mitigate the impact of tourism in the neighborhoods
➢ The City has the opportunity to allocate revenue from the viewing platform for program enhancements and neighborhood mitigations for tourism

Implementation
Short-Term
1. The City should conduct the necessary environmental and engineering analyses to determine the feasibility of constructing a viewing platform in either of the two proposed locations.

Long-Term
1. If the City proceeds with the recommendation to build an aerial tram, a viewing platform should be constructed as part of this plan. Otherwise, the City could consider constructing the viewing platform elsewhere in the park, such as along Mount Hollywood Drive.

The most logical location for the tram terminus would be at the top of Mt. Lee, which is behind the sign. Where can we find a viewing platform, accessible by a tram and in front of the sign, that does not interfere with the neighborhood?
Strategy #4. Implement a Hollywood Sign Art Program

**Overview**

A significant amount of the visitors traveling through the neighborhoods are in search of a picture with the Hollywood Sign. This results in increased neighborhood congestion, therefore reducing safety and limiting emergency vehicle access. The City could consider establishing a Hollywood Sign Art Program to implement several Hollywood Sign replicas at selected locations. Similar to how the iconic “I Amsterdam” monument was installed at the Amsterdam Airport, additional Hollywood Signs replicas would allow visitors to take up-close pictures with the Sign in other locations, thus reducing the amount of traffic for the original Sign. These Hollywood Signs could be decorated by local artists, with the designs possibly voted on by the community. The City’s Department of Cultural Affairs could potentially administer the program. Signs could be installed in popular tourist destinations such as the LAX airport, Hollywood Boulevard, the Farmer’s Market, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Hollywood Bowl, and within local parks.

**Benefits**

- Opportunity to promote local neighborhood attractions, culture, and local artists
- Would give visitors more options for photos with a Hollywood Sign, which could decrease the amount of congestion surrounding the original sign
- Visitors would have opportunities to take up-close photos with sign replicas

**Implementation**

**Short-Term**

1. Council Office staff should collaborate with the City’s Department of Cultural Affairs, or another relevant department, to develop a Hollywood Sign Art Program.
4. Through a public review process, the final designs should be selected.
   a. Each community could have their own set of potential designs, to be assessed through an online poll.

**Limited effect.**

A fake one is a fake one. It’s too gimmicky.
Mld-Term
1. Blank replica Hollywood Signs should be developed for the winning artists to decorate.
2. Decorated signs should be installed in their respective locations.
3. An education and outreach campaign, including social media outreach (see page 60) should be utilized to promote these alternative sign locations.

Strategy #5. Replicate the Sign on the Other Side of the Mountain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Traffic &amp; Congestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations:</td>
<td>Visual Impact, community buy-in, traffic flow, wayfinding, environmental impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview
Neighborhood congestion results in areas with a view of the Hollywood Sign from visitors seeking a photo opportunity. Not only is congestion a nuisance for the residents, but it also inhibits emergency vehicle access and reduces pedestrian safety. Currently, the best views of the sign are in impacted locations, typically along narrow residential roads. For example, 72% of those surveyed at the Mullholland Highway Vista were there to capture a photo of the Hollywood Sign, and this vista point can only be accessed by traversing through residential areas. Visitors sometimes walk along narrow roads with blind turns to access the viewpoints, and some popular areas lack sidewalks or the appropriate pedestrian infrastructure. Tour vans also have difficulty navigating the roads and turning around at dead ends.

The City could construct another Hollywood Sign on the north side of the park or on the LA Zoo side of the Park. The backdrop behind the sign would still look similar to the original if it is located on the mountain. This would give the City the opportunity to promote the replica sign viewpoints as more accessible locations for photos than in the residential neighborhoods south of the Park. One downside of this strategy is that it would take away from the history of the original Hollywood Sign and Hollywoodland. For educational and historical purposes, it may make the most sense to maintain only the original sign. An additional sign is proposed as a strategy to consider because of its potential to improve safety and reduce neighborhood congestion.

This should only be implemented if Universal pays a significant amount to LA. This would be a significant asset for them, and the people of LA, more than the shareholders of Universal should benefit.
**Benefits**
- An additional sign could spread out the impact of photo-seekers to both sides of the park
- Could decrease congestion on some of the impacted neighborhood streets

*A fake is still a fake. Exacerbates “LA is so fake” narrative. Bad for our city image.*

**Implementation**

**Short-Term**
1. A replica Hollywood Sign location should be identified to minimize community impact.
   a. Environmental impacts should be evaluated.
2. The City should solicit public feedback and stakeholder input about the potential of constructing a second Hollywood Sign.

**Long-Term**
1. If the City decides to proceed with a second Hollywood Sign, the Sign should be constructed in the longer-term, along with an education and outreach campaign.

**Strategy #6. Support a Dedicated Hollywood Sign Website**

*Already exists: www.hollywoodsign.org*

**Category:** Tourism  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Cost:** $  
**Considerations:** Developing a cohesive message and comprehensive strategy, management and upkeep

**Overview**
For information on how to view the Hollywood Sign, visitors solicit a variety of websites, which have a mix of information. Sometimes this information is inaccurate or it can direct visitors through residential streets, further intensifying the safety and congestion issues that the City is aiming to combat. When visitors search for how to view the Hollywood Sign, the top result on the common search engines should ideally be a website that provides **accurate, up to date, and reliable information.** This could be a City-managed website, or an existing website, such as the Hollywood Sign Trust website, which could be improved and promoted. The City should **work with travel sites** to provide a link to the website.  

*Maintained by the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce.*
Benefits
➢ This would create a consolidated place for helpful information related to the Hollywood Sign
➢ The website could help reduce the number of visitors in certain locations by promoting ideal routes and viewing points
➢ Opportunity to involve residents and stakeholders in defining content

Implementation

Short-Term
1. Determine the appropriate City department or external group to manage a Hollywood Sign website.
2. The City should work with stakeholders to determine priorities and develop website content.
   a. Content should be available in several languages.
3. A web designer should be hired to incorporate the City’s wayfinding brand and the appropriate outreach information. The website should be easily navigated and the display should adapt to a variety of viewing platforms including mobile phones.

Mid-Term and Long-Term
1. Advertising monies could be dedicated to ensure the Hollywood Sign website is a top search result on the common search engines.
2. Content should continually be reviewed and refreshed to ensure that information is up-to-date and consistent with the City’s safety and mobility goals.

Strategy #7. Implement a Social Media Marketing and Outreach Campaign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations:</td>
<td>Traffic flow, increased tourism in certain areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview
Recently, social media and online blogs have started to play a significant role in how visitors plan their trips. Often times, these sites promote information that may not coincide with the City’s goals and objectives for access, safety, and mobility. The City could use this platform as an opportunity to reach a wide audience of visitors and provide helpful travel information and tips. The Intercept Survey confirmed that social media and blogs
had a significant role in how visitors learned about each of the destinations. On Saturday, the majority (42%) of visitors that were surveyed at the Wonder View Trailhead heard about the location from social media. Additionally, on Thursday at Lake Hollywood Park, 19% of those surveyed learned of the location from social media, and an additional 11% heard about it from a blog or YouTube.

Many large brands retain social media bloggers to feature their products as a marketing tactic. The City could consider setting aside a portion of paid parking revenue for Hollywood Sign access and viewing marketing. Part of this fund could be used to pay local bloggers to feature the recommended viewing areas on their websites, YouTube channels, or social media accounts. Additionally, any alternative sign locations per the recommended Hollywood Sign Art Program (page 57) should be incorporated into the social media outreach campaign. This could be done partly through a hashtag campaign to gain visibility.

**Benefits**

➢ Will allow the City to educate more visitors during their trip planning process
➢ Could allow the City to better promote ideal viewing locations
➢ Would allow the City to reach a broader audience of visitors

**Implementation**

**Short-Term**

1. The City should consider allocating a portion of marketing dollars towards a social media and marketing outreach campaign.
2. Marketing staff should work to identify social media bloggers and influences with large following bases that could feature Griffith Park hikes and Hollywood Sign viewing locations through their platforms.

**Mid-Term**

1. Marketing staff should begin outreach to identified social media bloggers and influencers.
   a. Staff should collaborate with them to develop marketing and outreach plans. Staff should consider the hikes and/or Hollywood Sign viewing locations to be featured.
   b. Bloggers should be instructed to discuss and recommended safety tips, parking regulations, and/or public transportation routes.
   c. Appropriate compensation rates should be identified and proposed.
2. Any alternative sign locations per the recommended Hollywood Sign Art Program (page 57) should be incorporated into the social media outreach campaign.

**Long-Term**

1. Continue to collaborate with social media bloggers and influences to reach a broader audience for education and outreach purposes.
Strategy #8. Install Restroom Facilities at Key Locations

Overview
Currently there are no permanent restroom facilities located at Lake Hollywood Park or near the Brush Canyon Trail. These areas have proven to be popular destinations and in the past there have been issues with public defecation. To improve the visitor experience and address sanitation and health concerns, the City should consider installing permanent restroom facilities in these locations.

During the December Intercept Surveys, 80% of those surveyed on Thursday and Saturday at the Brush Canyon Trailhead indicated that they were planning to stay at the location for more than an hour. This is likely due to the length of the hiking trail. This highlights the need for a restroom facility in this location. At Lake Hollywood Park, of those surveyed on Thursday and Saturday, 57% said they were planning to stay between 15 minutes and an hour. This indicates that many of the Park visitors want to stay and enjoy the park, rather than just snapping a quick photo and leaving. Amenities like a restroom facility could improve their visit.

To reduce the impact, the restroom facilities can be designed to use solar power. Sustainable restrooms would allow the City to conserve water and energy. Ideally, the system should be low flow, and use a limit amount of water per flush.

Category: Safety
Priority: High
Cost: $$
Considerations: Vagrancy, cleaning and upkeep, environmental impact
Some City officials have expressed concern about illicit behavior in bathrooms, which is why the facilities should be designed to deter drug use. Fluorescent blue lighting is sometimes used in public restrooms to discourage injection drug use by making it difficult for drug users to see their veins. Additionally, bathroom stall doors should offer minimal privacy. While this is not ideal, it is better to offer semi-private restrooms than none at all. The City should also make sure to secure the restroom facilities at night when the Parks are closed.

Benefits
- Improvement to the visitor experience
- Will help address sanitation and safety concerns

Implementation

Short-Term Steps
1. Identify a location that can accommodate the utilities and sewage requirements in Lake Hollywood Park and in Griffith Park near the Brush Canyon Trailhead.
2. Begin the facility design process. It is recommended that the restroom facility in the Observatory parking lot be considered as an example for process and design.
3. Consult with City planners to confirm if an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be required to meet CEQA guidelines. If environmental analysis is required, the City should proceed with the review process straightaway.

Mid-Term Steps
1. Finalize restroom facility designs.
2. Complete any necessary environmental analysis required for each location.
4. During construction, the City should identify the necessary staffing resources for cleaning and maintaining the additional facilities. Additionally, staff should be allocated for locking and unlocking the restrooms for security purposes.
Conclusion

The seven goals presented in this CSR are intended to improve access, mobility, and safety in and around Griffith Park and around the Hollywood Sign. The outlined strategies were developed based upon a series of site visits, extensive stakeholder feedback, data analysis results, and industry best practices.

The feasibility and prioritization of the strategies will ultimately be dependent on the City's ongoing review, public feedback, environmental impacts, engineering viability, and estimated costs.

In the coming weeks and months, Councilmember Ryu and DIXON will be meeting with City officials and departments to discuss the viability of the various strategies presented in the CAP, as well as next steps. In addition, the City will continue to seek input and feedback from the community.
Alexander Heineman

Sat, Feb 10, 2018 at 8:08 AM

To: David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Michael Zelniker <m_zelniker@lacity.org>

Thanks for your mass email, Councilmember,

What are you doing to protect our community and the continuing issue we have with Bronson Canyon Park. It has gotten out of control and we need help.

Please don’t tell us to look at the survey you did, it won’t matter when a child gets injured or worse thanks to the amount of cars speeding up and down Canyon Drive every day and the weekends are insane. There is not enough parking and the park cannot sustain it. You need to protect your citizens, not ignore them.

And now this office is proposing a shuttle to Bronson? We do not have the infrastructure for that, it will make the problem much worse.

Please stop ignoring us and help! Shannon - you’ve been kind, but you really only give us lip service and don’t help the issue at hand.

We simply can’t handle what is happening!

Alex

On Feb 10, 2018, at 8:00 AM, David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org> wrote:

Hi Alex!
Here’s a quick roundup of the week in Council District 4.

In The News:

- **Los Feliz Ledger**: Ryu Headed to Pyeongchang for The Olympics
- **The Chattanooga**: Architecture Tour of Los Angeles' Hancock Park
- **Los Feliz Ledger**: Ryu Formally Opposes Zoning Code Workaround
- **The Eastsider**: Silver Lake Happy/Sad Foot Revolves Into an Animated Music Video
Michael Zelniker  Sat, Feb 10, 2018 at 11:16 AM
To: Alexander Heineman  Cc: David Ryu, Shannon Prior

Councilman Ryu,

Echoing exactly Alex's sentiments. What is being done to protect our neighborhood? It is not yet 11:00 on a Saturday morning and there is absolutely no parking anywhere along Canyon Drive between Spring Oak and the park. My wife and I have lived here for almost 7 years. This inundation of traffic has happened in the last year since the Beachwood Canyon entrance to the park was closed. And it's only getting worse.

Those of us who moved to Bronson Canyon and the Oaks did so because of the relative quiet of the neighborhood. When considering where to live, we ruled out Beachwood Canyon because we knew from having lived in Los Angeles for many years now that Beachwood Canyon positioned below the Hollywood Sign would tend to have much more traffic. Those who chose to move to Beachwood Canyon did so knowing (and perhaps, loving) that the Hollywood Sign was right above their location.

As I conveyed to Shannon, I read the entire (obscenely priced) study to discover that there is almost no discussion concerning re-opening access to the park from Beachwood Canyon. This makes absolutely no sense as the reason for the problems in Bronson Canyon and the Oaks and the other surrounding neighborhoods is entirely because of the closure of the entrance to the park off of Beachwood.
You and Shannon have repeatedly asked of us RESIDENTS that we be constructive and helpful in this process. We have all shown our willingness to do so. Unfortunately our elected representative seems uninterested in solving the problem. The entrance off of Beachwood Canyon, or an alternate entrance off of Beachwood, must be opened. And I for one want to know what you are doing to promote this outcome? Enough is enough.

As is well known by all, the overwhelming majority of residents living in Beachwood Canyon and in all the surrounding neighborhoods want an entrance to the park off of Beachwood Canyon. Because a few noisy residents in Beachwood succeeded in closing the entrance is not a reason for this to be sustained. Just because the rest of our country seems resigned to allow a minority to control our body politic nationally is not a reason to allow a minority to determine policy in our neighborhood.

Your lack of REAL concern and ACTUAL action is mobilizing people in our neighborhoods to do everything in our power to prevent your re-election. I don't say this to threaten you in any way. This is simply the political reality as a result of your inaction on our behalf.

Sincerely,

Michael Zelniker

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> Fri, Feb 16, 2018 at 2:05 PM
To: Michael Zelniker <michael.zelniker@lacity.org>, Alexander Heineman <alexander.heineman@lacity.org>, David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>
Cc: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Michael,

What are your thoughts on the Dixon idea of an electric shuttle to take hikers/tourists through the Beachwood Gate to the Hollyridge Trail?

Alex,

We are not proposing a shuttle at this time. The ideas in the report were proposed by Dixon. The Councilmember introduced a motion for the relevant departments to study the recommendations, including the shuttle idea, and report
back on their cost and feasibility. He has not endorsed or rejected any of the ideas at this time. A shuttle could reduce the amount of cars in your neighborhood especially if coupled with paid parking inside the Park. Perhaps you can further explain your opposition to that idea.

Thank you.

On Sat, Feb 10, 2018 at 8:08 AM, Alexander Heineman <wrote:>

Hi Shannon - a shuttle won’t reduce anything - it will just add more traffic and hazard to the street. Having a shuttle to Beachwood may make sense since there is already a bus stop there and if the shuttle is the only way to get people into the Beachwood Gate instead of reopening the gate fully - then so be it. No one in our community wants a shuttle running up and down canyon drive. I can only hope this office does not support it.

Thanks,

Alex

Sent from my iPhone

Looping in Jason to this as well.

Also - when this office does take a stance - please share with us so we have time to respond. Thanks.

Alex

Sent from my iPhone

Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
Other City issues: 3-1-1
Thank you. Jason and I have been in regular contact regarding the study and the ongoing issues. There will be future opportunities to provide feedback as well. It sounds like you would be in favor of a PPD and Beachwood access. Are there any other strategies in the report you find compelling or would possibly be in support of?

Sent from my iPhone

Michael Zelniker <sun, Feb 18, 2018 at 5:33 PM
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Cc: Alexander Heineman David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>

Hello Shannon,

If in the short term, an electric shuttle up Beachwood Canyon going through the gate thereby accessing the Hollyride Trail will alleviate some of the exponential traffic and pressure that has come to Bronson Canyon as a result of the original closure, I'm in favor of it. What is the frequency you're proposing? How many people will be shuttled up this way? It seems clear that this is, at best, only a partial solution.

But that proposal in no way changes my mind that there MUST be an access point off of Beachwood Canyon. This is what the overwhelming majority of residents want. The closure a year ago is what has caused all of the collateral problems in the surrounding canyons and neighborhoods.

I have now completed Step 2 of the speed hump process. I will be submitting my 10 signatures tomorrow. I hope that you will be proactively working to insure that we get our speed humps along this block. In canvassing my block for the 10 signatures, I can tell you, there are a lot of angry constituents. Everyone I spoke to was willing to sign the petition.

Thank you.

Michael

Michael Zelniker <Wed, Feb 21, 2018 at 8:08 AM
To: Shannon Prior, Jason Greenwald
Cc: Alexander Heineman, David Ryu

The completed speed hump application with 10 signatures has been completed and submitted.

Thank you.

Michael

Shannon Prior <Wed, Feb 21, 2018 at 9:54 AM
To: Michael Zelniker
Cc: Jason Greenwald, Alexander Heineman, David Ryu

That's great news! Thank you for applying.

Alexander Heineman <Sun, Mar 4, 2018 at 12:12 PM
To: Shannon Prior
Cc: Michael Zelniker, Jason Greenwald, David Ryu

Hi Shannon,

It is coming up on a year that Beachwood park access has been closed and I know everyone can attest to the fact that the issues in our community have gotten worse by the week.
When is this office planning on taking a stance and providing a solution to our problem? Our neighborhood is now overrun with tourists and hikers parking their cars because there is not enough parking within the park - you and Ryu know this well, I am aware. But when will something be done about it? Please tell me ONE major public park access point in Los Angeles county that doesn't have protection for the surrounding community in its immediate vicinity. Every major park entrance and beach entrance in this county has parking protection for the homeowners that pay property tax and live near it. When will we get these protections? Beachwood residents STILL have no weekend parking permits on Beachwood drive even though the park is closed now. None of this makes sense. Please don't refer us to the study done. What is the solution this office will get behind to handle this issue? It is getting worse and it needs to be addressed not ignored.

Will solutions be presented this week at the meeting, will you and Ryu be there to share them? Please help us and advise.

Alex

---

Michael Zelniker <Sun, Mar 4, 2018 at 12:37 PM>
To: Alexander Heineman <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Jason Greenwald <david.ryu@lacity.org>
Cc: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Jason Greenwald <david.ryu@lacity.org>

Hello Shannon,

These are all questions that I too want answers to. As I mentioned in a previous email, I will not be able to be at the Dixon Study open meeting this Thursday as I have to work that night.

I too look forward to hearing what specific SOLUTIONS Councilman Ryu is going to implement in order to protect our neighborhood. If he is not going to go on record and show a willingness to fight for an entrance being opened off of Beachwood Canyon, then we need some things to happen right now.

As you know, I already filed the appropriate paperwork to have speed humps. Nothing will happen until autumn the earliest. In the mean time we need to have some restricted parking on Canyon Drive as well as Spring Oak and perhaps other streets off of Canyon. This needs to be in process immediately.

When I walked the block gathering signatures last week, every neighbor is extremely upset about what's going on as a result of the closure of the entrance off of Beachwood. This will have electoral consequences. Perhaps if Ryu understands the anger that the closure has engendered in these neighborhoods, he'll actually do something.

Thank you.

Michael
Hi Shannon,

Recommendation #1 in the Comprehensive Strategies Report is to build a sidewalk bulb-out in front of the property I own, and where I live, on Beachwood Drive at Glen Holly. How can I provide input on this before further steps are taken to implement?

My bigger concern, however, is that in this 65 page report with 29 recommendations, there was no suggestion of simply opening the existing Beachwood vehicular gate 2-3 days a week, and leaving it closed 4-5 days a week. This would be a free and simple compromise that would reduce pedestrian impact on the Sunset Ranch, while also allowing City residents to enjoy the public park. This is a huge disappointment to me, and frankly I don't understand why so many complicated solutions are offered, but this simple and free recommendation is not among them. I recommended this when I participated in the survey your office conducted.

Can I please talk with you by phone about this? My cell is [redacted] Thank you.

Kirsten Grimm
Los Angeles, CA 90068
Hi Shannon and Julie,

Sorry to take so long to get you my comments...I was trying to be comprehensive and got carried away:)!

Attached find a pdf and a link which is actually easier to read on the phone than the pdf.

I hope they are helpful.
Thanks for everything.
Be in touch,

Brian

Brian Lane AIA, LEED® A.P. Principal
Hi Shannon,

Here's a link that should allow you to download and print. Let me know if this works for you. I may change it back to "view" once you've downloaded, mainly to avoid hacking.
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1gMFYMjijYOzCqVOhzDcTX1EZDF4AWLJYH14In1dpa8/edit?usp=sharing

I've added a few random items since the GPAB meeting on 3/9/18. We have to keep thinking right? One of these weekends I'm going to post it on the HHA facebook page, not to say any of these items are the ultimate answer, but more importantly to encourage people to continue to feed in and participate.

Hope things are well,

Brian

Brian Lane AIA, LEED® A.P. Principal
Dear Julie and Shannon,

Thanks for the effort and resources CD4 and Dixon have applied to getting this study off to a good start. I appreciate that the coverage has become increasingly comprehensive and was happy to see the breakdown of “Strategies” and “Categories.” I hope they continue to build as stakeholders and City Agencies digest this and discuss next steps. I imagine the study has spawned further thinking on everyone’s part resulting in even more options.

Following the structure of your report, I’ve tagged onto the “Strategies” as well as added some additional thoughts toward the end. My comments are as a 25 year Beachwood Canyon resident who hikes or runs to the Sign nearly every weekend, solo or with friends. They do not represent other groups...just me!

I feel that although we’ve come far, it would be ideal to continue to aggregate ideas and develop the best shared vision possible. There’s good momentum, a team and stakeholders in place to evolve this. I wouldn’t mind if a few more of my tax dollars were applied to extend this study to make it even more comprehensive, safe, accessible and enjoyable for all!

Thanks for your time to review all this. I look forward to continuing the conversation.

Brian Lane

---

My comments below are in *red italic*

**Comprehensive Strategies Report - Improving Access, Safety and Mobility around Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign.**

By Dixon Resources Unlimited, January 2018

**1. Enhance Pedestrian Safety**

*Strategy #1 Install bulb-out on Beachwood Drive*

*Comments:*

a. *Like the idea if it removes only 1-2 on street parking stalls.*

b. *Review the possibility of doing a bulb out at the widened intersection of Glen Green (sort of like a habitable roundabout) on the uphill/approaching side of the street. The area would shorten the crosswalks and this option would not eliminate street parking.*
Strategy #2 Implement Traffic Calming Measures  
Comments:
  a. Install more speed limit signs. For example, on Beachwood, after Ledgewood, there are no posted speed limit signs on either side of the street. A few strategically placed signs would offer a reminder of the limits.
  b. At key locations, put in cameras (like Franklin Canyon that ticket automatically) to discourage speeding and rolling stops.

Strategy #3 Post Walkability Signage  
Comments:
  a. Coordinate with emergency call box network
  b. Coordinate with trail sign network

Strategy #4 Install a Sidewalk Along Canyon Drive  
Comments:
  a. I see very little drawback to extending and improving sidewalk networks.
  b. Additionally, at Beachwood Drive, review adding a “Sharrows” (a dedicated pedestrian & bike lane) on one side of Beachwood after Ledgewood (where the sidewalks end). Eliminate parking on the sharrows side on Sat, Sun & Holidays 8am-6pm (all other streets in Hollywoodland have parking on one side only). Provide signage (no smoking, distance to trail, don’t walk in street, quiet etc). Eliminating parking on one side of Beachwood will improve emergency vehicle access during the most congested hours.

2. Improve Access to Griffith Park and Trailheads

Strategy #1 Implement Electric Shuttle Service Connecting the Nearest Metro Station with Beachwood Drive Park Entrance (AKA Sunset Ranch)
Comments:
  a. Create a stop at the Village, and a Midway stop near where the sidewalk along Beachwood ends (at Ledgewood).
  b. Re-establish pedestrian access (alongside the Ranch easement).
c. Provide WC’s, water, call box (w/improved cell service), security cams & trash cans.
d. Could this also consider rideshare drop off/pick up?
e. Not sure about the idea of “narration” due to noise. Maybe watch text on a phone or use “beacons via phone bluetooth?”

Strategy #2 Implement the Alternate Access Trail Plan at Beachwood Drive

Comments:

a. CEQA and potential litigation costs seem to be the biggest burden. Otherwise, creating access alongside the existing easement via a sidewalk with rails to separate from the road OR a stair-switchback uphill connecting to the Hollyridge Trail could probably be built at minimal cost. This would lighten the burden on other access points.

Sidewalk along Ranch easement

- Note that pedestrians more and more use Linforth to proceed to the Deronda gate so foot traffic continues up Beachwood regardless.
- Pedestrian access M-F is light and it would be good to allow neighbors to use this long standing Ranch access point (also, M-F traffic to Sunset Ranch is minimal since it’s not their peak operating hours).
- Provide items noted in 2. #1 c. above

Strategy #3 Relocate the Wonder View Trailhead and Install a Pedestrian Gate on Lake Hollywood Drive.

Comments:

a. Wisdom Tree access is becoming increasingly popular (and is on a route to the Hollywood Sign). This strategy follows the concept of increasing access points and porosity into the park which, overall is beneficial with mitigations at each proposed new location. If implemented, provide items noted in 2. #1 c. above
3. Expand Transit Opportunities

Strategy #1 Extend DASH Lines or Shuttle Routes to and from Highly Congested Areas

Comments:
   a. Yay!
   b. Continue to explore more non car options, including walking from lower Beachwood. The overall distance from lower Beachwood is no further than the distances from Brush Canyon Trail or Griffith Observatory.

Strategy #2 Implement Ridesharing Zones

Comments:
   a. Report should project growth of ridesharing use.
   b. This item does not mention potential ridesharing zones at:
      - Lower Beachwood Market (1. #4 a. connect to “sharrors”)
      - Upper Beachwood at Sunset Ranch (suggest same path at electric shuttle and utilize the same turnaround).
      - Deronda - lower portion (at Deronda and Rockcliff) currently used as such & signed “5 Min parking zone.”
      - “Dirt Mulholland” - lower portion (at Ledgewood) currently used as such. Should be signed similar to Deronda
      - Create a drop off at end of Canyon Lake Drive & investigate connecting Innsdale Trail (at the end of Canyon Lake Drive) to Dirt Mulholland which ultimately connects to Mt Lee Drive.

* Potential completion of “Dirt Mulholland” via street improvements would allow through traffic from the end of Deronda to Mulholland and Ledgewood. Note that new homes are being built along “Dirt Mulholland” and as each one completes, the improved street is extended further (at the homeowners expense). At some point it may be feasible for the City to complete the rest at reasonable cost.

Strategy #3 Supplement the Griffith Park Circulation System with an Aerial Tram

Comments:
   a. Tram offloading some distance down from the Sign on the back side would keep visual clutter of seeing the tram and Sign at the same time to a minimum. (Historically the Sign sits alone with the antennas only).
   - Likely increased pedestrian use will continue to wear down the hill behind the sign. The hill should be stabilized with erosion control measures, potentially steps and a handrail as well as a rail along the edge of the south side of the hill (the portion people back up to).
   b. If implemented provide items noted in 2. #1 c. above (at the tram offloading point and Sign).

4. Improve Traffic Flow and Reduce Congestion

Strategy #1 Obscure Views of the Hollywood Sign from Smaller Vista Points Along Mulholland Highway

Comments:
a. Implement at the area closest to the residences starting at Durand and Mulholland.

b. Along the remainder (southerly) review the possibility of creating a limited walking path (on the west side of Mulholland) with a rail along the Mulholland street bed to prevent pedestrians from walking in the road. Control and limit viewing areas along the path via new planting as noted.

Strategy #2 Implement District-Wide Wayfinding Strategy

Comments:

a. Signage could include QR codes &/or “bluetooth beacons” (newer tech)
b. Improve cellular service if QR’s are used.

Strategy #3 Discourage Illegal Maneuvers along Mulholland Highway

Comments:

a. Hummmmm - construct a turnaround? how?

Strategy #4 Collaborate with Google and Waze to Communicate Accurate and Helpful Information

Comments:

a. And Apple maps and...many others like utilizing “bluetooth beacons” to communicate specific data at certain locations (note: improve cell network)

5. Improve Emergency Vehicle Access
Strategy #1 Temporarily Close Narrow Streets with Highest Safety Risks During Peak Periods

Comments:
   a. It’s always about volume of cars on certain roads (resident traffic is rarely an issue). Plan could limit the number of vehicles on peak days.
   b. Create a “Sharrows” with no parking on one side along Beachwood drive for Sat, Sun, Holidays. This strategy would create more room for emergency vehicles. Additionally, implementation of a shuttle along with more pedestrian options would further reduce traffic.
   c. Develop a program to encourage residents to park cars in their garages.
   d. Review and extend network of red curbs and/or no parking signage throughout the canyons.

Strategy #2 Convert Some Narrow Two-Way Streets to One-Way Streets

Comments:
   a. Like the idea of “trialed or piloted” tests to observe if something may be effective before putting it in place permanently.

6. Increase Parking Efficiency and Compliance Rates

Strategy #1 Adjust (E) Preferential Parking District Time Limits & Days of Operation

Comments:
   a. “Some” areas may benefit from increased restrictions, but my general observation is that very few warrant 7 day a week restrictions.
   b. Create ride sharing zones at more than just Lake Hollywood Park. For example a drop off at “Dirt Mulholland” (Mulholland and Ledgewood) and/or Deronda and Rockcliff (and discourage cars from driving up Deronda, unless future improvements connect Deronda with an improved Mulholland Highway as described earlier).

Strategy #2 Consolidate Preferential Parking District Regulations

Comments:
   a. If this means all PPD’s would be 7 days, it seems like overkill for most.
   b. Agree that resident permits should be good for all streets/PPD’s.
   c. If a PPD remains on lower Beachwood 8am-4pm is better than a longer period. Possibly shorten this?
   d. “Different level of enforcement” is basically saying the City won’t enforce the hours of a posted sign? How would residents know what was enforced and when? Seems hard.

Strategy #3 Implement Paid Parking &/or Time Limits in Popular Tourist Destinations

Comments:
   a. Needs significant study, but appreciate the potential to direct meter revenue to further mitigations.
   b. Review possibility of increasing parking at Beachwood/Belden with angled parking (note: I understand this option was reviewed and rejected due to insufficient street width, but with a sharper angle may warrant further study. See below:
Strategy # 4 Increase Citation Amounts in High Impact Tourist Locations

Comments:
   a. Agree in concept. Would like to add that fines on the trails should also be increased, but more importantly enforced. See other options for cameras to monitor key locations (and then have rangers/LAPD available to enforce).

Strategy # 5 Increase Parking Enforcement in Impacted Areas

Comments:
   a. Automatic cameras to issue tickets?

7. Actively Manage and Provide Optimized Visitor Opportunities

Strategy #1 Enhance the most Accessible and Safe Hollywood Sign Viewing Locations and Hikes

Comments:
   a. Don’t disagree with this strategy, but while you “would not prohibit certain locations” there are key access points missing such as: Beachwood to Hollyridge Trail and Deronda/Mulholland. They are covered in this article.

Strategy #2 Develop a Hollywood Sign Visitor Center

Comments:
   a. Agree. Look for the opportunity to work with Hollywood developers to provide space as “Community Benefits” package (as part of an entitlement)...Put it in the Target...
   b. Locations farther away could also be considered like: LAX,
   c. Or other places with direct line of sight (such as the Hollywood Bowl which has a great view).

Strategy #3 Build a Hollywood Sign Viewing Platform

Comments:
   a. Agree with this opportunity - needs study. Currently there are 3-4 locations along the trail (including the hill behind the sign) that are utilized. Review all, develop options and mitigations to see which should be encouraged or developed further.
b. Other sites like Bronson Canyon Bat caves and locations closer to Griffith Park proper should be explored.
c. Could also incentivize nearby hotels to incorporate this feature (if it prevents a few people from trekking up the hill, that’s good right?)

Strategy #4 Implement a Hollywood Sign Art Program
Comments:
  a. Agree, keep thinking and promoting. Note that numerous businesses along Hollywood Blvd have this. Could the City incentivize more?

Photo: Hollywood Wax Museum on Hollywood Blvd

Strategy #5 Replicate the Sign on the Other Side of the Mountain
Comments:
  a. Never say never! However as is known, the sign is a Los Angeles Historic Cultural Monument (HCM #111). Griffith Park also for that matter. Recreating a replica so close to the historical artifact could confuse as to the authenticity of the original...and those not confused would likely just want to see the real thing over the hill. For many reasons, I don’t favor exploring this strategy further.

Strategy #6 Support a Dedicated Hollywood Sign Website
Comments:
  a. When searching on Google, the first entry that appears is https://hollywoodsign.org/ website of the Hollywood Sign Trust. Possibly work with the HST to improve and enhance the site.
b. It should also be noted that with simple deeper searching there are a multitude of additional sites that appear with info on both encouraged and discouraged access points to the sign. They are covered in this article.

Strategy #7 Implement a Social Media and Outreach campaign
Comments:
   a. Agree that this may have more impact than even the website. Use of “influencers” seems to be highly coveted to get the message out.

Strategy #8 Install Restroom Facilities at Key Locations
Comments:
   a. Include water fountains (like DWP Hollywood Reservoir Trail - bottle filler) also emergency call boxes and/or improved cell service + Trash cans.

OTHER - Comments and ideas as of 2/13/18

Dixon study Categories
- Pedestrians
- Park Access
- Traffic & Congestion
- Tourism
- Safety
- Parking

New/Additional Categories
- On trail issues
- Education/Media
- Revenue ideas
- Other...

1. Look for opportunities to leverage DWP Hollywood Reservoir Trail that has numerous views of the sign + decent infrastructure (bathrooms, water fountains, parking/drop off).

2. Accommodate biking and bike trails. They are more pleasant and easier to manage than cars.

3. I appreciate use of historic precedent (and what’s worked in other communities) to come up with solutions. Review National Parks for applicable strategies.

4. Add a camera system to take the place of rangers and police having to be at locations. Add emergency call boxes and phone #’s to call in reports.

5. Security idea - aggregate private security cams (or resident volunteers) and feed into overall monitored security camera network.
6. Set up a ranger monitored online system that can accept comments from local residents. Like a neighborhood Facebook page where residents can report issues and where notices and warnings can be seen.

7. Sell T shirts with “no smoking on the trail” “no butts on the trail”, “don’t cut trails” using the HOLLYWOOD sign logo (encourage the Chamber to authorize it cheaply). Engage artists to produce unique designs. Social media influencers could promote both the coolness of the shirt design as well as the important messages.

8. Get scout troops, school groups, conservationists, hiking groups or others to monitor and pick up trash along the trail and trail heads. Promote their efforts on social media related to the sign etc. (can be promotional for some groups).

9. Strike agreements to fund clean-ups and infrastructure improvements for the neighborhood (From: Hollywood Chamber, Tour companies, The Los Angeles Tourism and Convention Board, portion of hotel bed tax etc.). Monies could also fund better monitoring and enforcement.

10. Have the Mayor, Councilman and others hike the trail as “influencers” to get specific messages out.

Additional Next Steps

1. Solicit additional stakeholders - hiker, bike coalitions, public groups (LA Walks), tourism groups, etc.

2. Hold meetings on the routes and trails to solicit further thinking and collaboration on the current ideas. It’s likely more ideas will come out as stakeholders continue to ponder options together.

3. Do a “User Group” scenario study (ie: resident, resident who hikes, bikes, tourist, local visitor).

4. Is there a way we can learn from each others input (comments submitted to Shannon/CD4 & Dixon) ?...it might help us find more common ground and understanding...just a thought as I type!
Additional Notes 3/9/18

1. 3/8/18 GPAB meeting ideas
   - With Sierra Club and others identify and map all trails
   - Visitor center locations discussed: Florentine Gardens, Target, HD, other?
   - Wild life corridor review and park preservation issues
   - Place signs at the Beachwood gate to alert drivers that all parking above the gates on Beachwood is permit parking

Background: rolling additions

CD4
- Initial Dixon Report 1/18/18
- CD 4 web page re study
- Council Motion

Video
- Brian Lane video discussing - Sign Issues and Neighborhood. 4/5/2017
- All videos from Millennial Project series

Links
- Trail Maps
- Griffith Park Advisory Board GPAB on FB
- Friends of Griffith Park FGP on FB
- LA Curbed Sign Hikes, Parks
- Los Feliz Ledger articles
- Move On
I read your study on the feasibility of various solutions for the closure of access to the Hollyridge Trail and Griffith Park from Beachwood Canyon. I cannot understand why the opening of a new access point off of Beachwood Canyon is not a priority recommendation as a quick and low cost solution. Your conclusion on Page 15 of your study is an absurd conclusion and smacks of partisan interference in the study.

It is well known to all of those who live in Bronson Canyon, Beachwood Canyon and the surrounding canyons and neighborhoods that the main reason for the growing problems over this last year is the closure of access to the Hollyridge Trail off of Beachwood Canyon. The question I have: Was Dixon influenced by anyone in your conclusions? Did David Ryu and officials at the City Attorney’s office, who for some unknown reason sided with a small noisy minority of Beachwood Canyon residents in the law suit to close that entrance, influence Dixon in that conclusion? Perhaps a law suit will require those responsible for the study at Dixon to provide an answer to these questions.

The overwhelming majority of residents in Bronson Canyon, the Oaks, Beachwood Canyon and every other canyon and neighborhood affected by the closure want an entrance to the park opened off of Beachwood. That way we all share the burden and the privilege living so close to Griffith Park. There is an easy, low-cost, feasible solution well known to city officials. It’s time for all of you to do the job that we taxpayers pay you to do: To serve and protect your constituents.

I hope to hear from you!
Sincerely,

Michael Zelniker

--

Michael Zelniker

(office)

(cell)
Beachwood Canyon Bulb-out
3 messages

Hi Shannon,

I’m writing to express my displeasure regarding the idea of a bulb-out on Beachwood canyon. As a person who owns/lives in the area you propose to build this addition this is a bad idea.

Yes, people stand in the street once in a while to take photos. At least with the way things are currently people are dispersed throughout the neighborhood. By creating a centralized area you will be creating a tourist zone and pulling people into one spot in essence creating the same problem the owners at the recently closed trailhead were experiencing. Living at [redacted], we already experience tourists wandering behind our building to look around or to urinate. This I imagine will now get worse if you pull everyone to one spot.

You will also be creating more traffic as this spot becomes known as “the photo spot”. You will be drawing more people into a neighborhood that still, despite the current tourist traffic, feels like a neighborhood. We already deal with tourists blocking our driveway when they stop for photos. Putting a bulb-out that ends at the mouth of our driveway will make this problem worse as everyone stops to try to find parking. And let’s be honest, 5 or 10 minute parking zone? Is there going to be someone standing there all day to enforce that? And on top of that, it’s hard enough to park in our neighborhood. This will make it worse. Adding resident parking will not stop tourists from parking. Again, is someone going to be paid to stand there and enforce?

I would like to be informed as you plans move forward. Please add my email to your list.

Thank you,
Rob Naples
Los Angeles, CA 90068

Shannon Prior<br>Thu, Feb 22, 2018 at 11:39 AM

Hi Rob,

Thank you for taking the time to provide your feedback and direct experience. None of the strategies proposed in the Dixon report have been endorsed by the Councilmember. When the report was released the Councilmember introduced a motion directing the relevant City departments to analyze the strategies and report back on their cost and feasibility. The motion passed committee and is set to be considered by the full City Council within the next week. After that, the departments will get to work and be able to provide the Councilmember with more specific information so he can evaluate options. We will also reach out to the community for more input at that time.

I’ve added you to my email list.

Thank you.
Shannon Prior  
Field Deputy  
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu  
Office: 323.851-2121  
http://davidryu.lacity.org/  

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1  
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184  
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)  
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489  
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184  
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397  
- Other City issues: 3-1-1  

napolitano <[email protected]>  
Thu, Feb 22, 2018 at 11:54 AM  
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  

Thank you for the reply Shannon. I look forward to participating in the conversation.

[Quoted text hidden]
Bulb out proposal on Beachwood

1 message

Gibby Miller <gibby.miller@lacity.org> Sun, Feb 18, 2018 at 1:56 PM
To: shannon.prior@lacity.org

I own a unit and live in the building [redacted] where this bulb out is proposed. This is a terrible idea. Our driveway is blocked around the clock by cars double parked already. Having the only “photo op” location in one place will congest even more, making all visitors focus on double parking closer to the bulb. It will also increase noise, litter, and loitering. Please consider the taxpayers and owners who will have to have this outside our door.

Sent from my iPhone.
Dear Shannon,

I have a couple of questions about the Comprehensive Strategies Report issues January 17.

On p. 5 the report claims “Stakeholders were supportive of” and cites 9 proposals. We were never asked to show support for any proposal. As a matter of fact, when we were shown the proposal to replicate the Hollywood Sign on the Burbank side of the hill, we all spontaneously laughed. That is hardly a show of support. Why was such a duplicitous statement included in the report?

When Dixon made its presentation to stakeholders on January 16, we were told that nothing had been prioritized. They had thought about vetting some of the proposals and eliminating ones that were off the wall; in the end they included all proposals in the report. Thus the proposal about replicating the sign that we all laughed at. Therefore stakeholders were very surprised to find that the report issued to the public prioritized proposals. The Alternative Access Trail (p. 16) which has been supported by many neighborhood groups was rated low priority. The aerial tram proposal (p. 27) although it is much more costly was rated medium. What criteria was used to determine priority?

Marian Dodge
Los Feliz Improvement Association representative

Hi Marian,

I think this is an issue of semantics. The nine proposals were suggested by stakeholders so stakeholders were supportive of them. Perhaps it could have been clearer but to say it was duplicitous is off base.

Nothing had been prioritized at the January 16 meeting because Dixon wanted to keep the conversation open and not let prioritization become a distraction. I don't believe Dixon said ideas would never be prioritized. This report was designed to help the Councilmember move forward with ideas. Prioritization is essential in that decision making process. The prioritization provided by Dixon is preliminary. As you know, the Councilmember has requested the relevant departments to report on the cost and feasibility of the proposed strategies, which will help the Councilmember further prioritize the strategies. The report was meant to be as comprehensive as possible so naturally many ideas were included.

Please see page 7 of the report for an explanation of prioritization:

Their prioritization is based upon the estimated costs versus the potential benefits. This has been gauged through a mix of extensive stakeholder outreach, data analysis, industry best practices, and prior experience. The prioritization in this report is not a definitive guide for the City. Public and City Council review, environmental analyses, engineering evaluations, and cost appraisals, among other factors, will ultimately influence whether a strategy is viable, the prioritization, and a feasible timeline for implementation.

Thank you.

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.851-2121

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfeade515e&jsver=Z-grDj2gpow.en.&view=pt&cat=Feedback%20Dixon%20study%20publish&search=cat&th=161f7b57795
Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
Other City issues: 3-1-1

Shannon & Julie,

Semantics is important. To paraphrase Mark Twain: The difference between a word and the right word is the difference between “lightning” and a “lightning bug.”

Perhaps it would have been better to simply say they were suggested by stakeholders. Period. They may have been supported by only one person so to say “stakeholders” (plural) were supportive is not an accurate statement. Remember we all laughed.

Marian
[Quoted text hidden]
Dear Julie:

First, thanks for the comprehensive January 2017 report that you and your team prepared regarding western Griffith Park/Vista and related topics. You certainly covered the suggestions discussed during our meetings and more.

Representatives of the Lake Hollywood Homeowners Association had a meeting with Councilman Ryu, Sarah Dusseault and Shannon Prior on Feb. 15th to discuss a few matters, including the issue of visitors/the Vista. During that conversation we noted that while your report is very comprehensive, it basically addresses ways of managing the ever increasing numbers of visitors rather than directly dealing with the issue of reducing the volume of visitors in cars coming to our area. The major exception is the gondola concept. Even if that concept is ultimately pursued, it is a very long-term project. During our meeting with the council office, we proposed a couple of new ideas in the interest of public safety that had not fully occurred to the LHHA board until we met again recently in preparation for our meeting with the council office—The council office found the ideas to be interesting and suggested that we write you and copy them with our two new ideas. Below are our suggestions.

1. A 3-pronged approach for reducing the volume of visitors coming through or into Hollywoodland, the Knolls, and Lake Hollywood Estates:
   1. Red line all of Canyon Lake between Arrowhead Drive and the Vista.
   2. Place the entire Lake Hollywood Estates neighborhood into a PPD, thereby providing no public parking in our area except via permits.
   3. To accommodate the public in this area, visitors would be provided with city-run shuttles from public transportation areas, including Franklin and Beachwood, from the Hollywood side. Visitors in cars would take shuttles from public parking space(s), like the zoo, in Griffith Park and possibly the metro stations in Hollywood and Universal City. Sarah suggested that those shuttles should probably be electric to make them more environmentally friendly. The shuttles should also be equipped with an audio message about the history of the Hollywood sign as well as a message in multiple languages about the severe fire danger caused by smoking in the hills, accompanied by brochures and perhaps also signage in multiple languages with the same “no smoking” message.

Additionally, to make the 3-pronged program effective, the community would need regular, but not continuous, enforcement of parking restrictions. If such a comprehensive program were instituted, it would need to be communicated on all formal tourist web sites as well as on social media sites. The communications would inform visitors that they cannot stop their cars or park to take photographs. To get out of vehicles and take photographs, visitors need to take the publicly provided shuttles, for which there probably would be a modest fee, or have someone drop them off. The PPD would need to be in effect every day but would not be applicable at night.

We feel this proposal would directly address the huge volume of cars currently coming through Hollywoodland, the Knolls and LHHA while still providing public access. Shuttle fees hopefully would offset shuttle costs. And the current resources that the city devotes to enforcement in terms of Rangers, police and traffic enforcement officers, especially
during peak tourist periods, hopefully could be reduced as visitors begin to recognize that driving a private car into this area is not the most effective way to get the photograph they want. The basic enforcement element would be regular traffic officer enforcement of the parking restrictions.

Our neighborhood would not support this proposal unless all elements were implemented simultaneously. Clearly this area, already overwhelmed by visitors in ever larger numbers, cannot withstand additional visitors brought up via shuttle unless the parking restrictions were also implemented to discourage visitors in cars from driving into the area because of pervasive parking restriction that prohibit all daytime parking on Canyon Lake and all non-permitted parking on all the residential streets in the neighborhood.

The only major expense in this proposal would be acquisition and operation of the shuttles, for which a fee would be charged. The rest of the approach—painting curbs, creating a PPD, and regular but not continuous (except perhaps in the early stages to make the enforcement message clear) enforcement—involves relatively small to modest costs, and the entire approach or elements of it could readily be modified if time and experience show that the 3-pronged approach requires changes.

2. Consider making the Vista a turn-around area for vehicles in the near future to provide a safe area for cars, taxis, etc. to turn around and return in the direction from which they came without making the dangerous U-turns or 3 pointed turns currently undertaken at Arrowhead/Canyon Lake intersection, middle of Canyon Lake and at the “Madonna” house intersection at the top of Canyon Lake. Such a turn-around could also be used in the longer term if our suggested plan for shuttles were implemented. The shuttles could turn, drop off and pick up at such a turn-out.

We look forward to hearing back from you or your team and trust that the council office and you will pursue consideration of these ideas. If you wish to discuss, feel free to contact us.

Best regards,

Paul Rusconi, President LHHA
From: Paul Rusconi <paul.rusconi@lacity.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 1, 2018 10:35 AM
To: Julie Dixon <julie.dixon@lacity.org; shannon.prior@lacity.org; sarah.dusseault@lacity.org; david.ryu@lacity.org>
Cc: Kristina O'Neil <kristina.o.neil@lacity.org; Andy Corrigan <andy.corrigan@lacity.org; Jane Goichman <jane.goichman@lacity.org>
Subject: 3-Pronged Approach to Lake Hollywood Traffic and Safety Issues

[Quoted text hidden]

Paul Rusconi <paul.rusconi@lacity.org>
To: Julie Dixon <julie.dixon@lacity.org; shannon.prior@lacity.org; sarah.dusseault@lacity.org; david.ryu@lacity.org;
Cc: Kristina O'Neil <kristina.o.neil@lacity.org; Andy Corrigan <andy.corrigan@lacity.org; Jane Goichman <jane.goichman@lacity.org; Emily Kwatinetz <emily.kwatinetz@lacity.org>

Sorry - red curb. Ha.

[Quoted text hidden]
Traffic study response
4 messages

Bill Doyle <bill.doyle@lacity.org> Wed, Feb 28, 2018 at 11:05 AM
Reply-To: Bill Doyle <bill.doyle@lacity.org>
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Cc: Jason Greenwald <jason.greenwald@lacity.org>

Shannon,

Sorry about the delay in getting this to you.

I fully endorse Jason Greenwald's thorough response to Dixon's suggested remedies.

In brief, I would like to address the Shuttle/bus options directly.

Shuttles to Beachwood would...
1- Have the greatest effect in reducing congestions in all other areas.
2- Reopen an historic access to Griffith Park and The Hollywood sign.
3- Potentially help the businesses that are located further up Beachwood.
4- Help to service the numerous multi family and apartments that are located in that canyon.
5- Use existing parking for turn around

Shuttles up Canyon Drive would
1- Put more vehicles, larger, entering an all ready hazardous entrance.
2- Subtract from parking spaces to create a Loading/ turn/around point.
3- Increase traffic where there is no need for mass transit because there are no businesses or apartments.
4- Would still take 2-3 hours to access the Hollywood Sign destination.

So I feel strongly that the shuttle idea, while well intentioned, will not serve to decrease vehicular traffic, but increase congestion in areas that are already struggling with pedestrian and vehicle entry numbers.

The Uber/Lyft culture is here to stay. It is convenient, affordable and fast. People will also tend to drive there own private vehicles. Vacationers who choose to rent a vehicle will simply not pay additional costs for parking there rented car to use slower mass transit.

The one exception is Beachwood Canyon. Having that entrance reopened to shuttles and share some of the burden makes complete sense.

Respectfully,
Bill Doyle

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> Thu, Mar 1, 2018 at 1:30 PM
To: Bill Doyle <bill.doyle@lacity.org>
Cc: Jason Greenwald <jason.greenwald@lacity.org>

Thank you, Bill.

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfeade515e&jver=Z-grDj2gpow.en.&view=pt&cat=Feedback%20Dixon%20study%20publish&search=cat&th=162601529cd
Hey Bill,

Good to see you at the HOA meeting last week. Quick follow up to your last email: do you find the uber/lyft drop off/pick ups disruptive? Would it make sense to dedicate a space or two to create a drop off/pick up zone? Maybe a portion of the curb on the interior of the entrance? Or would it not be worth losing two parking spots?

Thanks!

Hey Shannon...I've been pondering this question. Yes, it is disruptive.

This issue speaks to the larger problem of the Dixon study's proposed solutions which will funnel more cars, shuttles and ride sharing vehicles into an entrance without an appropriate, safe and convenient turn around point. Issue is U-turns and the added doubling of traffic for each ride share (drop off, then pick-up)

Even if you establish dedicated drop-off space, it may not prevent illegal U-turns inside the park near playground. If the turn around is further up in the parking lot it is adding to congestion.

Not sure what the answer is.

I will ponder further.

Bill

On Mon, 3/19/18, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> wrote:

Subject: Re: Traffic study response
To: "Bill Doyle" <[redacted]>
Cc: "Jason Greenwald" <[redacted]>
Date: Monday, March 19, 2018, 4:42 PM

Hey Bill,

Good to see you at the HOA meeting last week. Quick follow up to your last email: do you find the uber/lyft drop off/pick ups disruptive? Would it make sense to dedicate a space or two to create a drop off/pick up zone? Maybe a portion of the curb on the interior of the entrance? Or would it not be worth losing two parking spots?

Thanks!

Hey Shannon...I've been pondering this question. Yes, it is disruptive.

This issue speaks to the larger problem of the Dixon study's proposed solutions which will funnel more cars, shuttles and ride sharing vehicles into an entrance without an appropriate, safe and convenient turn around point. Issue is U-turns and the added doubling of traffic for each ride share (drop off, then pick-up)

Even if you establish dedicated drop-off space, it may not prevent illegal U-turns inside the park near playground. If the turn around is further up in the parking lot it is adding to congestion.

Not sure what the answer is.

I will ponder further.

Bill

On Sun, Mar 25, 2018 at 7:13 PM, Bill Doyle <[redacted]> wrote:

Hey Shannon...I've been pondering this question. Yes, it is disruptive.

This issue speaks to the larger problem of the Dixon study's proposed solutions which will funnel more cars, shuttles and ride sharing vehicles into an entrance without an appropriate, safe and convenient turn around point. Issue is U-turns and the added doubling of traffic for each ride share (drop off, then pick-up)

Even if you establish dedicated drop-off space, it may not prevent illegal U-turns inside the park near playground. If the turn around is further up in the parking lot it is adding to congestion.

Not sure what the answer is.

I will ponder further.

Bill
Dear Shannon & Julie,

Attached is Friends of Griffith Park’s response to the Comprehensive Strategies Report.

Best regards,

Marian Dodge
President
Friends of Griffith Park

2018 0306 Access & Mobility Statement.pdf
82K
The Hollywood Sign has become a symbol for the City of Los Angeles and a popular tourist destination. Tourism is great for the city and its economy; however the surge of visitors has created unpleasant and unsafe experiences for both residents and visitors. Just as concerning, the surge of visitors creates new risks and pressures on already-stressed habitat and wildlife. Friends of Griffith Park commends Councilmember David Ryu for creating a group of community representatives, including Friends of Griffith Park, to brainstorm potential strategies to mitigate the problems.

Friends has reviewed the 29 strategies proposed in the Comprehensive Strategies Report prepared by Dixon Resources Unlimited. Friends’ primary concern is to maintain good public access to the park while protecting the sensitive habitat of the urban wilderness park.

**Public Access to Public Parks:**
One of the most important ideas proposed is a small electric shuttle to take visitors from the Metro stations in Hollywood up Beachwood Canyon through the gate to the Hollyridge Trail. (p. 13) This proposal could be implemented relatively quickly and would reduce the number of vehicles significantly by providing easy public transit. From the trailhead, visitors would have a very short, safe hike on a wide trail to the park’s premier vista for Hollywood Sign viewing. They would also have the opportunity to hike further, if they wish, knowing that public transportation will be available upon their return.

However, the proposal does not recognize the importance of providing access to the park for hikers and local residents, many of whom were drawn to Beachwood Canyon so they could walk out their front doors and into Griffith Park for a nice hike. The Alternate Access Trail Plan (p.16) would solve that issue by supplementing the electric shuttle with a pedestrian gate to the right of the vehicular gate. A similar plan, the Alternative Access Plan, includes modular steps which would take hikers up a 50-foot vertical rise to the old Hollyridge Trail. This plan is even simpler, would shield habitat from impacts, and enjoys strong community support.

Constructing a new trail in order to by-pass the short walk on the street to the end of Wonder View Drive (p.18) has been put before the public’s scrutiny previously and did not receive traction of any kind. Since the Sign is not at all visible from this trail, it has little to do with the tourist problem and visitors’ attempts to see the Hollywood Sign. It is a treacherous ascent, and then decent, to get to Mt. Lee from the Cahuenga Peak trail. Griffith Park already has 53 miles of good trails so there is no compelling reason to impose further impacts on the wilderness area of the park by adding more.

**Optimize Visitor Opportunities:**
We recognize that many tourists merely want to get a good photo of the Hollywood Sign, so providing a close-up, low-impact vista reduces adverse environmental impacts to the park, and at the same time minimizes impacts to the surrounding residential zones.

Friends has long encouraged the creation of a Hollywood Sign Visitor Center on Hollywood Boulevard because the tourists are already there (p.54). Instead of charging a small admission fee, which discourages visitors, the center could sell drinks, snacks, and souvenirs to generate revenue. The visitor center must be located outside of the park and not near residential areas.

Developing other sign viewing sites outside the park should be considered a priority and would give visitors alternative areas for getting that perfect photo. Placing mini Hollywood Signs or replica letters in various parts of the city like the airport might also help mitigate congestion.

In considering a district-wide wayfinding plan, social media, and a dedicated website (p. 59), the question should be seriously posed whether the measure enhances the experience for those who would come to see the Hollywood Sign anyway or in reality just increases the volume of tourists that come. The implementation of mitigating measures should not be conflated with tourism marketing, especially as the 2028 Summer Olympics approaches.

**Expand Transit Opportunities:**
The use of public transit such as shuttles should be expanded.

We urge caution in accommodating ride-sharing, since the goal is to reduce vehicles, not encourage more. Strategies to drop off passengers at locations where shuttles are available should be explored, perhaps through geo-fencing. The growth of ride-sharing into the future is well studied and could be huge, particularly when driverless ride-sharing becomes the reality. We currently see ride-sharing at the Observatory and the Greek Theatre which doubles the number of vehicle trips. Recent studies have shown that ride-sharing programs are actually drawing patrons away from public transportation and increasing traffic congestion in cities.

The idea of an aerial tram pops to the surface about once a decade. Big ideas such as a tram are complex, expensive and required much analysis. The three locations floated for the base of the tram and a Griffith Park Transit Hub are Martinez Arena, LA Zoo, and Wilson/Harding Golf Courses. Those areas are already heavily used by equestrians, zoo guests, and golfers. One of the major goals of the Griffith Park Vision was that new development should not displace current park users. The Department of Recreation and Parks’ stated goal is to encourage visitors to park outside the park and take public transportation to and around the park. This plan does not meet that goal.

Another disturbing aspect of the tram proposal is to make it a part of the “broader circulation system of Griffith Park.” A ride of this type to an interior-park viewing area would need to strictly contain its riders in order to prevent damage to the wilderness zone. With Griffith Park's current popularity, creating a better visitor experience is the goal, not attracting more visitors. The
aerial tram proposal requires very careful evaluation and would take a long time to implement. The community deserves relief now with ideas that can be implemented now.

**Parking Efficiency and Compliance Rates:**
Increasing enforcement of existing laws would go a long way toward improving the situation. Small tweaks to the existing Preferential Parking Districts could make them more effective as well.

One of the proposals is to implement paid parking in popular parking areas such as in the dirt lot and street at the top of Canyon Drive, along Lake Hollywood Drive, and Beachwood Drive. Paid parking always causes people to seek free parking in the adjacent residential areas which means Preferential Parking Districts then become necessary. Having to pay for parking in Griffith Park is contrary to Griffith’s wish that the park be free and accessible to all. Paid parking at the Griffith Observatory lot was reluctantly accepted by the public because the revenue generated was promised to go towards supplying more shuttles to provide public transit into the park so that even those who do not own a car could enjoy the park and to reduce vehicular traffic. Furthermore, the paid parking at the Observatory is not adjacent to a residential zone.

Friends of Griffith Park will continue to work with CD 4 and community groups in the Access and Mobility Committee to find ways to enhance the visitor experience for the Hollywood Sign and to protect the urban wilderness experience of Griffith Park which is its greatest asset.
I am shocked by recent government sponsored Dixon report! As a business owner in Hollywood and new home owner in the CD4. I am stunned at how long this Hollywood sign tourism problem has gone on.

It’s astonishing what little respect the Dixon study gave to lifelong residents of Hollywoodland and the surrounding neighborhoods or how much it underestimates the next generation of property buyers in the neighborhood like myself.

The entire $120,000.00 report is heavily biased towards the tourist experience not residential safety or your constituents needs.

There is a new generation, Gen X and millennials that are buying into the area, as property owners and tax payers we are disgusted with the status quo!!! As a neighborhood and voting block we are ready for the fight. We will stand up and be counted. We will organize and vote! We will hold this administration accountable for once again kicking the can and taking no action on behalf of its own constituents. As the national climate of activists grows so does the politicization of causes.

Nothing was considered regarding fire hazards!!! After the recent devistating fires, ongoing droughts, the city wants to double down and fuel a potential disaster by funneling in masses of tourism into private residential neighborhoods???? There aren’t enough park rangers or police to enforce these areas!!! Look at the homeless crisis and rise in crime. The LAPD itself has confirmed that they can not patrol or protect this area’s residence.

Not a cent was spent on simple traffic solutions like automated camera citations. It’s laughable if it weren’t so sad. The most shocking aspects of the study was once again the opening of the Hollyridge gate which again requires a history lesson that it was opened illegally in the first place, horrifyingly a proposed attempt at shuttling people to and from?? What about the masses that choose to bypass the shuttle and just drive over??? The inane proposed solution of hollyland tourist shuttle, a picture platform in the middle of beachwood dr. And coordinated sign markers throughout the city guiding pedestrians and cars to both the illegal vista and the Hollyridge trail will be fought and if needed lawsuits filed.

Also how truly ignorant the report’s proposed solutions to the inherently millennial problem of the selfie, not understanding my generations mindset at the least, that nothing less then the original sign will do. Having artistic versions of the sign is cool but will only draw more visitors not less.
One gentleman from the Sierra Club, a group that was not consulted in Dixon study mentioned a fully paved trail with parking and the possibility of an almost perfect view was mentioned. It is a location I’m not familiar with nor was anyone else apparently, but this gentleman brings school busses of students there for pictures. Does anyone know where this entrance is? Has that been even considered????

Why not incentives the developers Mayor Garcetti? Since you have billed yourself as the high-rise mayor to once and for all fix the problem, build a sky platform, a space needle, a star shaped open air or glass enclosed something, a true visitor center that allows tourism to revel in the Hollywood Sign, something that in itself can create an additional monument? Where is the forward thinking???? Why not commission a worldwide design competition. Make it reality show prize! Build this thing close enough to appease the tourist trade and safe enough to not destroy the living standards of the surrounding neighborhoods or the ecology of Griffith park. Find our I.M. Pei!!!

I intend to use my company to spearhead and fund a viral marketing campaign and possible media buyout to save our homes and neighborhoods if need be.

We can do better, we can be smarter, more innovative and cost efficient. The Olympics are coming, the world is watching, lets give them something to see the will remain long after and become iconic.

I am available to assist in anyway I can.

Sincerely,
Doron Ofir
A newly awakened Angeleno

Doron Ofir

This message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the designated recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this message you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. Email transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free. Therefore, we do not represent that this information is complete or accurate and it should not be relied upon as such. By viewing this email you are agreeing to non disclosure of confidential information.
I would like the following entered into the record, please:

March 8, 2018

To Councilman Ryu and whom else it may concern;

I am unable to attend this evening’s meeting, due to work commitments, but I would like to have my thoughts entered into the record.

I have owned my home in Beachwood Canyon since 1994. I have seen many changes in the 23 plus years – some for better and some for worse. Those worst being the invasion of tourists to access the scenic overlook on Canyon Lake Dr. While some aspects of this problem have been mitigated, as somebody who uses the park on a daily basis, I can attest to the fact that the numbers of visitors are increasing every year.

When you (Councilman Ryu) met with our neighborhood during your campaign, we decided to endorse you based on what seemed like your concern for our plight, and your promise to help us. This proposed plan is a complete reneging of that promise. Nothing in this proposal is about finding another solution for alleviating the influx of tourists into a neighborhood that was never designed for the car and pedestrian bandwidth needed to accommodate this influx. Also, changing Beachwood and Lake Hollywood from strictly residential neighborhoods to a tourist destination, or a thoroughfare to a tourist destination, not only impacts the quality of life, but it also imposes an undue burden with no reward or benefit to those of us who live here.

What has been suggested is simply a way to make it easier, safer and more comfortable for the tourists. There is no regard for the people who have to live here 365 days a year. I consider this study and proposal a completely missed opportunity to deal systemically with this issue by finding alternatives to people viewing the sign in a way that does not impact a neighborhood, which is being damaged. It’s tantamount to an exterminator trying to find a way to make a safer and more comfortable home for the rats he’s been hired to remove.

Please do not endorse the proposal, and start from scratch in a way that actually includes the ideas of people who live here, and understand the issue.

Sincerely,

J.J. Blair

LA, CA 90068
OAKS Response to GPAB meeting

2 messages

Linda Othenin-Girard <[redacted]>
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Sun, Mar 11, 2018 at 2:36 PM

Hi Shannon,
I hope you have a moment to read the attached letter in response to Thursday night’s GPAB meeting. Thanks.

Linda

Linda Othenin-Girard
Cell: [redacted]

GPAB meeting letter to SP.docx
239K

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
To: Linda Othenin-Girard <[redacted]>

Mon, Mar 12, 2018 at 11:10 AM

Thank you so much for your participation and productive feedback. I will share with the Councilmember and senior staff.

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.851-2121
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1
Dear Shannon:

Fate has provided a way to end bickering, stop wasting time and money, and together create a winning solution to a major problem. The over-run through single-family residential neighborhoods to Griffith Park can be solved by re-purposing the stalled, empty Target structure at Hollywood and Western. It is clear that the only way peacefully, fairly, legally, and productively to solve the problem of the overrun into Griffith Park is to establish a big, bold, and sophisticated tourist center away from residential neighborhoods. Fate has delivered the perfect structure. All parties can contribute to and benefit from The Hollywood Target with the Star on Top. Everyone wins: it's a win-win-win-win-win-win-win-win-win-win-win-win-win-win solution.

The Hollywood Target with the Star on Top

- The City uses its power of eminent domain to take possession of Target: Target wins
- Build a world class “star” on the roof as a museum and a high-tech selfie platform: tourists win
- Create & maintain the museum aspect of “star” structure: film schools and young talent win
- Develop photo techniques with green screening to bring the sign closer: Kodak and others win
- Create a top-drawer Visitors Center in the structure: City agencies come together and win
- Populate middle floors as an administrative center away from DTLA: centralized services win
- Populate the ground floor with choice food services and souvenirs: merchants win
- Shuttle pedestrians to The Hollywood Target with the Star on Top: traffic wins
- Olympics visitors sense a more orderly, composed, at peace state of affairs: everyone wins
- GP wildlife avoids penetration and human encroachment: the animals win
- Have Garcetti save face after his part in the Target dead end by sponsoring this new, winning solution: Even The Mayor wins with The Hollywood Target with the Star on Top
- A City architect wins with this redesign
- Franchise “Pocket Theme Parks” to other urban centers as solutions: creative consultants win

Attached is the proposal to build a “Pocket Theme Park” in the shape of a star, delivered to the City in April 2017. With this Target location, the idea grows to a new height and carries even more promise. Together, let's make an award-winner and leave the little bevvy of unworkable, undramatic, and not-future-oriented ideas behind us.

Sincerely,

Soren Kerk

Pocket Theme Parks 4-23 ver.pdf
237K
HHA Response to Dixon plan

HHA <[redacted]>  
To: susan@myhunc.com, Jim Van Dusen  
Cc: David Ryu <David.Ryu@lacity.org>, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, Joe.salaices@lacity.org, mike.shull@lacity.org

Please find attached the Hollywoodland Homeowners Association's response to the Dixon Resources Unlimited's plan for Hollywood Sign access. We request that the response be placed in the public record.

Thank you,

HHA

HHA Response to Dixon Proposals.pdf
493K
RESPONSE TO DIXON RESOURCES UNLIMITED
COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGIES REPORT

March 18, 2018

Hollywoodland Homeowners Association (tract 6450) represents 575 homes and the Hollywoodland Gifted Park (444 acres given to the city by the Sherman company in 1944). We are advocates for our residential community and the surrounding park land.

We have consistently stated our position regarding the complex tourist and hiker issues related to Western Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign: 1) Hollywood Sign Tourism has no place within R1 residential communities and all efforts must be made to protect these neighborhoods from tourist traffic intrusion. 2) Griffith Park access/entry must be located only in areas that have sufficient infrastructure to handle both pedestrian and auto traffic, are equipped with facilities for visitors (restrooms, water) and should be situated to minimize intrusion/disruption of R1 neighborhoods. With that understanding, we are woefully disappointed in the continued marketing of the historic but fragile Hollywoodland neighborhood as observed by the majority of Dixon study’s 29 suggestions. The Dixon Study and CD4’s acceptance and promotion of that study, reveal a complete disregard for the basic facts related to this geographic area:

- No legal park entrances (access) exist adjacent to the Hollywoodland, Lake Hollywood Estates and Hollywood Knolls residential neighborhoods.

- Physical constraints including: substandard width streets, lack of sidewalks, SEA (Significant Ecological Area), VHFSZ (Very High Fire Severity Zone), steep elevation grades, dead ends, the court order from Sunset Ranch vs. City of Los Angeles, historical landmarks, the main communication tower for the city, numerous private ingress/egress easements, trespassing of private property inside the park and the unauthorized, illegal alterations made in the park that contribute to many of the traffic issues.

- Ignoring the planning criteria and neighborhood protections dictated by the Hollywood Community Plan and the Los Angeles City Charter

We look forward to recognition of our factual comments and continued open communication and fact finding relating to these city imposed promotional issues. We will continue to work toward cost effective neighborhood preservation rather than neighborhood exploitation.

Hollywoodland Homeowners Association
Dear David, Sarah, Shannon, Susan and Julie:

The most important purpose of this email is to inform you that the board of directors of LHHA has retracted its support for a shuttle bus of any kind running up Beachwood Canyon in order to bring visitors to see the Hollywood sign.

HHA invited me to attend their last board meeting which took place last Tuesday, March 13.

At this meeting, HHA voted in favor of red curbing the non-residential portion of Canyon Lake Drive as a means to discourage visitors. Board members of HHA stated that they could walk to this park, which all of us understood was intended to be a small neighborhood park when it was first built and was never intended to be a major tourist attraction.

As Julie and Shannon know, I attended and spoke at the March 8 Griffith Park Advisory Board meeting. At both the 3/8 and 3/13 meetings, I learned much more clearly and compellingly how negatively the influx of tourists has impacted the quality of lives of the residents of Hollywoodland and Beachwood Canyon. Any solution that benefits one neighborhood to the detriment of another neighborhood is not a good solution. Both LHHA and HHA agree that public safety needs to be the #1 priority. Both of our HOA boards are deeply concerned that a careless smoker could cause a major fire and that a fatal automobile accident caused by a visitor unfamiliar with our narrow streets is unfortunately “waiting to happen”.

HHA and its late member Jack Conrad have come up with what I think is an outstanding solution: to build a parking lot and visitor and nature center on the Toyon landfill on the north side of Griffith Park. Kindly please review the attachments herein. The parking lot could connect to a shuttle that could bring visitors to see the Hollywood Sign. The area is large enough to safely provide the tourist infrastructure needed such as ADA requirements and public restrooms. This solution was not mentioned by Julie Dixon. I strongly feel that this solution warrants further serious consideration.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfeade515e&jsver=jIbIdzeP9wE.en.&view=pt&as_query=david%40vaughanbenz.com&as_from=david%40vaughanbenz.com
Dear Julie:

First, thanks for the comprehensive January 2017 report that you and your team prepared regarding western Griffith Park/Vista and related topics. You certainly covered the suggestions discussed during our meetings and more.

Representatives of the Lake Hollywood Homeowners Association had a meeting with Councilman Ryu, Sarah Dusseault and Shannon Prior on Feb. 15th to discuss a few matters, including the issue of visitors/the Vista. During that conversation we noted that while your report is very comprehensive, it basically addresses ways of managing the ever increasing numbers of visitors rather than directly dealing with the issue of reducing the volume of visitors in cars coming to our area. The major exception is the gondola concept. Even if that concept is ultimately pursued, it is a very long-term project. During our meeting with the council office, we proposed a couple of new ideas in the interest of public safety that had not fully occurred to the LHHA board until we met again recently in preparation for our meeting with the council.
The council office found the ideas to be interesting and suggested that we write you and copy them with our two new ideas. Below are our suggestions.

1. A 3-pronged approach for reducing the volume of visitors coming through or into Hollywoodland, the Knolls, and Lake Hollywood Estates:

   1. Red line all of Canyon Lake between Arrowhead Drive and the Vista.

   2. Place the entire Lake Hollywood Estates neighborhood into a PPD, thereby providing no public parking in our area except via permits.

   3. To accommodate the public in this area, visitors would be provided with city-run shuttles from public transportation areas, including Franklin and Beachwood, from the Hollywood side. Visitors in cars would take shuttles from public parking space(s), like the zoo, in Griffith Park and possibly the metro stations in Hollywood and Universal City. Sarah suggested that those shuttles should probably be electric to make them more environmentally friendly. The shuttles should also be equipped with an audio message about the history of the Hollywood sign as well as a message in multiple languages about the severe fire danger caused by smoking in the hills, accompanied by brochures and perhaps also signage in multiple languages with the same "no smoking" message.

Additionally, to make the 3-pronged program effective, the community would need regular, but not continuous, enforcement of parking restrictions. If such a comprehensive program were instituted, it would need to be communicated on all formal tourist web sites as well as on social media sites. The communications would inform visitors that they cannot stop their cars or park to take photographs. To get out of vehicles and take photographs, visitors need to take the publicly provided shuttles, for which there probably would be a modest fee, or have someone drop them off. The PPD would need to be in effect every day but would not be applicable at night.

We feel this proposal would directly address the huge volume of cars currently coming through Hollywoodland, the Knolls and LHHA while still providing public access. Shuttle fees hopefully would offset shuttle costs. And the current resources that the city devotes to enforcement in terms of Rangers, police and traffic enforcement officers, especially during peak tourist periods, hopefully could be reduced as visitors begin to recognize that driving a private car into this area is not the most effective way to get the photograph they want. The basic enforcement element would be regular traffic officer enforcement of the parking restrictions.

Our neighborhood would not support this proposal unless all elements were implemented simultaneously. Clearly this area, already overwhelmed by visitors in ever larger numbers, cannot withstand additional visitors brought up via shuttle unless the parking restrictions were also implemented to discourage visitors in cars from driving into the area because of pervasive parking restriction that prohibit all daytime parking on Canyon Lake and all non-permitted parking on all the residential streets in the neighborhood.

The only major expense in this proposal would be acquisition and operation of the shuttles, for which a fee would be charged. The rest of the approach—painting curbs, creating a PPD, and regular but not continuous (except perhaps in the early stages to make the enforcement message clear) enforcement—involves relatively small to modest costs, and the entire approach or elements of it could readily be modified if time and experience show that the 3-pronged approach requires changes.

2. Consider making the Vista a turn-around area for vehicles in the near future to provide a safe area for cars, taxis, etc. to turn around and return in the direction from which they came without making the dangerous U-turns or 3 pointed turns currently undertaken at Arrowhead/Canyon Lake intersection, middle of Canyon Lake and at the "Madonna" house intersection at the top of Canyon Lake. Such a turn-around could also be used in the longer term if our suggested plan for shuttles were implemented. The shuttles could turn, drop off and pick up at such a turn-out.
Hello David,

I'm waiting to get more technical information regarding the Toyon site from the Bureau of Sanitation. However, as I mentioned to you at the last HUNC meeting, this site was a landfill and roughly 10-12 years of methane extraction remains before anything can be built there. Again, I'm waiting for more technical specifics and will keep you posted.

Thank you.

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.851-2121
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1
Dear Shannon:

I will appreciate receiving this specific information when it is available.

Thank you.

Have a great weekend.

Best regards,

David

From: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Sent: Friday, April 06, 2018 10:28 AM
To: David Benz <david.benz@lacity.org>
Cc: David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>; Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>; Julie Dixon
This email has been scanned for spam and viruses by Proofpoint Essentials. Click [here](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfdeae515e&jsver=jblzdzeP9wE.en.&view=pt&as_query=david%40vaughanbenz.com&as_from=david%40vaughanbenz.co) to report this email as spam.
TOYON CANYON RECREATION & TOURISM CENTER

Problem:

Hundreds of thousands of tourists and visitors overwhelming substandard residential communities unequipped to absorb them, while simultaneously leaving extraordinary amounts of tourist dollars on the table.

Proposal:

To promote Griffith Park as a hub of Los Angeles, spotlighting its phenomenal flora and fauna, as well as its proximity to the Hollywood Sign, thereby redirecting the current unsustainable level of visitors from substandard residential neighborhoods.

Plan:

Toyon Canyon is a 90 acre parcel of undeveloped land in the middle of Griffith Park atop an abandoned dump. It is approached from the northern, non-residential side of the park, bordered by cemeteries and the Los Angeles River. The 134 Freeway has underused on / off ramps for both north and southbound traffic near the location, and there are on / off ramps to and from the 5 freeway nearby, as well. The roads to access the parcel itself are among some of the best in the park.

The first step in developing this project will be to get the Board of Sanitation to sign off on the safety of the location. There is a five year old film online declaring the area ready for picnicking and light recreation, and there’s plenty of other information about ‘rehabilitating’ the parcel dating from 1993. Considering that background, we feel the BoS should have enough information to make a satisfactory sign-off.

If Toyon Canyon is developed in harmony with players like Universal, Major Developers, etc., this could become a major cash cow for both Griffith Park and the City of Los Angeles.

We imagine a complex that could include:

1. **A VISITOR CENTER**: to greet and inform visitors, and act as a tram and hiking hub.
   - This space would enlarge the tiny display from Crystal Springs Ranger Station to include our local flora and fauna, and host to Ranger talks and interpretative tours featuring indigenous flora in landscaping around the center. (We’d include poison oak, so people know what to look for).
   - Zoo reps could answer questions about indigenous fauna, maybe bring a mascot along -- thereby promoting the Zoo.
   - This center could show a short film about the attractions in the park -- thinking bigger, it might feature an IMAX Theater.
   - Friends of Griffith Park and Griffith Park Advisory Board could also use this space to present their mission statements to the public.
   - A Tree People presence could include educational information about urban forestry. Perhaps it could include a study of how to get plants to grow on a former dump, which has been attempted since 1993 without much success. This may be a study that would interest a local University? Pierce College or some other Ag
School?
  ○ Displays from all the Griffith Park attractions: The Zoo, The Autry Museum, Travel Town, The Observatory, The Greek, Golf Courses, The Merry Go Round, Pony Ride, Kids Train, Disney Steamers and of course the local stables.

2. **CONCESSIONS:** hats, water, hiking poles, bumper stickers, t-shirts, maps, etc.

3. **FOOD / BATHROOMS / PICNIC AREAS.**

4. **GUIDED HIKES:** Involve the Sierra Club or some other trail building organization in setting up a comprehensive trail system with the hub at Toyon. Make it the center of the Park’s trail system.

5. **TRAM TO THE HOLLYWOOD SIGN, ETC.** This center would serve as the pickup and drop off point for guests who want to take a tram to access the Mt Chapel trail to Mt Lee (Hollywood Sign) and the trail to the top of Mt Hollywood (in the other direction above the Observatory), the Hollywood Sign picture spot (above the Bronson Caves), or the Observatory. This could also serve as a stop for people coming up/down the hill to/from Bronson Caves.

6. **PARKING:** There’s room for parking of up to 20,000 cars on the empty property. A gravel surface would suffice for both parking and out-gassing. Trams or walking only past this point.

7. **ANCILLARY SERVICES:** The Mt Chapel tram stop would have bathrooms and concessions.

8. **OTHER DEVELOPMENT:** Create and promote new trail space for equestrians in the area. Have tie ups and a water source for horses.

This plan is backed by the HHA.
adjacent HOA contacts
7 messages

David Benz <David.Benz@Lacity.org>  
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
Cc: Laura Davis, Jane Goichman, Kristina O'Neil, Andy Corrigan, Paul Rusconi, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>  

Tue, Mar 20, 2018 at 9:22 AM

Hi Shannon:

It was very nice seeing and spending time with you last night!

I have an important favor:

As I mentioned in my statement at the HUNC meeting, I strongly feel that the HOAs impacted by the Dixon meeting should speak to one another: it does us no good if we’re pitted against one another for whatever reason as, while the nuances of the tourist management problem may differ somewhat from neighborhood to neighborhood, all of us are overwhelmed by tourists in one way or another, and all of us share a common concern for public safety, especially fire safety and prevention of a fatal automobile accident.

HHA and LHHA are now speaking with one another and have found common ground. As I mentioned in a letter that I sent out yesterday, HHA’s board supports the LHHA board’s idea to red curb the non residential part of Canyon Lake Drive as part of a comprehensive plan to discourage private vehicles coming to the vista. I would also like to mention that they support the upcoming tree planting plan on Mulholland Highway.

Can you kindly please connect me with the leader(s) of the HOA representing Canyon Drive and Hollywood Knolls Community Club?

While I’m not sure we can make this happen, I’m hoping that all of these HOAs can arrive at some consensus prior to the 4/9 HUNC meeting.

Thanks, Shannon.

Best regards,

David
Hello all.

Sarah and Shannon, HHA is in agreement with everything David wrote below including his interest in connecting with The Oaks and Knolls groups. Can you help make this happen?

Thanks, Laura

---

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
To: David Benz < >  
Cc: Laura Davis , Jane Goichman , Kristina O'Neil < >, Andy Corrigan < >, Paul Rusconi < >, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>  

Hello.

Sarah and Shannon, HHA is in agreement with everything David wrote below including his interest in connecting with The Oaks and Knolls groups. Can you help make this happen?

Thanks, Laura

---

Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>  
To: David Benz < >  
Cc: Laura Davis , Jane Goichman , Kristina O'Neil < >, Andy Corrigan < >, Paul Rusconi < >, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>  

Hello.

Sarah and Shannon, HHA is in agreement with everything David wrote below including his interest in connecting with The Oaks and Knolls groups. Can you help make this happen?

Thanks, Laura
Hi David,

Good to see you last night. The Councilmember has, since day one, consistently and repeatedly taken a holistic approach to this issue. I’m confused how you think the process pits neighbors against each other when the process has always been about bringing the similarly impacted neighborhoods together. That is why the Councilmember commissioned a study to look at all of the areas. That is also why we brought all of the communities together at the stakeholder meetings and why I shared all of the participants’ names in a follow-up email on 11/15/17.

It was also confusing to hear particular community members claim they were not included in the process when our office and Dixon has met with them regarding the study.

I’m glad that you and your neighbors are open to ideas to manage and address access and safety issues. I look forward to continuing to work with you and all of the stakeholders.

I’m cc’ing the following community members who participated in the stakeholder meetings from the HOAs/Associations in The Oaks, Beachwood, Hollywoodland, and The Knolls:

**Hollywood Knolls Community Club:**
Christina Capps
Bruce McCarthy

**Hollywoodland HOA:**
Tara Stephenson-Fong
Jeanne Clark

**Oaks HOA:**
Linda Othenin-Girard
Bob Young

**Beachwood Canyon Neighborhood Association:**
Florence Isabelle Megginson
Missy Kelly

**Lake Hollywood HOA:**
Paul Rusconi
Andy Corrigan
Jane Goichman

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.851-2121
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1
+ Dan Savage and Ken Gralla from HKCC

David Benz, President

Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.851-2121
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1
Hi Shannon:

Thank you for your response.

I think some of the pitting one neighborhood against another, whether intentionally or unintentionally, occurred when Tom La Bonge was our council person.

Laura Davis and I met at the excellent meeting at the Central Area Command Center that Sarah facilitated some months ago. She reached out to me and invited me to the HHA meeting a couple of weeks ago. I don’t think it is productive to mention names of people that might have instigated discord between LHHA and HHA, but suffice to say that names of well-intended people in both communities were mentioned as instigators of discord. Since I am friends with some of these people in both communities, I know they have good hearts, good intentions and share the same concerns that I do. I explained this to Laura.

When your office provided my HOA with information about the Dixon study, I forwarded it by email to the residents of LHHA and posted it to LHHA residents on Nextdoor.com. I’m not at all familiar with how this information was disseminated to residents of the other HOAs.

Thanks again for this information. I’ll reach out to the other HOAs, and hopefully, in the weeks to come, we can arrive at some consensus.

Best regards,

David

David Benz, President

Vaughan Benz
Exceptional Furniture Since 1986

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=cfeade515e&jsver=HcM5JMu2nSY.en.&view=pt&cat=Feedback%20Dixon%20study%20publish&search=cat&th=162460114
From: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2018 11:29 AM
To: David Benz < >; Laura Davis < >; Jane Goichman < >; Kristina O'Neil < >; Andy Corrigan < >; Paul Rusconi < >; Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>; christina capps < >; Bruce McCarthy < >; Tara Stephenson-Fong < >; Jeanne Clark < >; Linda Othenin-Girard < >; Missy Kelly < >; Linda Othenin-Girard
Cc: Paul Rusconi < >; Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>; christina capps
Subject: Re: adjacent HOA contacts

This email has been scanned for spam and viruses by Proofpoint Essentials. Click here to report this email as spam.

Linda Othenin-Girard
To: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Hi Shannon,
Thanks for this. I hope we can pursue a policy that Councilmember Ryu started to bring people together to find common ground. I will forward this to the Oaks Board. Now that John Saurenman is president of the Oaks Board please copy him on all communications to the Board. His email is

Thank so much.
Linda

Linda Othenin-Girard
Oaks Homeowners Association
Cell:

On Mar 20, 2018, at 11:28 AM, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]
Shannon Prior
Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.851-2121
http://davidryu.lacity.org/

- Immediate life-threatening police, fire or medical emergency: 9-1-1
- Parking enforcement (blocked driveway, parking violation, locate impounded vehicle): 213-485-4184
- Police non-emergency: 877-ASK-LAPD (877-275-5273)
- Sanitation (missed trash pick-up, broken container): 800-773-2489
- Traffic control (signal light out): 213-485-4184
- Dept. of Water & Power: 800-342-5397
- Other City issues: 3-1-1

Ken Gralla

Tue, Mar 20, 2018 at 5:41 PM
To: Bruce McCarthy < >, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, " 
Cc: christina capps < >, " 

Shannon,

I support the Council member and your efforts to address the increasing problems in our area. The Dixon study is a good start.

Thank you.

Ken Gralla

Sent from Outlook

From: Bruce McCarthy < >
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2018 11:42 AM
To: Shannon Prior; Ken Gralla; 
Cc: David Benz; Laura Davis; Jane Goichman; Kristina O'Neil; Andy Corrigan; Paul Rusconi; Sarah Dusseault; christina capps; Tara Stephenson-Fong; Jeanne Clark; Linda Othenin-Girard; ; Florence-Isabelle Megginson; Missy Kelly
Subject: Re: adjacent HOA contacts