



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

Dixon Report. File # 18-0057

1 message

robert andrus <andrus.r@gmail.com>
To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org
Cc: info@hollywoodland.org

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 10:38 PM

Hello,

I am a resident of Beachwood Canyon. I cannot come to the meeting regarding the Dixon report because I have to work but would like to express my opinion on the matter.

I attended a presentation of the Dixon proposals earlier this year. What stood out about the proposals was that they put the interests of everyone at the same level - that those of the tourists who will be here for an hour or a day are the same, or even more important than those of the residents. That everyone's more or less an equal "stakeholder."

That's just not the case. The priority of the government - of the city of Los Angeles - is to protect and serve its residents. Not the residents of other places all over the world, but the people who live here. Who pay taxes here. Who get up and go to work and raise their families and walk their dogs and say hi to their neighbors and make this area a good place. Who have made probably the most fundamental investment of time and money and energy that they will ever make in their lives - their homes. And this is a great neighborhood, a unique neighborhood - because it functions not as a throughway, not as a stop for tour buses, not as a footnote in a travel experience, but as a place where people live.

The city should be thinking of ways to protect this neighborhood, not to encourage its use as a tourist destination. The city should not be opening "vista points" in the middle of this neighborhood. They should not be talking about bringing shuttle buses with tour guide commentators through the streets. It's really crazy that these things are even being seriously proposed. This is a residential neighborhood, not Disneyland. Try to imagine how this would feel if it happened where you lived.

The city, if anything, should be discouraging the tourist intrusion and consequent destruction of this neighborhood. Because it is a destructive process - encouraging the tourist trade here says to the residents that they don't matter - that people taking selfies at the Hollywood sign are more important than the lives of the people who live here day in and day out. The people who run this city - you who are reading this letter - who are participating in this decision- are saying to their fellow citizens that they don't matter. And that really isn't right.

From the outside - to someone hired to do a traffic study or even the average resident of the city itself - the kind of sentiment I'm expressing seems whiney, extreme, a little hysterical. But take a look at some of the videos of summer weekends in which cars are gridlocked on narrow streets, unable to move, blocking the residents ability to get in and out of their own houses, blocking potential emergency vehicles, blocking even the ability of the visitors to get out of the area. And tell me that a neighborhood can survive this for

long. That the city has done the right thing by its citizens. And that you would feel okay if you lived here.

You can say that the city has to encourage tourism, that tourism keeps the city prosperous. In part that is true. But when everywhere is just another tourist destination, the city has lost its soul.

The city has to step up and do the right thing. You must reconsider the assumptions of this report and initiate positive steps to protect this neighborhood and the city itself.

Thank you

Robert Andrus
2890 Durand Drive



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

Council file 18-0057 Dixon Report email #1

1 message

sschw56079 via Clerk Arts Committee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 1:30 PM

Reply-To: sschw56079@aol.com

To: clerk.artscommittee@lacity.org

I am resending this email.
I did not see it in the file.

-----Original Message-----

From: [sschw56079](mailto:sschw56079@aol.com) <sschw56079@aol.com>

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Sent: Wed, May 9, 2018 9:49 pm

Subject: Council file 18-0057 Dixon Report email #1

Subject: Council file 18-0057 Dixon Report email #1

COUNCIL FILE 18-0057 DIXON REPORT

Dear City Official,

I am writing to you about the Dixon Report Council file 18-0057.

I am a forty year resident of Hollywoodland, a twice president of the Hollywoodland Homeowners Association, a founder of Homeowners on Beachwood Drive United, and an activist in Hollywoodland and Hollywood. My comments on the Dixon Report will mainly focus on **Hollywoodland and its surrounding areas. Almost all of our concerns deal with safety.**

Can you please confirm the following:

1 Please confirm you have received this document. I will be sending a total of five emails--the last one being sent in a few days which will contain more specific comment on the Dixon Report. Please make them all part of the public record, and we hope you will also carefully read and consider this information that we are sending to you as you carry out careful deliberations on the Dixon Report.

2 I am requesting to be informed of any public hearings, forums, and/or other opportunities for public comment on the Dixon Report. I and my neighbors had no participation in this report even though our safety and property values are DIRECTLY impacted by this report. Some Dixon suggestions are literally several feet from our homes. We are entitled to have input in this process.

3 I have made a 30 minute safety film about the fire and traffic dangers in Hollywoodland. Various City officials have viewed this film (which has been updated 14 times) If you have any interest in seeing this film, and I think it would be very helpful in understanding conditions here, please contact me.

Below are my general comments on the Dixon Report.

Sincerely,
 Sarajane Schwartz
 Homeowners On Beachwood Drive United (HBDU)

Overview

Tourism and hiking at the current level is a new phenomenon in Hollywoodland, which for decades had been a quiet residential community. For over seventy years tourists would come and go, spend money in Los Angeles, and were satisfied to view the Hollywood Sign from afar. The Sign was built to be experienced that way. That was the norm. It has only been recently that the City, through representatives like former Councilman Tom Labonge and the current Councilman David Ryu, has illegally and dangerously created and promoted bootlegged tourist magnets in Hollywoodland. The City of Los Angeles has never received a single cent of income directly from people visiting the Sign, (it doesn't even receive the lucrative royalty fees from its use), but the dangerous promotion of the Sign which invites visitors into an extremely fragile residential neighborhood with limited infrastructure is leaving **the City with a potential liability that could run from tens of millions to possibly a billion dollars** in the case of a truly catastrophic incident. (Before the recent tourist related congestion, one resident died in a house fire when first responders had trouble navigating our narrow streets and limited infrastructure. Now multiply that by the hundreds.) **The suggestions in the Dixon Report, if followed, would cause the City for the first time to FORMALLY create, sponsor, and operate a world wide tourist magnet in the midst of an extremely substandard residential neighborhood in a very high fire zone.** Tourism to Los Angeles is approaching 50 million visitors a year and growing. This number does not include local hikers. How many of these visitors now want to visit the Hollywood Sign close up? Even a small percentage of these numbers, which it is not, can be devastating to a limited residential neighborhood. Formally creating these magnets for the first time as the Dixon Study suggests will cause an even more dramatic jump in these numbers. The two crucial factors most frequently ignored in the Dixon Report are safety and the fact that this is a residential neighborhood.

Almost all of the proposals in the Dixon Report will have a negative and for the most dangerous impact on Hollywoodland, and that is why the City has previously rejected many of these ideas. These include such things as formally establishing and expanding tourism through signs, buses/trams, new park entrances, parking meters, reducing residential parking, establishing new tourist magnets, further reducing ingress and egress by establishing one way streets and narrowing streets with pedestrian lanes and a bump out, eliminating use of a pocket park for the surrounding neighborhood, and on and on. Also, this is an incomplete haphazard list that ignores some of the major tourist magnets, so the Dixon Report is far from comprehensive.

Cost

Contrary to the Dixon Report, which extraordinarily and primarily lists positives and barely any negatives to their suggestions, hardly any of the "fixes" listed in Hollywoodland to expand tourism would be cheap, easy, or fast. The proposals to transform the previously passive western side of Griffith Park and the surrounding residential communities into a platform for Hollywood Sign viewing is a "project". Under CEQUA law a project cannot be piecemealed in, including these suggested bandaids. A full comprehensive EIR is mandated by law. Also any decisions to formally establish and transform Hollywoodland into a tourist magnet--and possibly by definition and necessity, one of the largest on the West Coast--will be met with prolonged litigation. So far two different judges have not only recently ruled against greater public access in Hollywoodland but have closed down the existing bootlegged opening which was the subject of the litigations. All of the other magnets would be litigated. Hollywoodland is also protected by a formal agreement with the City that these proposals violate, The Hollywoodland Specific Plan. Hollywoodland is also a SEA, significant ecological area. In addition, the area surrounding Hollywoodland (The Hollywoodland Gifted Park) was a later gift to Griffith Park in the 1940's and is not bound by the mandates of the original Griffith Park gift.

If after going through a prolonged legal process in which the City were surprisingly but unfortunately successful and these ideas were to be put into place, they would be very expensive to properly and safely manage. There is no substitute for personnel and supervision. Signs in Hollywoodland are routinely and frequently ignored. (Example: Daily, residents see visitors illegally smoking near "No Smoking" signs, and visitors parking next to "No Parking" signs.) They don't work. These signs are connected to basic safety. Imagine if Disney said they were going to open a brand new park that was specifically designed for tourism and in a safe place, but there would be no employees to supervise or secure the visitors. How would the City respond to this insane idea? Now imagine that the City--not Disney--is going to put this same international tourist attraction in a place that was never designed for tourism-- a hillside residential neighborhood with substandard infrastructure, limited site lines, blind curves, dead ends, no turnarounds, no sidewalks, limited parking, etc. in a very high fire hazard severity zone with limited ingress and egress, and still have no full time supervision. (To give further perspective, Disneyland is under 200 acres, while Hollywoodland and its surrounding area are over 500 acres) How can the City, which has an even greater responsibility for public welfare and safety, provide so much less than they would demand from a private entity? At what point does this become criminal negligence? Because of the very inherent inhospitable nature of Hollywoodland's location, layout, and infrastructure to being a tourist attraction, a minimum skeleton crew of 12 to 15 full time employees would be needed to manage this officially designated area, and even the amount of safety this would provide is questionable because you are still forcing a square peg into a round hole.

In the end, as stated above, the potential liability for the City could run from tens of millions to a billion dollars in the case of a catastrophic event. Because conditions here are so obviously limited and unsuited to these Dixon proposals, the possibility of a tragedy is not an "if" but a "when".

Location

The Dixon Report offers suggestions that are out of place, outdated, questionable, dangerous and probably illegal. Rather than putting safety first as a top priority, it is shockingly ignored or at most an afterthought. Surprisingly, many of the proposals are a rehash of previously presented ideas that the City has already rejected because of the above mentioned qualities.

The Dixon Report is out of place because it would be harder to find a worst place for promoting tourism and hiking than in the streets of Hollywoodland. And because there are hardly any sidewalks, we literally mean IN the streets. (Currently, pedestrians including many children and cars dangerously mix in narrow congested streets, and the Dixon Report wants to add trams/buses to the mix. Pedestrians are threatened, and car accidents and damage to parked cars is common.) Hollywoodland is a residential neighborhood even though the report virtually ignores residents, their needs and barely even mentions the word. **There are currently no legal park entrances, view sites or tourist magnets in Hollywoodland.** They have all been recently bootlegged in without proper process. Hollywoodland, the first Canyon development in Los Angeles, was established in 1923. This R1 residential hillside development with its formally designated historical monuments---some that wind throughout the neighborhood-- was built with what is today categorized as substandard infrastructure. All of the streets are substandard widths (some as narrow as 18 feet) featuring frequent blind curves. Most have no sidewalks, limited parking, and have dead ends with no turnarounds. It is in a very high fire hazard severity zone with limited egress and ingress. In addition, because Hollywoodland juts further north into Griffith Park than any other neighborhood, it is a bottleneck and the only neighborhood 80% surrounded by combustible brush. A fire on a windy day could cut off residents and tourists trapping thousands in a catastrophic fire storm. In addition to fire and pedestrian and vehicular traffic issues, there is a public health and security issue. Visitors, strangers, knock on residents' doors and ask to use private bathrooms. That's when they ask, but there is also widespread public urination and defecation in streets and on private property. For the most part, this vulnerable neighborhood functions well for its intended purpose as a home to residents, but is totally inadequate, unsuitable, inappropriate, and dangerous to be used as a tourist magnet and destination, for one of the most recognizable icons on the planet. **This is a matter of safety.** Hollywoodland is also an historically and environmentally significant area, and in order to protect and conserve this neighborhood a formal City agreement, The Hollywoodland Specific Plan, was put into place over 20 years ago. The Dixon Report ignores and violates the very reason for and foundation of this plan.

More On Fire Safety

An additional word about fires. The threat of a catastrophe has never been greater due to climate change. Fire season, which used to be confined to a few months out of the year, is now practically year round. Smoking is illegal in this very high fire hazard severity zone, yet since the recent influx of tourists, everyday, residents see visitors and hikers who have been invited in by the City, breaking the law, frequently and threateningly, right in front of their homes and/or next to "No Smoking" signs. Visitors are hardly ever cited even though smoking is wide spread and very dangerous. It is sadly and inappropriately left to residents to protect their homes and enforce no smoking laws. When a resident asks a stranger to put out their cigarette these interactions can become confrontational and at times hostile. Frankly, it is unfair for residents to be put in this position but cigarettes have been the cause of previous fires. In the 1960's there was a fire in Hollywoodland caused by a machine spark, and dozens of homes burned. There were fewer homes in Hollywoodland than now, no tourists, and the traffic in Hollywood was just a fraction of what it is today. Contemporary accounts of the fire say it took 200 policemen just to control traffic in the evacuation of the hillsides. Until that time it was the largest traffic jam in Hollywood history. What do you think would happen today with all of the additional people and congestion? How many would die? The evacuation plan also includes the dozens of horses at the historic Sunset Ranch established in 1923 that would be run down the middle of Beachwood Drive, the main artery of Hollywoodland, but still substandard in width and missing sidewalks. In 2003, before all of the tourist/hiking congestion there was a fire on a nearby street, and the resident died because the emergency vehicles had trouble maneuvering on the narrow streets. This incident contributed to the establishment of The Red Flag program in Hollywoodland and in Los Angeles. But fires do not only occur on the very few Red Flag Days. It is irresponsible and negligent for the City to be flooding this fragile area with hundreds of thousands of visitors causing dangerous congestion. Isn't one death more than enough?

Terrorism

The Dixon Report is sadly lacking and outdated in today's post 9/11 world. Security as well as safety concerns are all but ignored. For decades, hikers, even residents, were discouraged from going up to the top of Mt Lee and were asked to leave. The area is still filled with "No Trespassing" signs---signs that are now ignored because, ironically, since 9/11 instead of increasing protections in this area as threats have grown, the City's reaction has been the exact opposite in now encouraging visitors into this once "off limits" and still very sensitive location. The City, under the previous

Councilman Labonge, has invented the new unvetted activity of "Walking to the Sign" which has caused the numbers of visitors to skyrocket. Anything can be carried to the top of Mt Lee--large suitcases, backpacks the size used for hiking in the Rockies for weeks--anything, and none of it is inspected! And what is at the top of Mt Lee? **There are five terrorist targets concentrated in one area!** The first is the Hollywood Sign, a symbol of Western culture known throughout the world. The second is the very important emergency communication tower necessary for first responders throughout areas of Southern California. The third is a heliport with 8000 gallons of stored flammable fuel. The fourth is the Tyrolean Tank which contains the water supply for Hollywoodland. The fifth is the extremely vulnerable and flammable hillside with its residential homes which sits in a very high fire severity zone with limited ingress and egress. (Fires have been promoted on extremists' websites to be used as weapons.) I will not write further details on this in public, but one can use their imagination. All of this in one location that is basically unsupervised with the City encouraging even more visitors to come. Where else in the world are major attractions and sensitive emergency infrastructure treated this way? How negligent is this? The level of supervision can be judged by a 2016/17 New Years Eve event when the entire world was understandably on high alert, and we were assured by our City representatives that the same was the case atop of Mt Lee. That night a visitor climbed onto the Hollywood Sign and then left after spending three hours on the Sign in order to change its appearance. If security is so meager on one of the most high alert times of the year, what is left? Is this an appropriate location for tourists and hikers? These conditions are an utter embarrassment and further contribute to the views of residents that when it comes to safety and the Sign, the City is guilty of utter incompetence and manifest and unpardonable neglect.

What The Dixon Report Should Have Been

The Dixon Report, with the possible exception of some planting along Mulholland Highway, is a gross failure in conjunction with Hollywoodland. The report contains proposals for dangerously promoting, fostering, accommodating, establishing and increasing tourism and hiking in Hollywoodland and the immediate surrounding areas. It does not truly regulate or minimize tourist problems. It makes them worse. It would establish one of the West Coast's largest tourist attractions in the middle of a substandard residential neighborhood. It makes no sense. It's like pouring water from a pitcher into a thimble. You can paint the thimble, put signs on the thimble, bandage the thimble, but it will still only hold so much water and is inadequate and inappropriate for the purpose. Even if we supported tourism here, the increasing numbers are simply unsustainable. The City needs to find a larger, safer receptacle for its ever growing water/visitors.

If City representation were thoughtful and responsible they would have requested a plan that put **safety first** and, therefore, would have focused on sheltering vulnerable residential neighborhoods because conditions there are dangerous and inappropriate. In the past when there were high numbers of tourists Councilman Labonge would shut down all access to Hollywoodland except for residents and their needs. This worked. Because of the ever rising numbers, this solution now needs to be put into place--either for all of Hollywoodland or for the just the magnets--- permanently. The Dixon Report should have had suggestions for shutting down each of the bootlegged magnets instead of expanding them because they are unsafe, and the potential City liability is enormous. There are solutions for each one. For example, when the bootlegged entrance to Griffith Park at the end of Beachwood Drive was open, and Beachwood Drive was dangerously overrun with visitors and congestion, a chief DOT engineer said close off access to the park at the dead end, and it will solve the safety problem. The politicians did not close the magnet, but two different judges ruled that the access should be closed. Safety was the issue. Since it was closed approximately a year ago, problems have been greatly reduced in this area, and it is unconscionable that the Dixon Report actually contains several plans for reopening what would be a new public access at the end of Beachwood Drive for hikers and buses that would not only recreate the previous dangerous conditions but make them far worse. The neighborhood has plans for the other bootlegged magnets that would close them and make those areas safe. There is also a neighborhood plan for replanting, fencing, and restoring the illegal and bootlegged view site at Mulholland Highway and Canyon Lake Drive. This should have been in the Dixon Report. There are also ways to close down the other magnets. With the possible exception of residential areas that have legal entrances to Griffith Park and have infrastructure (the end of Canyon Drive in Brush Canyon is an example of this. It has been the legal entrance to this area of Griffith Park since the 1940's. It has parking, sidewalks, and access to all of the same trails. It is safe.) **the City should be focusing on shutting down tourism/hiking in fragile hillside residential neighborhoods and instead be focusing on the northern side of Griffith Park.** It was only briefly mentioned in the Dixon Report. That is where the future lies. The City can SAFELY develop this area with proper infrastructure for the ever growing numbers of visitors. It is away from the dangerous confines and limitations of the residential neighborhoods. It is near freeways. There is even enough room to build a structure that can be monetized if the City chooses. But in the end before and after this northern area is developed, Hollywoodland needs to be sheltered and the bootlegged magnets need to be shut down. This is for two reasons. The first is very simple. It is not safe in Hollywoodland and cannot be made safe. Issues such as smoking, and vehicular and pedestrian congestion IN the street, cannot be solved any other way. Secondly, in order for the new northern access and development to work, the closer and cheaper/free access --in case the City monetizes the north--must be shut down in Hollywoodland or visitors will continue to come here even though it is unsafe, and this will undercut the potential success of northern access or other developed safe access points. It's just common sense.

There should have been a different methodology in the Dixon Report. The process was fatally flawed. Besides putting safety first along with residential considerations, the cons as well as the pros of each of the suggestions should have been listed instead of for the most part just listing the pros. Many proposals originating from Hollywoodland residents

were not included even though they are directly impacted, and real hard data is nonexistent or questionable. In the end the report is an incomplete and inaccurate laundry list of some new proposals along with many previously rejected ones, that are illegal, impractical and dangerous. That's not much return on \$125,000 of taxpayers' money, but at least a long overdue public process is beginning. We hope it will continue with public officials putting the safety of residents and tourists first as they protect residential neighborhoods and promote tourism in other areas that are appropriate and safe.



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

Council File 18-0057 Dixon Report email #2

1 message

sschw56079 via Clerk Arts Committee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 1:19 PM

Reply-To: sschw56079@aol.comTo: clerk.artscommittee@lacity.org

I am resending this email.
I did not see it in the file.

-----Original Message-----

From: [sschw56079](mailto:sschw56079@aol.com) <sschw56079@aol.com>

To: [mayor.garcetti](mailto:mayor.garcetti@lacity.org) <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>; [councilmember.cedillo](mailto:councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org) <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>; [councilmember.krekorian](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org) <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>; [councilmember.blumenfield](mailto:councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org) <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>; [councilmember.martinez](mailto:councilmember.martinez@lacity.org) <councilmember.martinez@lacity.org>; [paul.koretz](mailto:paul.koretz@lacity.org) <paul.koretz@lacity.org>; [councilmember.rodriguez](mailto:councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org) <councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org>; [councilmember.harris-dawson](mailto:councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org) <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org>; [councilmember.price](mailto:councilmember.price@lacity.org) <councilmember.price@lacity.org>; [councilmember.wesson](mailto:councilmember.wesson@lacity.org) <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>; [councilmember.bonin](mailto:councilmember.bonin@lacity.org) <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>; [councilmember.englander](mailto:councilmember.englander@lacity.org) <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>; [councilmember.ofarrell](mailto:councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org) <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>; [councilmember.huizar](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org) <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>; [councilmember.buscaino](mailto:councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org) <councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org>; [david.ryu](mailto:david.ryu@lacity.org) <david.ryu@lacity.org>; [mike.n.feuer](mailto:mike.n.feuer@lacity.org) <mike.n.feuer@lacity.org>; [controller.galperin](mailto:controller.galperin@lacity.org) <controller.galperin@lacity.org>; [LAXAirportManager](mailto:LAXAirportManager@lawa.org) <LAXAirportManager@lawa.org>; [planning](mailto:planning@lacity.org) <planning@lacity.org>; [ladbs.webmaster](mailto:ladbs.webmaster@lacity.org) <ladbs.webmaster@lacity.org>; [adria.ybarra](mailto:adria.ybarra@lacity.org) <adria.ybarra@lacity.org>; [ken.bernstein](mailto:ken.bernstein@lacity.org) <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>; [lambert.giessinger](mailto:lambert.giessinger@lacity.org) <lambert.giessinger@lacity.org>; [ethics.commission](mailto:ethics.commission@lacity.org) <ethics.commission@lacity.org>; [LAFDrequest](mailto:LAFDrequest@lacity.org) <LAFDrequest@lacity.org>; [fernando.campos](mailto:fernando.campos@lacity.org) <fernando.campos@lacity.org>; [rap.commissioners](mailto:rap.commissioners@lacity.org) <rap.commissioners@lacity.org>; [ladot](mailto:ladot@ladot.org) <ladot@ladot.org>; [cory.palka](mailto:cory.palka@lapd.lacity.org) <cory.palka@lapd.lacity.org>; 40988 <40988@lapd.online>; [joe.salaices](mailto:joe.salaices@lacity.org) <joe.salaices@lacity.org>; [michael.a.shull](mailto:michael.a.shull@lacity.org) <michael.a.shull@lacity.org>; [aram.sahakian](mailto:aram.sahakian@lacity.org) <aram.sahakian@lacity.org>; [steve.houchin](mailto:steve.houchin@lacity.org) <steve.houchin@lacity.org>; [emdcommunications](mailto:emdcommunications@lacity.org) <emdcommunications@lacity.org>; [steven.cole](mailto:steven.cole@ladwp.com) <steven.cole@ladwp.com>; [michael.mcMenamin](mailto:michael.mcMenamin@ladwp.com) <michael.mcMenamin@ladwp.com>; [david.wright](mailto:david.wright@ladwp.com) <david.wright@ladwp.com>; [armando.hogan](mailto:armando.hogan@lacity.org) <armando.hogan@lacity.org>

Sent: Wed, May 9, 2018 10:35 pm

Subject: Council File 18-0057 Dixon Report email #2

email #2

Subject: COUNCIL FILE 18-10057 DIXON REPORT

ATTORNEY LETTER FROM LUNA GLUSHON

Running tourist trams/buses to the end of Beachwood Drive
Opening a tourist magnet at the end Of Beachwood Drive
Eliminating parking on Beachwood Drive to make more room for pedestrian and vehicular traffic

Dear City Official,

I'm sending this document in conjunction with the Dixon Report. This follows email #1 which contains my general comments on the Dixon Report. Please add this to the record.

The idea of running tourist trams/buses up Beachwood to the dead end of the street with no turnaround is not a new idea. Councilman Labonge introduced it several years ago. This attorney letter was sent to the City Transportation Committee along with some other docs I will be sending you. (This letter was written in conjunction with the then proposal to have buses/trams on Beachwood Drive, but it would certainly also apply to the rest of Hollywoodland with even narrower streets where Dixon is also proposing having buses/trams.) **After the receipt of these documents, these proposals died a quick and appropriate death. We are frankly surprised they are being exhumed again.**

In addition, since these ideas were first presented, two courts headed by **two different judges have both ruled in favor of keeping access at the end of Beachwood Drive closed to the public** except for Sunset Ranch access because of safety.

Also, and possibly most importantly, since this attorney letter was sent, there was a court stipulation recently agreed to by the City and the ranch, so it cannot be appealed, that **there has NEVER been an official public entrance into the park at the end of Beachwood Drive**, because it never went through a proper process. In other words everything, the entrance, the switchback, and the now removed parking lot, were all bootlegged in. (This is also true of the other so far unlitigated "entrances" from Hollywoodland and the "view site" by Canyon Lake Drive in Hollywoodland. None are legal. All have been bootlegged in.) **These Dixon proposals are not a quick or cheap solution and a full EIR would be needed to open this and run buses/trams**, but nothing can change the fact that infrastructure here is substandard and inappropriate and dangerous. How can the City promote a new tourist magnet on a narrow street with weight limits and blind curves, that dead ends with no turn around, that mainly has no sidewalks and limited parking which causes cars, pedestrians, and as suggested, buses/trams to all be IN the street together causing dangerous congestion in a very high fire severity zone? (An example: While this bootlegged entrance was still open, my car which was parked in the street in front of my house was totaled because a tourist swerved her car into mine in order to avoid hitting the other tourists walking in the street. This happened even with the use of ppd's, and car damage was common up here.) Also any opening at the end of the street for buses will also be used by vehicles and pedestrians. All that will be achieved is dangerous chaos. Support the court decisions and keep this closed or else the City will be facing **new prolonged litigation** brought by residents. If you open this, the number of visitors would be even greater than before because this would finally be an official tourist magnet, and the number of tourists are always growing. You would be inviting almost 50 million tourists into this limited area. How many buses/trams would you have to run to accommodate these numbers? **This would only add to the congestion** and is totally impractical. If you opened this and had buses/trams, and a tragedy occurred because an emergency response vehicle was slowed by congestion, or a pedestrian death, or a fire caused by a tourist's cigarette--it's happened before--,or tourists and residents stuck in congestion and unable to evacuate,etc. etc. imagine the **massive liability** of the City particularly when everyone knew and was warned of the dangers of establishing a tourist magnet in a totally inappropriate and dangerous place. **Would it be criminal negligence?**

If more access is needed, the City should be sending visitors and buses/trams to the Canyon Drive entrance to Griffith Park in Brush Canyon. It has been the legal entrance to the park since the land was donated to the City in the 1940's, and therefore, has infrastructure, parking, turnarounds, sidewalks, access to the very same trails and most importantly is safe. It is also the entrance that was agreed upon as part of the recent court decision. If buses/trams are needed for tourists, this is a safe place to send them. The City can also look at other places that do not have substandard infrastructure and which are legal. Then maybe that would be a quicker, cheaper solution. Hollywoodland is not that place.

Safety must take the highest priority.

Sincerely,
Sarajane Schwartz
Homeowners on Beachwood Drive United



CITY COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE LETTER 8.28.2013.pdf
1415K



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

Council File 18-0057 Dixon Report email #3

1 message

sschw56079 via Clerk Arts Committee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 1:22 PM

Reply-To: sschw56079@aol.comTo: clerk.artscommittee@lacity.org

I am resending this email.
I do not see it in the files.

sschw56079@aol.com

-----Original Message-----

From: [sschw56079](mailto:sschw56079@aol.com) <sschw56079@aol.com>

To: [mayor.garcetti](mailto:mayor.garcetti@lacity.org) <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>; [councilmember.cedillo](mailto:councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org) <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>; [councilmember.krekorian](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org) <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>; [councilmember.blumenfield](mailto:councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org) <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>; [councilmember.martinez](mailto:councilmember.martinez@lacity.org) <councilmember.martinez@lacity.org>; [paul.koretz](mailto:paul.koretz@lacity.org) <paul.koretz@lacity.org>; [councilmember.rodriguez](mailto:councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org) <councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org>; [councilmember.harris-dawson](mailto:councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org) <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org>; [councilmember.price](mailto:councilmember.price@lacity.org) <councilmember.price@lacity.org>; [councilmember.wesson](mailto:councilmember.wesson@lacity.org) <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>; [councilmember.bonin](mailto:councilmember.bonin@lacity.org) <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>; [councilmember.englander](mailto:councilmember.englander@lacity.org) <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>; [councilmember.ofarrell](mailto:councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org) <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>; [councilmember.huizar](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org) <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>; [councilmember.buscaino](mailto:councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org) <councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org>; [david.ryu](mailto:david.ryu@lacity.org) <david.ryu@lacity.org>; [mike.n.feuer](mailto:mike.n.feuer@lacity.org) <mike.n.feuer@lacity.org>; [controller.galperin](mailto:controller.galperin@lacity.org) <controller.galperin@lacity.org>; [LAXAirportManager](mailto:LAXAirportManager@lawa.org) <LAXAirportManager@lawa.org>; [planning](mailto:planning@lacity.org) <planning@lacity.org>; [ladbs.webmaster](mailto:ladbs.webmaster@lacity.org) <ladbs.webmaster@lacity.org>; [adria.ybarra](mailto:adria.ybarra@lacity.org) <adria.ybarra@lacity.org>; [ken.bernstein](mailto:ken.bernstein@lacity.org) <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>; [lambert.giessinger](mailto:lambert.giessinger@lacity.org) <lambert.giessinger@lacity.org>; [ethics.commission](mailto:ethics.commission@lacity.org) <ethics.commission@lacity.org>; [LAFDrequest](mailto:LAFDrequest@lacity.org) <LAFDrequest@lacity.org>; [fernando.campos](mailto:fernando.campos@lacity.org) <fernando.campos@lacity.org>; [rap.commissioners](mailto:rap.commissioners@lacity.org) <rap.commissioners@lacity.org>; [ladot](mailto:ladot@lacity.org) <ladot@lacity.org>; [cory.palka](mailto:cory.palka@lapd.lacity.org) <cory.palka@lapd.lacity.org>; 40988 <40988@lapd.online>; [joe.salaices](mailto:joe.salaices@lacity.org) <joe.salaices@lacity.org>; [michael.a.shull](mailto:michael.a.shull@lacity.org) <michael.a.shull@lacity.org>; [aram.sahakian](mailto:aram.sahakian@lacity.org) <aram.sahakian@lacity.org>; [steve.houchin](mailto:steve.houchin@lacity.org) <steve.houchin@lacity.org>; [emdcommunications](mailto:emdcommunications@lacity.org) <emdcommunications@lacity.org>; [steven.cole](mailto:steven.cole@ladwp.com) <steven.cole@ladwp.com>; [michael.mcMenamin](mailto:michael.mcMenamin@ladwp.com) <michael.mcMenamin@ladwp.com>; [david.wright](mailto:david.wright@ladwp.com) <david.wright@ladwp.com>; [armando.hogan](mailto:armando.hogan@lacity.org) <armando.hogan@lacity.org>

Sent: Wed, May 9, 2018 10:37 pm

Subject: Council File 18-0057 Dixon Report email #3

Subject: Council File 18-0057 Dixon Report email #3

Subject: COUNCIL FILE 18-0057 DIXON REPORT

BEACHWOOD DRIVE RESIDENTS IN HOLLYWOODLAND PETITIONS

Running tourist trams/buses to the end of Beachwood Drive
Opening a tourist magnet at the end Of Beachwood Drive
Eliminating parking on Beachwood Drive to make more room for pedestrian and vehicular traffic

Dear City Representative.

I'm sending these documents in conjunction with the Dixon Report. This is my third email in a series. Please add these

to the record.

The idea of creating a tourist magnet and running tourist trams/buses up Beachwood to the dead end of the street is not a new idea. Councilman Labonge introduced it several years ago. The enclosed documents are **two different petitions signed by the most significantly impacted residents**--those that live on Beachwood Drive in Hollywoodland. One is against having a tourist magnet/access to Griffith Park at the end of Beachwood Drive, and the other is against tourist trams/buses going up to the end of Beachwood Drive, a substandard street with no sidewalks. **The petitions represent overwhelming opposition to these proposals.** These petitions were sent to the City Transportation Committee along with some other docs I will be sending you. After the receipt of these documents, **these proposals died a quick and appropriate death.** We are frankly surprised they are being exhumed again.

In addition, **since these ideas were first presented two courts headed by two different judges have both ruled in favor of keeping access at the end of Beachwood Drive closed to the public except for Sunset Ranch access because of safety.**

Also, most importantly, there was a court stipulation recently agreed to by the City and the ranch, so it cannot be appealed, that **there has NEVER been an official entrance into the park at the end of Beachwood Drive**, because it never went through a proper process. In other words everything, the entrance, the switchback, and the now removed parking lot, were all bootlegged in. (This is also true of the other "entrances" from Hollywoodland and the "view site" by Canyon Lake Drive in Hollywoodland. None are legal. All have been bootlegged in.)

Instigating **these proposals are not quick or cheap.** A full EIR would be needed. If these proposals then passed they would be met with new prolonged litigation brought by residents. And if the City still prevailed they would be opening themselves up to massive liability and possibly criminal negligence.

Please see the additional relevant comments in email #1 and email #2 that are discussed at great lengths.

Safety must take the highest priority.

Sincerely,
Sarajane Schwartz
Homeowners on Beachwood Drive United

2 attachments

 **7pages 2.pdf**
704K

 **7 pages 1.pdf**
696K



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

Fwd: Council File 18-0057 Dixon Report email #4

1 message

sschw56079 via Clerk Arts Committee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 1:24 PM

Reply-To: sschw56079@aol.comTo: clerk.artscommittee@lacity.org

I am resending this email.
I did see it in the files, but none of the accompanying emails were there, so I'm resending it as part of the group.

-----Original Message-----

From: [sschw56079](mailto:sschw56079@aol.com) <sschw56079@aol.com>

To: [sschw56079](mailto:sschw56079@aol.com) <sschw56079@aol.com>; [mayor.garcetti](mailto:mayor.garcetti@lacity.org) <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>; [councilmember.cedillo](mailto:councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org) <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>; [councilmember.krekorian](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org) <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>; [councilmember.blumenfield](mailto:councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org) <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>; [councilmember.martinez](mailto:councilmember.martinez@lacity.org) <councilmember.martinez@lacity.org>; [paul.koretz](mailto:paul.koretz@lacity.org) <paul.koretz@lacity.org>; [councilmember.rodriquez](mailto:councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org) <councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org>; [councilmember.harris-dawson](mailto:councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org) <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org>; [councilmember.price](mailto:councilmember.price@lacity.org) <councilmember.price@lacity.org>; [councilmember.wesson](mailto:councilmember.wesson@lacity.org) <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>; [councilmember.bonin](mailto:councilmember.bonin@lacity.org) <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>; [councilmember.englander](mailto:councilmember.englander@lacity.org) <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>; [councilmember.ofarrell](mailto:councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org) <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>; [councilmember.huizar](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org) <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>; [councilmember.buscaino](mailto:councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org) <councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org>; [david.ryu](mailto:david.ryu@lacity.org) <david.ryu@lacity.org>; [mike.n.feuer](mailto:mike.n.feuer@lacity.org) <mike.n.feuer@lacity.org>; [controller.galperin](mailto:controller.galperin@lacity.org) <controller.galperin@lacity.org>; [LAXAirportManager](mailto:LAXAirportManager@lawa.org) <LAXAirportManager@lawa.org>; [planning](mailto:planning@lacity.org) <planning@lacity.org>; [ladbs.webmaster](mailto:ladbs.webmaster@lacity.org) <ladbs.webmaster@lacity.org>; [adria.ybarra](mailto:adria.ybarra@lacity.org) <adria.ybarra@lacity.org>; [ken.bernstein](mailto:ken.bernstein@lacity.org) <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>; [lambert.giessinger](mailto:lambert.giessinger@lacity.org) <lambert.giessinger@lacity.org>; [ethics.commission](mailto:ethics.commission@lacity.org) <ethics.commission@lacity.org>; [LAFDrequest](mailto:LAFDrequest@lacity.org) <LAFDrequest@lacity.org>; [fernando.campos](mailto:fernando.campos@lacity.org) <fernando.campos@lacity.org>; [rap.commissioners](mailto:rap.commissioners@lacity.org) <rap.commissioners@lacity.org>; [ladot](mailto:ladot@lacity.org) <ladot@lacity.org>; [cory.palka](mailto:cory.palka@lapd.lacity.org) <cory.palka@lapd.lacity.org>; 40988 <40988@lapd.online>; [joe.salaices](mailto:joe.salaices@lacity.org) <joe.salaices@lacity.org>; [michael.a.shull](mailto:michael.a.shull@lacity.org) <michael.a.shull@lacity.org>; [aram.sahakian](mailto:aram.sahakian@lacity.org) <aram.sahakian@lacity.org>; [steve.houchin](mailto:steve.houchin@lacity.org) <steve.houchin@lacity.org>; [emdcommunications](mailto:emdcommunications@lacity.org) <emdcommunications@lacity.org>; [steven.cole](mailto:steven.cole@ladwp.com) <steven.cole@ladwp.com>; [michael.mcMenamin](mailto:michael.mcMenamin@ladwp.com) <michael.mcMenamin@ladwp.com>; [david.wright](mailto:david.wright@ladwp.com) <david.wright@ladwp.com>; [armando.hogan](mailto:armando.hogan@lacity.org) <armando.hogan@lacity.org>

Sent: Wed, May 9, 2018 10:40 pm

Subject: Council File 18-0057 Dixon Report email #4

Subject: Council File 18-0057 Dixon Report email #4

Subject: COUNCIL FILE 18-0057 DIXON REPORT

POLLS TAKEN BY BEACHWOOD DRIVE RESIDENTS IN HOLLYWOODLAND AGAINST ELIMINATING PARKING ON ONE SIDE OF THE STREET

Running tourist trams/buses to the end of Beachwood Drive
Opening a tourist magnet at the end Of Beachwood Drive
Eliminating parking on Beachwood Drive to make more room for pedestrian and vehicular traffic

Dear City representative,

I'm sending these documents in conjunction with the Dixon Report. This is my 4th email in a series containing different documents. Please add them to the record.

The idea of creating a tourist magnet and running tourist trams/buses up Beachwood to the dead end of the street is not a new idea. Councilman Labonge introduced it several years ago. There was a proposal to eliminate parking from one side of Beachwood Drive, a substandard street, to make more room IN the street for pedestrian and vehicular traffic with the addition of tourist trams/buses. The enclosed documents are polls signed by **the most significantly impacted residents**-those that live on Beachwood Drive in Hollywoodland. They are overwhelming against this proposal. There was **not a single resident in favor of this proposal**. These polls were sent to the City Transportation Committee along with some other docs I sent you. After the receipt of these documents, these proposals died a quick and appropriate death. We are frankly surprised they are being exhumed again. This proposal would increase, not decrease, dangerous pedestrian and vehicular congestion in the street while robbing residents of half of their parking. (Because this neighborhood was developed in the 1920's some of the garages are unaccessible to or unsuitable for modern cars. Some houses have no driveways and street parking is the ONLY option.)

In addition, since these ideas were first presented, two courts headed by two different judges have both ruled in favor of keeping access at the end of Beachwood Drive closed to the public except for Sunset Ranch access because of safety.

Also, possibly most importantly, there was a court stipulation recently agreed to by the City and the ranch, so it cannot be appealed, that there has NEVER been an official entrance into the park at the end of Beachwood Drive, because it never went through a proper process. In other words everything, the entrance, the switchback, and the now removed parking lot, were all bootlegged in. (This is also true of the yet to be litigated other "entrances" from Hollywoodland and the "view site" by Canyon Lake Drive in Hollywoodland. None are legal. All have been bootlegged in.)

If the court order is followed there will be no public access at the end of Beachwood, no running of tourist buses/trams to the end of the street, and therefore no need to eliminate parking on one side of the street to make room for those buses and pedestrians. As stated in the previous emails a full EIR would be needed in order to place this one piece into a much larger "project." It would also be met by prolonged litigation brought by residents. In the end the transformation of a vulnerable, substandard, and inappropriate residential neighborhood in a very high fire hazard severity zone with very limited egress and ingress, into a formal tourist attraction for the Hollywood Sign known throughout the world, would be extremely dangerous for residents and visitors. The potential liability for the City would be immense.

Safety must take the highest priority.

Sincerely,
Sarajane Schwartz
Homeowners on Beachwood Drive United

 97 Pages.pdf
4881K



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

COUNCIL FILE: 18-0057 EMAIL#5

1 message

sschw56079 via Clerk Arts Committee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 1:27 PM

Reply-To: sschw56079@aol.comTo: clerk.artscommittee@lacity.org

I'm resending this email as I did not see it in the files.

sschw56079@aol.com

-----Original Message-----

From: [sschw56079 <sschw56079@aol.com>](mailto:sschw56079@aol.com)

To: [mayor.garcetti <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>](mailto:mayor.garcetti@lacity.org); [councilmember.cedillo <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org); [councilmember.krekorian <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org); [councilmember.blumenfield <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org); [councilmember.martinez <councilmember.martinez@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.martinez@lacity.org); [paul.koretz <paul.koretz@lacity.org>](mailto:paul.koretz@lacity.org); [councilmember.rodriguez <councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org); [councilmember.harris-dawson <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org); [councilmember.price <councilmember.price@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.price@lacity.org); [councilmember.wesson <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.wesson@lacity.org); [councilmember.bonin <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.bonin@lacity.org); [councilmember.englander <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.englander@lacity.org); [councilmember.ofarrell <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org); [councilmember.huizar <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org); [councilmember.buscaino <councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org); [david.ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>](mailto:david.ryu@lacity.org); [mike.n.feuer <mike.n.feuer@lacity.org>](mailto:mike.n.feuer@lacity.org); [controller.galperin <controller.galperin@lacity.org>](mailto:controller.galperin@lacity.org); [LAXAirportManager <LAXAirportManager@lawa.org>](mailto:LAXAirportManager@lawa.org); [planning <planning@lacity.org>](mailto:planning@lacity.org); [ladbs.webmaster <ladbs.webmaster@lacity.org>](mailto:ladbs.webmaster@lacity.org); [adria.ybarra <adria.ybarra@lacity.org>](mailto:adria.ybarra@lacity.org); [ken.bernstein <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>](mailto:ken.bernstein@lacity.org); [lambert.giessinger <lambert.giessinger@lacity.org>](mailto:lambert.giessinger@lacity.org); [ethics.commission <ethics.commission@lacity.org>](mailto:ethics.commission@lacity.org); [LAFDrequest <LAFDrequest@lacity.org>](mailto:LAFDrequest@lacity.org); [fernando.campos <fernando.campos@lacity.org>](mailto:fernando.campos@lacity.org); [rap.commissioners <rap.commissioners@lacity.org>](mailto:rap.commissioners@lacity.org); [ladot <ladot@lacity.org>](mailto:ladot@lacity.org); [cory.palka <cory.palka@lapd.lacity.org>](mailto:cory.palka@lapd.lacity.org); [40988 <40988@lapd.online>](mailto:40988@lapd.online); [joe.salaices <joe.salaices@lacity.org>](mailto:joe.salaices@lacity.org); [michael.a.shull <michael.a.shull@lacity.org>](mailto:michael.a.shull@lacity.org); [aram.sahakian <aram.sahakian@lacity.org>](mailto:aram.sahakian@lacity.org); [steve.houchin <steve.houchin@lacity.org>](mailto:steve.houchin@lacity.org); [emdcommunications <emdcommunications@lacity.org>](mailto:emdcommunications@lacity.org); [steven.cole <steven.cole@ladwp.com>](mailto:steven.cole@ladwp.com); [michael.mcMenamin <michael.mcMenamin@ladwp.com>](mailto:michael.mcMenamin@ladwp.com); [david.wright <david.wright@ladwp.com>](mailto:david.wright@ladwp.com); [armando.hogan <armando.hogan@lacity.org>](mailto:armando.hogan@lacity.org); [michael.espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org); [john.white <john.white@lacity.org>](mailto:john.white@lacity.org)

Sent: Tue, May 29, 2018 12:04 am

Subject: Fwd: COUNCIL FILE: 18-0057 EMAIL#5

SUBJECT: COUNCIL FILE 18-0057 DIXON REPORT
EMAIL #5

Dear City representative,

This is my 5th email in a series of emails I have sent to the City in response to the Dixon Report. Like the others, please make this a part of the public record.

In this email I will attempt to respond to the specific Dixon Report proposals. As stated before I am a forty year resident of Hollywoodland, a two time president of the Hollywoodland Homeowners Association, and my comments come from my extensive knowledge of this area and its history.

I represent Homeowners on Beachwood Drive United. Our homes are literally several feet away from several proposals and will be heavily and directly impacted. We were never invited by the City to participate in this process even though we have been one of the most active groups in our neighborhood on these tourist issues through emails, testimony, petitions, polls, attorney letters, and lawsuits. This is just one flaw of many in the methodology used in the compilation of the Dixon Report. In addition in order to put in these Dixon bandaids a full EIR is needed because you cannot piecemeal in the

project of transforming the previously passive western side of Griffith Park and its bordering residential neighborhoods into a platform for Hollywood Sign viewing and tourism.

THERE ARE NO LEGAL TOURIST MAGNETS IN HOLLYWOODLAND. The access points into Griffith Park and the view site by Lake Hollywood Park have all been bootlegged in. There have been two recent court rulings that have shut down the bootlegged entrance at the end of Beachwood Drive for safety reasons and includes a City stipulation that there has NEVER been a public entrance to Griffith Park at the end of Beachwood Drive. Why the Dixon report chooses to revive these ideas and others including a tram proposal that was voted down for safety reasons by the City Transportation Committee several years earlier is a mystery since this is a futile exercise promoting rejected dangerous and illegal "strategies" that are a waste of time and money. If anything the number of visitors has grown worse and conditions are even more dangerous now.

In reading the study you would not know that most of the impact of these suggestions would be in an extremely limited hillside RESIDENTIAL neighborhood in a very high fire severity zone. The appropriateness of Hollywoodland as a tourist location is never questioned. The word resident much less their needs is barely mentioned. Their concerns and needs are irrelevant even though they are living in an almost hundred year old historic R1 neighborhood. They are an afterthought, and the same suggestions would have been made whether they lived in this area or not. Not only are residents not given a priority--they are invisible for the most part. Ironically they are mentioned in proposals away from their lives and homes, and not mentioned in proposals that directly impact them. Fire danger is only mentioned in passing as well as references to smoking which are HUGE constant threats to this entire area. Existing egress and ingress for residents in this fire zone is extremely limited and problematic particularly since Hollywoodland uniquely juts into Griffith Park as a vulnerable bottleneck and is 80% surrounded by parkland and combustible brush. It would be possible that this entire residential area could be cut off by a fire. The addition of tourism is suicidal. The fact that there is extremely limited parking for residents much less for visitors or that there are no parking lots for magnets that are expected to draw millions of people is barely a concern. Safety is scarcely mentioned and is never a priority. The existential question of whether it is smart, appropriate, effective, safe, or legal to pretty much rezone and transform a residential neighborhood into an amusement park is never dealt with. This area is extremely limited and has what is now considered substandard infrastructure for residents. It is not a park, recreational or tourist area. A skeleton crew of at least 12 to 15 full time employees would be needed to manage this inappropriate area and even that would fall short of the safety standards that would be required for this risky venture if it were privately owned and supervised.

pg 8-9

The "traffic calming" of this bulb-out is not safe, but the opposite. This southern section of Beachwood Drive, north of Franklin, in the ONLY street in the area that is not substandard in width. In the event of a fire or other need for evacuation, the traffic flow on this street is vital to the dozens of other streets that feed into it. You are proposing narrowing the street. That and the additional traffic congestion it would cause could prove deadly.

You would be eliminating badly needed parking for the residents that live there.

You are putting a designated tourist structure literally in the middle of the street. Even with short term parking, dozens of cars will be lined up in the street blocking traffic, waiting for the short term parking places, while others will just park where they want as it currently exists. You will have a street blocked with traffic while still having pedestrians in the street, and conditions will have only been made worse by this.

You are putting a structure who's sole purpose is to serve tourists in the middle of a residential neighborhood and transforming it into something else. This would have to be part of a CEQUA review.

pg 10

At least you do mention residents here and the necessity to consult with them.

pg 11

These signs should only be placed WITHIN Griffith Park and not in surrounding residential neighborhoods that are not part of the park.

The signs within the park should in no way direct visitors to residential points outside of the park, or to bootlegged tourist areas on the edge of the park that have not gone through a proper legal process.

pg 12

We support the sidewalk particularly since Canyon Drive in Brush Canyon is THE ONLY LEGAL ENTRANCE to this entire area (Hollywoodland Gifted Park) since it was donated to the City in the 1940's and therefore has appropriate infrastructure. WE STRONGLY ENCOURAGE AND SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS AREA. IT IS SAFE. A goal of this study should be to remove tourists from bootlegged and unsafe sites.

pg 13-15

These ideas are not cheap, easy, or quick. It will be very expensive and take years of study and then be met with years of litigation.

This is one of the worst suggestions in the Dixon Report. The idea of running buses/trams was PREVIOUSLY REJECTED by the City several years ago for safety reasons, and then there have been TWO COURT ORDERED CLOSINGS at this access point since then in addition to the CITY STIPULATION THAT THIS HAS NEVER BEEN A

LEGAL PUBLIC ENTRANCE TO GRIFFITH PARK. A legal opinion letter pertaining to buses/trams was written by attorneys at LUNA & GLUSION and was sent to you in an earlier email. The street is now much safer with the court ordered closing. It would be unconscionable to reopen it.

A BRAND NEW ENTRANCE with a full EIR would therefore be needed. In addition, a full EIR would be needed of all of the suggestions for turning the western side of Griffith Park and the surrounding residential neighborhoods into a platform for Hollywood Sign viewing. You cannot piecemeal in a project.

These streets are substandard in width, have legal weight limits and NO SIDEWALKS. Some homes are just 5 feet from the street.

How many trips back and forth would these small buses/trams be making every hour to carry enough visitors?

This would only ADD TO THE CONGESTION in the street and make things worse--not better. Opening this entrance and creating a legal tourist magnet will increase the numbers of visitors tenfold. Only some will take the buses/trams. You will have hundreds of cars and pedestrians mixing literally IN the narrow street with blind curves with buses/trams. Dozens of children will be in the streets. Beachwood is also a deadend with no turnaround.

This is a major evacuation street for emergencies. In the event of a fire, the horses from the historic stables are to be run down this street. Proper egress and ingress are a necessity in this very high fire hazard area.

You would need to hire full time employees to monitor the gate as buses/trams enter and exit in order to prevent vehicular and pedestrian traffic going through the gate.

The switchback that connects this easement road to the trail was BOOTLEGGED IN and is illegal. It needs to be removed. There is no legal access to the trail from this location.

The buses/trams with the recording are literally turning a residential neighborhood into an amusement park.

See the description of the Wonderview Trail pg 18. Conditions are even worse here because of the lack of parking. Why are conditions that are unsafe and unacceptable a consideration there, but not here?

pg 16-18

The study says there are problems with time and expense. It says it would be expensive and time consuming. SEE CONDITIONS MENTIONED IN PG 13-15. All of the problems there apply here. In addition there would have to be an engineer to study a new trail to access the existing trail that would require "a significant amount of engineering and construction work."

pg 18-20

It says that Wonderview should be closed down as a magnet because the lack of infrastructure makes it dangerous. We want THIS SAME CRITERIA APPLIED TO ALL OF THE TOURIST MAGNETS IN HOLLYWOODLAND---the access points and view site. They were all bootlegged in, lack infrastructure and have less parking than even Wonderview. They are MORE dangerous. The description of Wonderview reads like a description of each magnet in Hollywoodland. This report should be calling for the shutting down of ALL of these magnets. Instead it is insanely wanting to promote and expand them. We want equal application of criteria.

pg 21-24

Again there are legal and environmental issues in running buses/trams on substandard hillside streets with no sidewalks. see pg 13-15.

It is questionable whether these buses/trams should be running in residential areas, but if there were to be a location, Canyon Drive in Brush Canyon is it. This is the LEGAL ENTRANCE to Griffith Park reached by a wider street with sidewalks. It would be the best choice to quickly, cheaply, and safely run buses/trams to access this part of the park. Since the 1940's since it was made the legal entrance infrastructure to service the public has been built there. This is the ONLY LEGAL ACCESS to the Hollyridge Trail and other trails going by the Hollywood Sign so this should be the location for buses/trams.

Beachwood Drive is again mentioned. There is NO LEGAL PUBLIC ACCESS into the park at the end of Beachwood. See comments pg13-15, 16-18, why this is dangerous, illegal, impractical, and expensive.

A Griffith Park transit hub is mentioned. THE NORTHERN PART OF THE PARK IS WHERE THE FUTURE LIES. THIS IS AWAY FROM ALL RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS AND NEAR FREEWAYS. This is one of the best suggestions in the Dixon Report to realistically manage the ever-growing number of visitors.

pg 24-27

Ride sharing zones have no place in an R1 hillside residential neighborhood, much less one with no sidewalks on blind curved streets. It's dangerous to be loading and unloading passengers IN the street. In addition no residential house should have a "taxi zone" put in front of their house. This is not a hotel or a commercial area.

THERE SHOULD BE NO RIDE SHARING IN HOLLYWOODLAND BECAUSE THERE ARE NO LEGAL TOURIST MAGNETS.

Lake Hollywood Park has been a quiet neighborhood POCKET PARK for the use of nearby residents. It has only been recently that the tourists have usurped this park. The view site was illegally bootlegged in. The view site needs to be shut down and the area restored and replanted. A full EIR as part of a larger EIR is needed to establish a tourist magnet/destination at this location. The pocket park should be returned to the residents.

Canyon Drive in Brush Canyon again is the legal entrance to Griffith Park. Ride sharing should be put in there. It will be quick, easy, and appropriate.

The Griffith Park traffic hub away from residential neighborhoods should be encouraged and developed.

pg 27-30

THIS OVERVIEW SHOULD HAVE BEEN THE OVERVIEW FOR THE ENTIRE DIXON REPORT. WHAT IS WRITTEN HERE IS A FACTUAL STATEMENT OF CONDITIONS THAT IS LEFT OUT OF OTHER PARTS OF THE REPORT. WHAT IS TRUE HERE IS TRUE EVEN THOUGH IT IS NOT WRITTEN ELSEWHERE. "NARROW RESIDENTIAL STREETS CANNOT ALWAYS SAFELY ACCOMMODATE THE RESULTING LEVEL OF CONGESTION.....INSTEAD THE CITY MUST ENCOURAGE VISITORS TO SEEK THEIR PHOTOS ELSEWHERE."

THIS IS THE MOST IMPORTANT PART OF THE STUDY. The northern part of Griffith Park must be developed. It is away from residential neighborhoods with limited infrastructure and is near the freeways.

An EIR is needed (but it is also needed in Hollywoodland). This northern area has the GREATEST POTENTIAL to safely and appropriately accommodate the ever growing number of visitors. It is probably the only area.

An areal tram could be a possibility, but more study needs to be done and greater details revealed. It should be to the north and not impact residential neighborhoods. The impact on wildlife would have to be studied.

ANY PROMOTION OF TOURIST MAGNETS ELSEWHERE SHOULD BE ACCOMPANIED WITH THE SHUTTING DOWN OF THE BOOTLEGGED MAGNETS IN HOLLYWOODLAND OR ELSE THE HOLLYWOODLAND MAGNETS BESIDES BEING OVERRUN BECAUSE OF GREATER SIGN VIEWING PUBLICITY WILL UNDERCUT THE SUCCESS OF THE NEW TOURISTS SITES. Visitors will go where it is closer and free instead of supporting sites further away and that cost money.

pg 31-32

This is one of the few suggestions in Hollywoodland that I CAN AGREE WITH BUT DOES NOT GO FAR ENOUGH.

The vista site was illegally bootlegged in, and tourist traffic, as a result, is recent. (The previous councilman's office workers put it in.)The approach to this location is EXTREMELY DANGEROUS with an extremely narrow street with about a half a dozen quick blind curves, and no sidewalks---meaning pedestrians in the street. On one side is an uphill slope with no shoulder. On the other side is a drop off with varying amounts of land that go from plots of land to barely a few feet. Cars have gone over the side into a child's playground area below. This is one of the most dangerous routes for thousands of tourists to be traveling. That's what happens when things are bootlegged in without a proper process or review.

This area mentioned should be planted and fenced but that needs to extend to the ENTIRE VISTA SITE. This whole area needs to be restored and turned into a location that is inhospitable to tourists and Sign viewing. It needs to be shut down.

If you want a LEGAL view site you must do an EIR as part of a total EIR for turning the western side of Griffith Park and the surrounding residential neighborhoods into a platform for Hollywood Sign viewing.

Also this site requires three full time employees to properly supervise the different areas with limited site lines that are located here.

pg 33-34

NO TOURIST SIGNAGE BELONGS IN RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS.

NO TOURIST SIGNAGE SHOULD DIRECT VISITORS TO A RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD.

THERE ARE NO LEGAL TOURIST MAGNETS IN HOLLYWOODLAND SO THERE IS NO NEED FOR SIGNAGE IN IT OR TO IT.

IF YOU TRANSFORM AND REZONE A RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD INTO A TOURIST DESTINATION YOU NEED A FULL EIR.

pg 34-35

IT IS VERY DANGEROUS. SEE PG 31-32.

THERE HAVE BEEN FIRES HERE FROM TOURISTS ILLEGALLY SMOKING EVEN THOUGH THERE ARE MANY NO SMOKING SIGNS.

pg 35-36

All navigational aps/websites should be sending visitors to ONLY legal magnets away from Hollywoodland and other limited residential neighborhoods.

Information is often inaccurate and dangerous. A year after the court ordered closure at the end of Beachwood, visitors are still mistakenly being sent there. 90% of the vehicular and pedestrian traffic still going to the end of Beachwood Drive is from visitors having to then turn around and go back down.

pg 37-38

This is another suggestion I APPROVE of but does not go far enough. This needs to be done more often.

In the past Councilman Labonge passed a City Council motion in order to temporarily shut down our streets and Hollywoodland to just residents for about a third of the year because of dangerous conditions caused by tourists. THIS MADE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD SAFE.

If the bootlegged tourists magnets were closed down the streets would not have to be closed.

The City should work with residents to permanently vacate streets in Hollywoodland for safety reasons.

pg 38-39

THESE TWO SUGGESTIONS ARE HORRIBLE AND DANGEROUS. These ideas will make conditions less safe. If safety is really the primary concern, the City would send visitors elsewhere to where there is safe infrastructure. It's very simple.

HOLLYWOODLAND'S SUBSTANDARD INFRASTRUCTURE IS APPROPRIATE FOR A RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD, BUT INSUFFICIENT AND DANGEROUS FOR A TOURIST DESTINATION.

Turning two way streets into one way streets is dangerous in a very high fire zone where you are reducing exits by half.

The needs of residents who own property, pay taxes, and are there every day are superseded by the needs of a one time visitor from half way around the world that is spending an hour there. And that "there" is a residential neighborhood where they don't belong in the first place. Stop trying to transform a residential neighborhood into Disneyland.

There is limited access to some garages that can only be accessed from certain directions that could be eliminated by one way streets.

If streets are so limited and narrow that you need to have a special designated lane in order to insure emergency access, than those streets are too narrow and inappropriate for tourism.

Putting in special lanes will eliminate street parking for residents, some of whose older garages cannot accommodate today's cars.

Pedestrian lanes in the street are still dangerous. Pedestrians belong on sidewalks. This just reinforces what an inappropriate place this is for tourists without basic the infrastructure found in so many other places. Stop forcing a square peg into a round hole.

pg 39-41

It should not be residents who have the "privilege" of having to pay in order to park in front of their own homes when you convert a residential neighborhood into a tourist destination. This is a bandaid with some advantages, but still a bandaid. Solve the problem by shutting down bootlegged tourist magnets.

Increasing ppd's does not solve ride sharing, pedestrians in the street and vehicular congestion.

The end of Deronda has a BOOTLEGGED, ILLEGAL PARK ENTRANCE. It is filled with "no trespassing" signs that are ignored. A full EIR is needed to put in a public entrance there. Shut this entrance down and put in a street vacation for this extremely narrow, easily congested, deadended segment of Deronda.

Access to the park at the end of Mulholland Highway is also illegal and filled with ignored "no trespassing" signs. This vulnerable section of Mulholland Highway should be PRIVATIZED AND GATED to prevent vehicular and pedestrian traffic. There would be no need for ppd's, and this would truly secure this area.

The view site at Canyon Lake Park should be shut down. See pg 31-32. RESTORE THIS TO BEING A NEIGHBORHOOD POCKET PARK..

Tourists should be sent to the Canyon Drive entrance in Brush Canyon. It is the legal entrance that is safe with appropriate infrastructure. The residents living there can decide about having ppd's.

pg 41-42

Residential neighborhoods are inappropriate locations for tourist magnets. Residents carry a heavy burden. DO NOT CONSOLIDATE limited ppd sections into one big district. Residents living closest to the magnets will be the most negatively and unfairly impacted by this. If you want to make conditions convenient for residents, eliminate the tourists. Then the ppps can be gotten rid of.

pg 43-46

Canyon Drive in Brush Canyon is the legal entrance to the park. Parking can safely be expanded there.

The view site, the tourist magnet, at Lake Hollywood Park is illegal. This is a neighborhood pocket park that is unfairly being transformed into a tourist attraction. See pg 31-32. There should not be meters and ride sharing zones. Restore this to being a neighborhood pocket park.

The bulb out on lower Beachwood Drive is a dangerous idea. You are reducing badly needed parking for residents. See pg 8.

Hollywoodland is protected by the formal Hollywoodland Specific Plan. Placing parking meters in the village is contrary to the meaning and reason for the plan. You are also proposing putting meters in front of homes. This is an R1 neighborhood, almost 100 years old that your proposals would destroy with needless commercialization. PARKING METERS DO NOT BELONG IN ANY PART OF HOLLYWOODLAND.

pg 46-47

IF YOU DO NOT ENFORCE THE LAWS, THEN SIGNAGE AND RAISING CITATION FINES ARE MEANINGLESS. This is the first time that SMOKING, which is a huge problem, is mentioned in this report. "No Smoking" signs like all of the traffic and "No Trespassing" signs are routinely ignored. If you insist on turning an unsuitable, residential neighborhood into Disneyland, you must have supervision and enforcement performed by real people. A minimum of 12 to 15 full time employees would be needed in Hollywoodland as a skeleton crew. That would still be insufficient in order to insure safety and would fall way short of what would be demanded of a private entity running a comparable enterprise.

pg 47-50

This is a hillside residential neighborhood not set up to be an amusement park. The narrow streets have many blind curves with limited site lines making enforcement very difficult. This is not an appropriate place for tourism under any circumstances.

This section mentions employees to enforce traffic violations. Nothing is said of smoking violations which are equally widespread and even more dangerous with an even greater potential for disaster. Again the Dixon Report is clueless when it comes to the real and present dangers in Hollywoodland.

How many smoking citations have been given out?

How many jaywalking citations have been given out to pedestrians that walk in the middle of the street and block vehicular traffic?

This lack of enforcement for obvious and widespread violations contribute to the distrust by residents of the City's concern and ability to enforce much of anything.

pg 50-54

Your heading says that these are "the most accessible and safe Hollywood Sign Viewing locations and hikes." SOME ARE AND SOME ARE NOT. Yes, "The ideal location for hiking to and taking photos of the Hollywood Sign should ultimately be determined by the City based on **accessibility, safety and parking availability**," and therefore I cannot agree that some or any of THE MAGNETS IN HOLLYWOODLAND BEGIN TO EVEN COME CLOSE TO MEETING THAT CRITERIA. These are bootlegged, dangerous magnets on narrow, substandard, winding, blind curved streets deadended with no turnarounds, sidewalks, or parking in a very high fire hazard zone. This is all in a bottleneck into the park, vulnerable like no other residential neighborhood by being 80% surrounded by combustible brush. Optimize magnets that are safe and legal. Shut down magnets that are dangerous and illegal. Leaving the dangerous magnets in Hollywoodland open, will only undermine the safe locations. See pg 27-30.

The view site at Lake Hollywood Park was illegally put in. Shut it down because it is dangerous. The approach from Hollywoodland is one of the most perilous stretches of road anywhere. See page 31-32. If you want to keep it open you'll need a full EIR as part of a larger EIR for the whole western side of Griffith Park and the surrounding neighborhoods, You will also face prolonged litigation. This area, as all of Hollywoodland is also protected by the Hollywoodland Specific Plan which this violates. All of these spent City resources will appear cheap in comparison to the enormous potential liability of hundreds of millions or even a billion dollars in damages that the City could be responsible for in case of a catastrophic fire started by a tourist's cigarette. It should be removed from this section of the report.

Canyon Lake Drive in Brush Canyon is the legal entrance to this area of Griffith Park. It is safe, has appropriate infrastructure, accessibility and parking and meets the criteria stated earlier in this section.

The Wonderview Trail also did not go through a proper EIR. It needs to go through a full EIR. I would support shutting down the present access point which is dangerous and inappropriate and moving it to a different location. See pg 18-20. We want the same criteria applied to all of the bootlegged access points and the view site in Hollywoodland which are even more dangerous due to lack of parking. We want these shut down. The Wonderview Trail does not belong on this list unless the access point is moved, and it passes a full EIR.

Keep sending visitors to other parts of Griffith Park to the East. In the formal Griffith Park Plan the western side of Griffith park was to be left passive for plants and animals with no attractions being placed there. While sending visitors to the Observatory, additional space is needed. Reopening Mt Hollywood Drive would be very helpful. Also, as mentioned earlier, the northern side of Griffith Park away from residential neighborhoods and close to freeways hold the greatest potential for development in order to better accommodate the ever growing number of tourists.

The Ford Theatre Trail and Hollywood and Highland are good examples away from residential neighborhoods that can and should be expanded.

pg 54-55

Yes, A VISITORS CENTER SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AWAY FROM ANY RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS. But as promotion of the Sign grows and grows, it makes it even more important and imperative that the limited, bootlegged, inappropriate, and dangerous magnets (end of Beachwood, Deronda, dirt Mulholland, and the view site on Canyon Lake Drive) in substandard residential neighborhoods all be shut down. It is simply unsafe and unsustainable. See pg 27-30.

pg 55-56

A VIEWING PLATFORM SHOULD BE PLACED WHERE IT DOES NOT IMPACT RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS. Mt Hollywood Drive is a safe and legal place.

An areal tram needs a lot more study of its impact on animals and residents before it can even be considered.

pg 57-58

Again the only way to have these projects which involve greater promotion of the Hollywood Sign and therefore increasing the number of visitors is to FIRST SHUT DOWN the unsustainable, dangerous, bootlegged tourist magnets in Hollywoodland and in other residential neighborhoods.

pg 58-59

THIS OVERVIEW SHOULD ALSO BE PART OF THE OVERVIEW FOR THE WHOLE DIXON REPORT. See pg 27-30. "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 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....Visitors sometimes walk along narrow roads with blind curves to access 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." These are YOUR words. These magnets are inherently dangerous, cannot be made safe , and therefore must be shut down.

People will still want to see the "original" Sign (although none of it is original). This would only work if you moved the Sign to a different location as opposed to adding an additional Sign at an additional location.

pg 59-60

The Hollywood Sign Trust already has a website. Therefore I do not understand this suggestion. Most of the time the trust has been sensitive to resident concerns, safety issues, and the huge potential liability in litigation for loses or damages. They have certainly been more responsible and responsive than the City which has demonstrated most of the time that they don't care about these issues.

pg 60-62

This again is further promotion and marketing of the Sign which will cause an increase in visitors. You can't handle the current numbers. FIRST close down all of the tourist magnets in Hollywoodland or this will only make things worse. This is a safety issue.

pg 62-63

This proposal belongs at the Canyon Drive entrance in Brush Canyon, the LEGAL entrance to Griffith Park, and therefore is safe and has infrastructure. There is already a temporary bathroom facility there so this would be a natural upgrade and makes sense.

This does NOT belong in Lake Hollywood Park. See pg 24-27. The tourist magnet here was illegally bootlegged in and needs a full EIR as part of a full EIR of the western side of Griffith Park and the surrounding residential neighborhoods that are being transformed into a platform for Hollywood Sign viewing. THIS IS A POCKET PARK. POCKET PARKS DO NOT HAVE BATHROOMS. Remove the illegal magnet, restore the area with planting and fences, and return the pocket park to the residents.

pg 64

This is the fifth email in a series of emails I have sent to City Officials. Besides my comments, my emails have included an attorney's letter, polls, and petitions. I want this all to be part of the public record. In addition I have made a 30 minute film about fire, traffic and pedestrian safety conditions in regards to tourism in Hollywoodland. Various City officials have already seen this movie. I would like to show it to City officials who have not yet seen it in the hopes it will bring them a greater understanding and appreciation of these issues and their impact on Hollywoodland. I am available to answer any questions or give further testimony about the problems connected with tourism, the Hollywood Sign and Hollywoodland. Please feel free to contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Thank you.

Sarajane Schwartz
Homeowners on Beachwood Drive United
HBDU



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

COUNCIL FILE: 18-0057 EMAIL#5

1 message

sschw56079 via Clerk Arts Committee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 1:27 PM

Reply-To: sschw56079@aol.comTo: clerk.artscommittee@lacity.org

I'm resending this email as I did not see it in the files.

sschw56079@aol.com

-----Original Message-----

From: [sschw56079 <sschw56079@aol.com>](mailto:sschw56079@aol.com)

To: [mayor.garcetti <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>](mailto:mayor.garcetti@lacity.org); [councilmember.cedillo <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org); [councilmember.krekorian <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org); [councilmember.blumenfield <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org); [councilmember.martinez <councilmember.martinez@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.martinez@lacity.org); [paul.koretz <paul.koretz@lacity.org>](mailto:paul.koretz@lacity.org); [councilmember.rodriguez <councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org); [councilmember.harris-dawson <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org); [councilmember.price <councilmember.price@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.price@lacity.org); [councilmember.wesson <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.wesson@lacity.org); [councilmember.bonin <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.bonin@lacity.org); [councilmember.englander <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.englander@lacity.org); [councilmember.ofarrell <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org); [councilmember.huizar <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org); [councilmember.buscaino <councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org>](mailto:councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org); [david.ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>](mailto:david.ryu@lacity.org); [mike.n.feuer <mike.n.feuer@lacity.org>](mailto:mike.n.feuer@lacity.org); [controller.galperin <controller.galperin@lacity.org>](mailto:controller.galperin@lacity.org); [LAXAirportManager <LAXAirportManager@lawa.org>](mailto:LAXAirportManager@lawa.org); [planning <planning@lacity.org>](mailto:planning@lacity.org); [ladbs.webmaster <ladbs.webmaster@lacity.org>](mailto:ladbs.webmaster@lacity.org); [adria.ybarra <adria.ybarra@lacity.org>](mailto:adria.ybarra@lacity.org); [ken.bernstein <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>](mailto:ken.bernstein@lacity.org); [lambert.giessinger <lambert.giessinger@lacity.org>](mailto:lambert.giessinger@lacity.org); [ethics.commission <ethics.commission@lacity.org>](mailto:ethics.commission@lacity.org); [LAFDrequest <LAFDrequest@lacity.org>](mailto:LAFDrequest@lacity.org); [fernando.campos <fernando.campos@lacity.org>](mailto:fernando.campos@lacity.org); [rap.commissioners <rap.commissioners@lacity.org>](mailto:rap.commissioners@lacity.org); [ladot <ladot@lacity.org>](mailto:ladot@lacity.org); [cory.palka <cory.palka@lapd.lacity.org>](mailto:cory.palka@lapd.lacity.org); [40988 <40988@lapd.online>](mailto:40988@lapd.online); [joe.salaices <joe.salaices@lacity.org>](mailto:joe.salaices@lacity.org); [michael.a.shull <michael.a.shull@lacity.org>](mailto:michael.a.shull@lacity.org); [aram.sahakian <aram.sahakian@lacity.org>](mailto:aram.sahakian@lacity.org); [steve.houchin <steve.houchin@lacity.org>](mailto:steve.houchin@lacity.org); [emdcommunications <emdcommunications@lacity.org>](mailto:emdcommunications@lacity.org); [steven.cole <steven.cole@ladwp.com>](mailto:steven.cole@ladwp.com); [michael.mcMenamin <michael.mcMenamin@ladwp.com>](mailto:michael.mcMenamin@ladwp.com); [david.wright <david.wright@ladwp.com>](mailto:david.wright@ladwp.com); [armando.hogan <armando.hogan@lacity.org>](mailto:armando.hogan@lacity.org); [michael.espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org); [john.white <john.white@lacity.org>](mailto:john.white@lacity.org)

Sent: Tue, May 29, 2018 12:04 am

Subject: Fwd: COUNCIL FILE: 18-0057 EMAIL#5

SUBJECT: COUNCIL FILE 18-0057 DIXON REPORT
EMAIL #5

Dear City representative,

This is my 5th email in a series of emails I have sent to the City in response to the Dixon Report. Like the others, please make this a part of the public record.

In this email I will attempt to respond to the specific Dixon Report proposals. As stated before I am a forty year resident of Hollywoodland, a two time president of the Hollywoodland Homeowners Association, and my comments come from my extensive knowledge of this area and its history.

I represent Homeowners on Beachwood Drive United. Our homes are literally several feet away from several proposals and will be heavily and directly impacted. We were never invited by the City to participate in this process even though we have been one of the most active groups in our neighborhood on these tourist issues through emails, testimony, petitions, polls, attorney letters, and lawsuits. This is just one flaw of many in the methodology used in the compilation of the Dixon Report. In addition in order to put in these Dixon bandaids a full EIR is needed because you cannot piecemeal in the

project of transforming the previously passive western side of Griffith Park and its bordering residential neighborhoods into a platform for Hollywood Sign viewing and tourism.

THERE ARE NO LEGAL TOURIST MAGNETS IN HOLLYWOODLAND. The access points into Griffith Park and the view site by Lake Hollywood Park have all been bootlegged in. There have been two recent court rulings that have shut down the bootlegged entrance at the end of Beachwood Drive for safety reasons and includes a City stipulation that there has NEVER been a public entrance to Griffith Park at the end of Beachwood Drive. Why the Dixon report chooses to revive these ideas and others including a tram proposal that was voted down for safety reasons by the City Transportation Committee several years earlier is a mystery since this is a futile exercise promoting rejected dangerous and illegal "strategies" that are a waste of time and money. If anything the number of visitors has grown worse and conditions are even more dangerous now.

In reading the study you would not know that most of the impact of these suggestions would be in an extremely limited hillside RESIDENTIAL neighborhood in a very high fire severity zone. The appropriateness of Hollywoodland as a tourist location is never questioned. The word resident much less their needs is barely mentioned. Their concerns and needs are irrelevant even though they are living in an almost hundred year old historic R1 neighborhood. They are an afterthought, and the same suggestions would have been made whether they lived in this area or not. Not only are residents not given a priority--they are invisible for the most part. Ironically they are mentioned in proposals away from their lives and homes, and not mentioned in proposals that directly impact them. Fire danger is only mentioned in passing as well as references to smoking which are HUGE constant threats to this entire area. Existing egress and ingress for residents in this fire zone is extremely limited and problematic particularly since Hollywoodland uniquely juts into Griffith Park as a vulnerable bottleneck and is 80% surrounded by parkland and combustible brush. It would be possible that this entire residential area could be cut off by a fire. The addition of tourism is suicidal. The fact that there is extremely limited parking for residents much less for visitors or that there are no parking lots for magnets that are expected to draw millions of people is barely a concern. Safety is scarcely mentioned and is never a priority. The existential question of whether it is smart, appropriate, effective, safe, or legal to pretty much rezone and transform a residential neighborhood into an amusement park is never dealt with. This area is extremely limited and has what is now considered substandard infrastructure for residents. It is not a park, recreational or tourist area. A skeleton crew of at least 12 to 15 full time employees would be needed to manage this inappropriate area and even that would fall short of the safety standards that would be required for this risky venture if it were privately owned and supervised.

pg 8-9

The "traffic calming" of this bulb-out is not safe, but the opposite. This southern section of Beachwood Drive, north of Franklin, in the ONLY street in the area that is not substandard in width. In the event of a fire or other need for evacuation, the traffic flow on this street is vital to the dozens of other streets that feed into it. You are proposing narrowing the street. That and the additional traffic congestion it would cause could prove deadly.

You would be eliminating badly needed parking for the residents that live there.

You are putting a designated tourist structure literally in the middle of the street. Even with short term parking, dozens of cars will be lined up in the street blocking traffic, waiting for the short term parking places, while others will just park where they want as it currently exists. You will have a street blocked with traffic while still having pedestrians in the street, and conditions will have only been made worse by this.

You are putting a structure who's sole purpose is to serve tourists in the middle of a residential neighborhood and transforming it into something else. This would have to be part of a CEQUA review.

pg 10

At least you do mention residents here and the necessity to consult with them.

pg 11

These signs should only be placed WITHIN Griffith Park and not in surrounding residential neighborhoods that are not part of the park.

The signs within the park should in no way direct visitors to residential points outside of the park, or to bootlegged tourist areas on the edge of the park that have not gone through a proper legal process.

pg 12

We support the sidewalk particularly since Canyon Drive in Brush Canyon is THE ONLY LEGAL ENTRANCE to this entire area (Hollywoodland Gifted Park) since it was donated to the City in the 1940's and therefore has appropriate infrastructure. WE STRONGLY ENCOURAGE AND SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS AREA. IT IS SAFE. A goal of this study should be to remove tourists from bootlegged and unsafe sites.

pg 13-15

These ideas are not cheap, easy, or quick. It will be very expensive and take years of study and then be met with years of litigation.

This is one of the worst suggestions in the Dixon Report. The idea of running buses/trams was PREVIOUSLY REJECTED by the City several years ago for safety reasons, and then there have been TWO COURT ORDERED CLOSINGS at this access point since then in addition to the CITY STIPULATION THAT THIS HAS NEVER BEEN A

LEGAL PUBLIC ENTRANCE TO GRIFFITH PARK. A legal opinion letter pertaining to buses/trams was written by attorneys at LUNA & GLUSION and was sent to you in an earlier email. The street is now much safer with the court ordered closing. It would be unconscionable to reopen it.

A BRAND NEW ENTRANCE with a full EIR would therefore be needed. In addition, a full EIR would be needed of all of the suggestions for turning the western side of Griffith Park and the surrounding residential neighborhoods into a platform for Hollywood Sign viewing. You cannot piecemeal in a project.

These streets are substandard in width, have legal weight limits and NO SIDEWALKS. Some homes are just 5 feet from the street.

How many trips back and forth would these small buses/trams be making every hour to carry enough visitors?

This would only ADD TO THE CONGESTION in the street and make things worse--not better. Opening this entrance and creating a legal tourist magnet will increase the numbers of visitors tenfold. Only some will take the buses/trams. You will have hundreds of cars and pedestrians mixing literally IN the narrow street with blind curves with buses/trams. Dozens of children will be in the streets. Beachwood is also a deadend with no turnaround.

This is a major evacuation street for emergencies. In the event of a fire, the horses from the historic stables are to be run down this street. Proper egress and ingress are a necessity in this very high fire hazard area.

You would need to hire full time employees to monitor the gate as buses/trams enter and exit in order to prevent vehicular and pedestrian traffic going through the gate.

The switchback that connects this easement road to the trail was BOOTLEGGED IN and is illegal. It needs to be removed. There is no legal access to the trail from this location.

The buses/trams with the recording are literally turning a residential neighborhood into an amusement park.

See the description of the Wonderview Trail pg 18. Conditions are even worse here because of the lack of parking. Why are conditions that are unsafe and unacceptable a consideration there, but not here?

pg 16-18

The study says there are problems with time and expense. It says it would be expensive and time consuming. SEE CONDITIONS MENTIONED IN PG 13-15. All of the problems there apply here. In addition there would have to be an engineer to study a new trail to access the existing trail that would require "a significant amount of engineering and construction work."

pg 18-20

It says that Wonderview should be closed down as a magnet because the lack of infrastructure makes it dangerous. We want THIS SAME CRITERIA APPLIED TO ALL OF THE TOURIST MAGNETS IN HOLLYWOODLAND---the access points and view site. They were all bootlegged in, lack infrastructure and have less parking than even Wonderview. They are MORE dangerous. The description of Wonderview reads like a description of each magnet in Hollywoodland. This report should be calling for the shutting down of ALL of these magnets. Instead it is insanely wanting to promote and expand them. We want equal application of criteria.

pg 21-24

Again there are legal and environmental issues in running buses/trams on substandard hillside streets with no sidewalks. see pg 13-15.

It is questionable whether these buses/trams should be running in residential areas, but if there were to be a location, Canyon Drive in Brush Canyon is it. This is the LEGAL ENTRANCE to Griffith Park reached by a wider street with sidewalks. It would be the best choice to quickly, cheaply, and safely run buses/trams to access this part of the park. Since the 1940's since it was made the legal entrance infrastructure to service the public has been built there. This is the ONLY LEGAL ACCESS to the Hollyridge Trail and other trails going by the Hollywood Sign so this should be the location for buses/trams.

Beachwood Drive is again mentioned. There is NO LEGAL PUBLIC ACCESS into the park at the end of Beachwood. See comments pg13-15, 16-18, why this is dangerous, illegal, impractical, and expensive.

A Griffith Park transit hub is mentioned. THE NORTHERN PART OF THE PARK IS WHERE THE FUTURE LIES. THIS IS AWAY FROM ALL RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS AND NEAR FREEWAYS. This is one of the best suggestions in the Dixon Report to realistically manage the ever-growing number of visitors.

pg 24-27

Ride sharing zones have no place in an R1 hillside residential neighborhood, much less one with no sidewalks on blind curved streets. It's dangerous to be loading and unloading passengers IN the street. In addition no residential house should have a "taxi zone" put in front of their house. This is not a hotel or a commercial area.

THERE SHOULD BE NO RIDE SHARING IN HOLLYWOODLAND BECAUSE THERE ARE NO LEGAL TOURIST MAGNETS.

Lake Hollywood Park has been a quiet neighborhood POCKET PARK for the use of nearby residents. It has only been recently that the tourists have usurped this park. The view site was illegally bootlegged in. The view site needs to be shut down and the area restored and replanted. A full EIR as part of a larger EIR is needed to establish a tourist magnet/destination at this location. The pocket park should be returned to the residents.

Canyon Drive in Brush Canyon again is the legal entrance to Griffith Park. Ride sharing should be put in there. It will be quick, easy, and appropriate.

The Griffith Park traffic hub away from residential neighborhoods should be encouraged and developed.

pg 27-30

THIS OVERVIEW SHOULD HAVE BEEN THE OVERVIEW FOR THE ENTIRE DIXON REPORT. WHAT IS WRITTEN HERE IS A FACTUAL STATEMENT OF CONDITIONS THAT IS LEFT OUT OF OTHER PARTS OF THE REPORT. WHAT IS TRUE HERE IS TRUE EVEN THOUGH IT IS NOT WRITTEN ELSEWHERE. "NARROW RESIDENTIAL STREETS CANNOT ALWAYS SAFELY ACCOMMODATE THE RESULTING LEVEL OF CONGESTION.....INSTEAD THE CITY MUST ENCOURAGE VISITORS TO SEEK THEIR PHOTOS ELSEWHERE."

THIS IS THE MOST IMPORTANT PART OF THE STUDY. The northern part of Griffith Park must be developed. It is away from residential neighborhoods with limited infrastructure and is near the freeways.

An EIR is needed (but it is also needed in Hollywoodland). This northern area has the GREATEST POTENTIAL to safely and appropriately accommodate the ever growing number of visitors. It is probably the only area.

An areal tram could be a possibility, but more study needs to be done and greater details revealed. It should be to the north and not impact residential neighborhoods. The impact on wildlife would have to be studied.

ANY PROMOTION OF TOURIST MAGNETS ELSEWHERE SHOULD BE ACCOMPANIED WITH THE SHUTTING DOWN OF THE BOOTLEGGED MAGNETS IN HOLLYWOODLAND OR ELSE THE HOLLYWOODLAND MAGNETS BESIDES BEING OVERRUN BECAUSE OF GREATER SIGN VIEWING PUBLICITY WILL UNDERCUT THE SUCCESS OF THE NEW TOURISTS SITES. Visitors will go where it is closer and free instead of supporting sites further away and that cost money.

pg 31-32

This is one of the few suggestions in Hollywoodland that I CAN AGREE WITH BUT DOES NOT GO FAR ENOUGH.

The vista site was illegally bootlegged in, and tourist traffic, as a result, is recent. (The previous councilman's office workers put it in.)The approach to this location is EXTREMELY DANGEROUS with an extremely narrow street with about a half a dozen quick blind curves, and no sidewalks---meaning pedestrians in the street. On one side is an uphill slope with no shoulder. On the other side is a drop off with varying amounts of land that go from plots of land to barely a few feet. Cars have gone over the side into a child's playground area below. This is one of the most dangerous routes for thousands of tourists to be traveling. That's what happens when things are bootlegged in without a proper process or review.

This area mentioned should be planted and fenced but that needs to extend to the ENTIRE VISTA SITE. This whole area needs to be restored and turned into a location that is inhospitable to tourists and Sign viewing. It needs to be shut down.

If you want a LEGAL view site you must do an EIR as part of a total EIR for turning the western side of Griffith Park and the surrounding residential neighborhoods into a platform for Hollywood Sign viewing.

Also this site requires three full time employees to properly supervise the different areas with limited site lines that are located here.

pg 33-34

NO TOURIST SIGNAGE BELONGS IN RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS.

NO TOURIST SIGNAGE SHOULD DIRECT VISITORS TO A RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD.

THERE ARE NO LEGAL TOURIST MAGNETS IN HOLLYWOODLAND SO THERE IS NO NEED FOR SIGNAGE IN IT OR TO IT.

IF YOU TRANSFORM AND REZONE A RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD INTO A TOURIST DESTINATION YOU NEED A FULL EIR.

pg 34-35

IT IS VERY DANGEROUS. SEE PG 31-32.

THERE HAVE BEEN FIRES HERE FROM TOURISTS ILLEGALLY SMOKING EVEN THOUGH THERE ARE MANY NO SMOKING SIGNS.

pg 35-36

All navigational aps/websites should be sending visitors to ONLY legal magnets away from Hollywoodland and other limited residential neighborhoods.

Information is often inaccurate and dangerous. A year after the court ordered closure at the end of Beachwood, visitors are still mistakenly being sent there. 90% of the vehicular and pedestrian traffic still going to the end of Beachwood Drive is from visitors having to then turn around and go back down.

pg 37-38

This is another suggestion I APPROVE of but does not go far enough. This needs to be done more often.

In the past Councilman Labonge passed a City Council motion in order to temporarily shut down our streets and Hollywoodland to just residents for about a third of the year because of dangerous conditions caused by tourists. THIS MADE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD SAFE.

If the bootlegged tourists magnets were closed down the streets would not have to be closed.

The City should work with residents to permanently vacate streets in Hollywoodland for safety reasons.

pg 38-39

THESE TWO SUGGESTIONS ARE HORRIBLE AND DANGEROUS. These ideas will make conditions less safe. If safety is really the primary concern, the City would send visitors elsewhere to where there is safe infrastructure. It's very simple.

HOLLYWOODLAND'S SUBSTANDARD INFRASTRUCTURE IS APPROPRIATE FOR A RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD, BUT INSUFFICIENT AND DANGEROUS FOR A TOURIST DESTINATION.

Turning two way streets into one way streets is dangerous in a very high fire zone where you are reducing exits by half. The needs of residents who own property, pay taxes, and are there every day are superseded by the needs of a one time visitor from half way around the world that is spending an hour there. And that "there" is a residential neighborhood where they don't belong in the first place. Stop trying to transform a residential neighborhood into Disneyland.

There is limited access to some garages that can only be accessed from certain directions that could be eliminated by one way streets.

If streets are so limited and narrow that you need to have a special designated lane in order to insure emergency access, than those streets are too narrow and inappropriate for tourism.

Putting in special lanes will eliminate street parking for residents, some of whose older garages cannot accommodate today's cars.

Pedestrian lanes in the street are still dangerous. Pedestrians belong on sidewalks. This just reinforces what an inappropriate place this is for tourists without basic the infrastructure found in so many other places. Stop forcing a square peg into a round hole.

pg 39-41

It should not be residents who have the "privilege" of having to pay in order to park in front of their own homes when you convert a residential neighborhood into a tourist destination. This is a bandaid with some advantages, but still a bandaid. Solve the problem by shutting down bootlegged tourist magnets.

Increasing ppd's does not solve ride sharing, pedestrians in the street and vehicular congestion.

The end of Deronda has a BOOTLEGGED, ILLEGAL PARK ENTRANCE. It is filled with "no trespassing" signs that are ignored. A full EIR is needed to put in a public entrance there. Shut this entrance down and put in a street vacation for this extremely narrow, easily congested, deadended segment of Deronda.

Access to the park at the end of Mulholland Highway is also illegal and filled with ignored "no trespassing" signs. This vulnerable section of Mulholland Highway should be PRIVATIZED AND GATED to prevent vehicular and pedestrian traffic. There would be no need for ppd's, and this would truly secure this area.

The view site at Canyon Lake Park should be shut down. See pg 31-32. RESTORE THIS TO BEING A NEIGHBORHOOD POCKET PARK..

Tourists should be sent to the Canyon Drive entrance in Brush Canyon. It is the legal entrance that is safe with appropriate infrastructure. The residents living there can decide about having ppd's.

pg 41-42

Residential neighborhoods are inappropriate locations for tourist magnets. Residents carry a heavy burden. DO NOT CONSOLIDATE limited ppd sections into one big district. Residents living closest to the magnets will be the most negatively and unfairly impacted by this. If you want to make conditions convenient for residents, eliminate the tourists. Then the ppps can be gotten rid of.

pg 43-46

Canyon Drive in Brush Canyon is the legal entrance to the park. Parking can safely be expanded there.

The view site, the tourist magnet, at Lake Hollywood Park is illegal. This is a neighborhood pocket park that is unfairly being transformed into a tourist attraction. See pg 31-32. There should not be meters and ride sharing zones. Restore this to being a neighborhood pocket park.

The bulb out on lower Beachwood Drive is a dangerous idea. You are reducing badly needed parking for residents. See pg 8.

Hollywoodland is protected by the formal Hollywoodland Specific Plan. Placing parking meters in the village is contrary to the meaning and reason for the plan. You are also proposing putting meters in front of homes. This is an R1 neighborhood, almost 100 years old that your proposals would destroy with needless commercialization. PARKING METERS DO NOT BELONG IN ANY PART OF HOLLYWOODLAND.

pg 46-47

IF YOU DO NOT ENFORCE THE LAWS, THEN SIGNAGE AND RAISING CITATION FINES ARE MEANINGLESS. This is the first time that SMOKING, which is a huge problem, is mentioned in this report. "No Smoking" signs like all of the traffic and "No Trespassing" signs are routinely ignored. If you insist on turning an unsuitable, residential neighborhood into Disneyland, you must have supervision and enforcement performed by real people. A minimum of 12 to 15 full time employees would be needed in Hollywoodland as a skeleton crew. That would still be insufficient in order to insure safety and would fall way short of what would be demanded of a private entity running a comparable enterprise.

pg 47-50

This is a hillside residential neighborhood not set up to be an amusement park. The narrow streets have many blind curves with limited site lines making enforcement very difficult. This is not an appropriate place for tourism under any circumstances.

This section mentions employees to enforce traffic violations. Nothing is said of smoking violations which are equally widespread and even more dangerous with an even greater potential for disaster. Again the Dixon Report is clueless when it comes to the real and present dangers in Hollywoodland.

How many smoking citations have been given out?

How many jaywalking citations have been given out to pedestrians that walk in the middle of the street and block vehicular traffic?

This lack of enforcement for obvious and widespread violations contribute to the distrust by residents of the City's concern and ability to enforce much of anything.

pg 50-54

Your heading says that these are "the most accessible and safe Hollywood Sign Viewing locations and hikes." SOME ARE AND SOME ARE NOT. Yes, "The ideal location for hiking to and taking photos of the Hollywood Sign should ultimately be determined by the City based on **accessibility, safety and parking availability**," and therefore I cannot agree that some or any of THE MAGNETS IN HOLLYWOODLAND BEGIN TO EVEN COME CLOSE TO MEETING THAT CRITERIA. These are bootlegged, dangerous magnets on narrow, substandard, winding, blind curved streets deadended with no turnarounds, sidewalks, or parking in a very high fire hazard zone. This is all in a bottleneck into the park, vulnerable like no other residential neighborhood by being 80% surrounded by combustible brush. Optimize magnets that are safe and legal. Shut down magnets that are dangerous and illegal. Leaving the dangerous magnets in Hollywoodland open, will only undermine the safe locations. See pg 27-30.

The view site at Lake Hollywood Park was illegally put in. Shut it down because it is dangerous. The approach from Hollywoodland is one of the most perilous stretches of road anywhere. See page 31-32. If you want to keep it open you'll need a full EIR as part of a larger EIR for the whole western side of Griffith Park and the surrounding neighborhoods, You will also face prolonged litigation. This area, as all of Hollywoodland is also protected by the Hollywoodland Specific Plan which this violates. All of these spent City resources will appear cheap in comparison to the enormous potential liability of hundreds of millions or even a billion dollars in damages that the City could be responsible for in case of a catastrophic fire started by a tourist's cigarette. It should be removed from this section of the report.

Canyon Lake Drive in Brush Canyon is the legal entrance to this area of Griffith Park. It is safe, has appropriate infrastructure, accessibility and parking and meets the criteria stated earlier in this section.

The Wonderview Trail also did not go through a proper EIR. It needs to go through a full EIR. I would support shutting down the present access point which is dangerous and inappropriate and moving it to a different location. See pg 18-20. We want the same criteria applied to all of the bootlegged access points and the view site in Hollywoodland which are even more dangerous due to lack of parking. We want these shut down. The Wonderview Trail does not belong on this list unless the access point is moved, and it passes a full EIR.

Keep sending visitors to other parts of Griffith Park to the East. In the formal Griffith Park Plan the western side of Griffith park was to be left passive for plants and animals with no attractions being placed there. While sending visitors to the Observatory, additional space is needed. Reopening Mt Hollywood Drive would be very helpful. Also, as mentioned earlier, the northern side of Griffith Park away from residential neighborhoods and close to freeways hold the greatest potential for development in order to better accommodate the ever growing number of tourists.

The Ford Theatre Trail and Hollywood and Highland are good examples away from residential neighborhoods that can and should be expanded.

pg 54-55

Yes, A VISITORS CENTER SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AWAY FROM ANY RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS. But as promotion of the Sign grows and grows, it makes it even more important and imperative that the limited, bootlegged, inappropriate, and dangerous magnets (end of Beachwood, Deronda, dirt Mulholland, and the view site on Canyon Lake Drive) in substandard residential neighborhoods all be shut down. It is simply unsafe and unsustainable. See pg 27-30.

pg 55-56

A VIEWING PLATFORM SHOULD BE PLACED WHERE IT DOES NOT IMPACT RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS. Mt Hollywood Drive is a safe and legal place.

An areal tram needs a lot more study of its impact on animals and residents before it an even be considered.

pg 57-58

Again the only way to have these projects which involve greater promotion of the Hollywood Sign and therefore increasing the number of visitors is to FIRST SHUT DOWN the unsustainable, dangerous, bootlegged tourist magnets in Hollywoodland and in other residential neighborhoods.

pg 58-59

THIS OVERVIEW SHOULD ALSO BE PART OF THE OVERVIEW FOR THE WHOLE DIXON REPORT. See pg 27-30. "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 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....Visitors sometimes walk along narrow roads with blind curves to access 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." These are YOUR words. These magnets are inherently dangerous, cannot be made safe , and therefore must be shut down.

People will still want to see the "original" Sign (although none of it is original). This would only work if you moved the Sign to a different location as opposed to adding an additional Sign at an additional location.

pg 59-60

The Hollywood Sign Trust already has a website. Therefore I do not understand this suggestion. Most of the time the trust has been sensitive to resident concerns, safety issues, and the huge potential liability in litigation for loses or damages. They have certainly been more responsible and responsive than the City which has demonstrated most of the time that they don't care about these issues.

pg 60-62

This again is further promotion and marketing of the Sign which will cause an increase in visitors. You can't handle the current numbers. FIRST close down all of the tourist magnets in Hollywoodland or this will only make things worse. This is a safety issue.

pg 62-63

This proposal belongs at the Canyon Drive entrance in Brush Canyon, the LEGAL entrance to Griffith Park, and therefore is safe and has infrastructure. There is already a temporary bathroom facility there so this would be a natural upgrade and makes sense.

This does NOT belong in Lake Hollywood Park. See pg 24-27. The tourist magnet here was illegally bootlegged in and needs a full EIR as part of a full EIR of the western side of Griffith Park and the surrounding residential neighborhoods that are being transformed into a platform for Hollywood Sign viewing. THIS IS A POCKET PARK. POCKET PARKS DO NOT HAVE BATHROOMS. Remove the illegal magnet, restore the area with planting and fences, and return the pocket park to the residents.

pg 64

This is the fifth email in a series of emails I have sent to City Officials. Besides my comments, my emails have included an attorney's letter, polls, and petitions. I want this all to be part of the public record. In addition I have made a 30 minute film about fire, traffic and pedestrian safety conditions in regards to tourism in Hollywoodland. Various City officials have already seen this movie. I would like to show it to City officials who have not yet seen it in the hopes it will bring them a greater understanding and appreciation of these issues and their impact on Hollywoodland. I am available to answer any questions or give further testimony about the problems connected with tourism, the Hollywood Sign and Hollywoodland. Please feel free to contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Thank you.

Sarajane Schwartz
Homeowners on Beachwood Drive United
HBDU



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

COUNCIL FILE 18-0057 DIXON REPORT EMAIL #6

1 message

sschw56079 via Clerk Arts Committee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 2:41 PM

Reply-To: sschw56079@aol.com

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org, david.ryu@lacity.org, mike.n.feuer@lacity.org, controller.galperin@lacity.org, LAXAirportManager@lawa.org, planning@lacity.org, ladbs.webmaster@lacity.org, adria.ybarra@lacity.org, ken.bernstein@lacity.org, lambert.giessinger@lacity.org, ethics.commission@lacity.org, LAFDrequest@lacity.org, fernando.campos@lacity.org, rap.commissioners@lacity.org, ladot@lacity.org, cory.palka@lapd.lacity.org, 40988@lapd.online, joe.salaices@lacity.org, michael.a.shull@lacity.org, aram.sahakian@lacity.org, steve.houchin@lacity.org, emdcommunications@lacity.org, steven.cole@ladwp.com, michael.mcMenamin@ladwp.com, david.wright@ladwp.com, armando.hogan@lacity.org, michael.espinosa@lacity.org, john.white@lacity.org, clerk.artscommittee@lacity.org

DIXON REPORT COUNCIL FILE 18-0057
EMAIL #6

Dear City Officials,

Please add this email to my previous 5 emails and make them all part of the public record.

I am sending this in regards to pg 13-16 of the Dixon Report and concerns sending trams/buses to the end of Beachwood and other references to the end of Beachwood Drive as an access point into Griffith Park throughout your entire report. Not only has a court order closed this access point, but it has NEVER been a public access point into the park.

I want to clarify this issue that keeps coming up--incorrectly--and I want to set the record straight. In the Sunset Ranch decision the ranch and the City stipulated certain facts in the court documents (so they cannot be appealed). One was that there has never been an official public entrance to Griffith Park at the end of Beachwood. The court documents say...

"The Board of Recreational and Parks Commissioners never approved the Beachwood Gate being an access point to Griffith Park, and unlike other access points to Griffith Park the Beachwood Gate never appeared on a Recreation and Parks Department website or brochure. The City currently provides and will continue to provide access to Hollyridge Trail and other trails through an official and published entrance to Griffith Park at the terminus of Canyon Drive." (The underlines are mine) In other words there is a process for creating a brand new public entrance to the park which includes the RAP Commissioners, and it was not followed. In addition the court ruling stated that all public access to the Hollyridge trail should go through the legal public entrance at Canyon Drive.

Two different judges in the past year have ruled and confirmed the closing of public access into the park from the end of Beachwood Drive.

Your report for some mysterious reason chooses to ignore these facts.

ALL REFERENCES TO BEACHWOOD DRIVE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE HOLLYRIDGE TRAIL SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM YOUR ENTIRE REPORT AND INSTEAD REPLACE THEM WITH CANYON DRIVE.

The same legal procedure NEVER occurred at the other magnets in Hollywoodland--the other access points and the view site. They have all been bootlegged in and are illegal. Tourism should be removed from these locations and the areas should go through restoration from the damage that has been caused.

Sarajane Schwartz
Homeowners on Beachwood Drive United



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

Council file #18-0057 (Feasibility of the Dixon Study recommendations)

1 message

ben.sheffner@gmail.com <ben.sheffner@gmail.com>

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 9:57 AM

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Cc: Shannon Prior <Shannon.Prior@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseault <Sarah.Dusseault@lacity.org>, Catherine Landers <Catherine.Landers@lacity.org>, Councilmember.Ryu@lacity.org

To the members of the Arts, Entertainment, Parks and River Committee:

I am a resident of the Beachwood Canyon/Hollywoodland neighborhood. I write in advance of your June 18, 2018 meeting to voice qualified support for the recommendations included in the June 15, 2018 memo re Feasibility of the Dixon Study recommendations regarding pedestrian and vehicular issues related to the Hollywood Sign viewing areas. Please make this email part of the record of Council file #18-0057.

As the Committee is aware, Beachwood Canyon/Hollywoodland at times receives large volumes of tourists and hikers, given our proximity to the Hollywood Sign and the hiking trails of Griffith Park. This is a reality, and is not going to change. The Dixon Study correctly accepts the reality that Beachwood Canyon/Hollywoodland will continue to receive large volumes of visitors, and offers a variety of constructive solutions to mitigate the traffic and related issues that result from the large numbers of visitors.

Some comments on several of the specific recommendations in the June 15 memo:

Strategy 1.1: Install sidewalk bulb-out along North Beachwood Drive. The practice of visitors standing in the middle of Beachwood Drive to take pictures with the Hollywood Sign in the background is a real problem. Providing a safer way for visitors to pose for pictures, including by installing "bulb-outs" or similar features, makes sense (as does constructing a viewing platform, as outlined in Strategy 7.3). The Dixon Report recommends placing a bulb-out near Glen Holly St. I would just point out that I frequently witness people walking into Beachwood Dr. to take pictures at various locations **south** of Glen Holly. Therefore, the City should consider placing additional bulb-outs south of Glen Holly, or at least placing prominent signage in the southern portion of Beachwood Dr. (before the sign becomes visible), informing them that a good spot for sign photos is ahead by some specified distance. (I note that the opponents of the Dixon Study provide no solutions whatsoever to the problem of people walking into Beachwood Dr. to take photos. Increased enforcement, while theoretically helpful, isn't a viable solution; obviously the LAPD does not have the resources to deploy officers every 50 feet along Beachwood Dr. to deter jaywalkers, which is what would be necessary to truly solve the problem through enforcement.)

Strategy 1.3: Post walkability signage. I strongly endorse this measure. As noted above, visitors already come to Beachwood Canyon/Hollywoodland, and they frequently get lost and confused (I know this because they often stop me while I'm walking to ask directions). The only objection I have heard to better signage is that it would somehow "invite" visitors into the neighborhood. But the visitors are already here, and they will keep coming. It's time to accept that reality, and do a much better job of directing them to where they want to go.

Strategy 2.1: Implement an electric shuttle service connecting nearest Metro Station with North Beachwood Drive park entrance. Generally speaking, I support the idea of providing better transportation options into the park, and electric shuttles seem to make sense. Some object to having any shuttles into the neighborhood, but I would point out that shuttles will likely reduce private car trips up the canyon, and it is preferable to have one shuttle than 10 private cars on Beachwood Dr.

Strategy 2.2: Implement the alternate access trail plan at North Beachwood Drive. I am disappointed that the June 15 memo rejects this recommendation. While there are no doubt

obstacles, I urge the Committee not to give up searching for solutions that would permit access to the Hollyridge Trail that comply with the law and do not interfere with the stables' operations. I also urge the Committee 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.

The Committee will no doubt hear from certain residents of Beachwood Canyon/Hollywoodland who categorically reject **all** of the Dixon Study recommendations out of hand on the grounds that implementing them will somehow "invite" visitors into the neighborhood. This point of view is simply a refusal to acknowledge reality. The visitors are already here, and they will keep coming, no matter what the City does. Our streets are public, and the public -- whether Beachwood Canyon/Hollywoodland residents, others from around Los Angeles and Southern California, or visitors from throughout the world -- has every right to traverse the neighborhood's streets and sidewalks. We can either howl ineffectively against the visitors in the hope that they will somehow stop coming (as, unfortunately, some of the loudest voices in the neighborhood have been doing for years), or we can accept the reality that visitors will keep coming to Beachwood Canyon/Hollywoodland, and try to find solutions to mitigate the problems they sometimes cause for residents, as the Dixon Study admirably does. I also note that certain residents of Beachwood Canyon/Hollywoodland fault the City for "promoting" the Hollywood Sign and thereby increasing the flow of visitors into Beachwood Canyon/Hollywoodland. This is a red herring. People come to view the sign because it is one of the most famous landmarks on the planet, a ubiquitous metonym in pop culture for Los Angeles and the movie industry as a whole. The sign is easily visible from many points in Los Angeles, and is shown, worldwide, in and on untold numbers of movies, TV shows, magazines, web sites, books, billboards, t-shirts, tchotchkes, and other items, making it one of the most famous images on earth. Whatever "promotion" of the sign that the City engages in has at most marginal effect, and eliminating all "promotion" of the sign by the City will have no appreciable impact on the volume of visitors to Beachwood Canyon/Hollywoodland, given the omnipresence of the sign through channels having nothing to do with any official "promotion."

Thank you for your work on this issue and for considering my views.

Best regards,

Ben Sheffner
[2751 Hollyridge Dr.](mailto:ben@ben-sheffner.com)
[Los Angeles, CA 90068](mailto:ben@ben-sheffner.com)



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

Support of Strategy 2.3 and Recommendation #10 / Council File 18-0057

1 message

'Bruce McCarthy' via Clerk Arts Committee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org> Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 10:24 PM

Reply-To: Bruce McCarthy <bgmccarthy@yahoo.com>

To: "Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org" <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Cc: "alice.roth@lacity.org" <alice.roth@lacity.org>, "shannon.prior@lacity.org" <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, "daniel@danielsavage.com" <daniel@danielsavage.com>, "karenrosen@mac.com" <karenrosen@mac.com>, "roodog1989@gmail.com" <roodog1989@gmail.com>, "kgralla@hotmail.com" <kgralla@hotmail.com>, Chad Smith <chadthomassmith@gmail.com>

To: The Arts, Entertainment, Parks, & River Committee

Thank you for the opportunity to submit our comments. My partner Chad Smith and I are full time residents and owners of [3585 Wonder View Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90068](#) which is located on Upper Wonder View Drive between Lake Hollywood Drive and an unofficial access, through DWP land, to a trail that leads to the Wisdom Tree ("the Wonder View Trailhead"). **We write in full support of Strategy #3 (Relocate the Wonder View Trailhead and Install a Pedestrian Gate on Lake Hollywood Drive)** of Dixon Resources Unlimited's Comprehensive Strategies Report on Improving Access, Safety, and Mobility in Griffith Park and around the Hollywood Sign dated January 2018 (the "Study") **and the resulting Strategy 2.3 ("Strategy 2.3") and Recommendation #10 (Recommendation 10") of the June 15, 2018 report from the City departments regarding the strategies proposed in the Study** to be discussed on Monday June 18, 2018 at the City Counsel Chambers at City Hall. Further, **the Study and Strategy 2.3 proposes to close access to the trail head on Upper Wonder View completely** while proffering one of two alternative trail routes: Option A which seems to run just adjacent to Upper Wonder Drive and Option B starts the trail at the lake (Lake Hollywood, that is) running partly adjacent to the Toyon Tanks and connecting with an existing trail. **Chad and I fully support completely closing the existing access to the Wonder View Trailhead and establishing the trail in Option B (not Option A) as noted in the Study.**

Of the two Options, only Option B comes close to mitigating the majority of the safety and other issues in the neighborhood. As concluded in the Study, "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." We completely agree. The sight of hurried traffic and touring hordes up and down this small, curvy, sidewalk-less street, at all hours of the day, or even the night, is completely commonplace. There have been dozens of instances of very large groups, even of accompanied children, walking and blocking the street. Every month during the full moon, hikers head up to the Wisdom Tree. The same is true during any holiday that includes fireworks. The congestion is dangerous as pedestrians can't see cars coming and cars - often tourists or Ubers/Lyfts - speed without suspecting the pedestrians. Further as the adjacent public area is DWP's it seems to be unpatrolled. As a result, folks routinely use nature (including a beautiful California Oak Tree located across the street from our property) for their toilet breaks and/or just to hang out and smoke. Trash, graffiti and erosion are rampant. **As Option A remains alongside Upper Wonder View it at best gets some - but not all - of people off the road does not fully ease the aforementioned congestion, nor limit the trash, toilet breaks, etc in the residential area.**

Strategy 2.3 leaves open the possibility that either Option A or B may be subject to environmental impact analysis under CEQA. If that is the case, **it would likely make sense that the unofficially developed Wonder View Trailhead also is also subject to CEQA. I don't believe that study was ever done.**

Lastly, at several times throughout the Study and recommendation process, many residents of and near Upper Wonder View, and the Hollywood Knolls Community Club (HKCC), suggested that **the City, as part of its stated intention to mitigate the problems in the Hollywood Sign/Wonder View area, also consider the establishment of a new trailhead leading up to the Wisdom Tree site from Forest Lawn Drive.** Such a site would have ample street parking and is far away from any residences. By this email, we again, request that the City consider this Forest Lawn Drive alternative as well.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide our very strong support in favor of Recommendation 10.

Best Regards,

Bruce McCarthy & Chad Smith
[3585 Wonder View Drive, 90068](#)



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

File No. 18-0057

1 message

'Capps Arthur' via Clerk Arts Committee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 8:41 PM

Reply-To: Capps Arthur <kimosaby4@yahoo.com>

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

To: the Arts, Entertainment, Parks, & River Committee:

I am wholeheartedly in favor of Strategy 2.3, and Recommendation #10, and Option B, which directly effects the residents of the Wonder View Dr. surrounding streets, and The Hollywood Knolls. The car traffic, hikers, fire hazard, noise, trash, safety, and home property intrusions cannot continue.

The Hollywood sign has become a major tourist attraction and generates tourist revenue in the "Billions" to the city as reported in the Los Angeles Times. We need a long range plan that gives relief to effected home owners.

Strategy 2.3 along with the permanently closing of the Wonder View Dr. entrance to the trailhead and creating another trail for access to the Wisdom Tree/Hollywood Sign Trail is the only solution.

I'm feed up with hikers knocking on my door at all hours asking to use our bathroom and wanting water and directions to the "Sign."

Arthur Capps
3615 Wonder View Dr.
Hollywood, CA 90068



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

File # 18-0057, Dixon Report

1 message

Yvonne <yvonnewestbrook@sbcglobal.net>
To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 8:18 PM

I have lived in Beachwood Canyon for 46 years, I know and understand the community and the physical territory of the canyon quite well, thus my opinion, I feel is worthy of your serious consideration.

The Dixon report, is on the whole, a very misguided document, one full of ideas so idiotic that I find it, at best, unlearned in scope and content. Do our community a favor and scrap it, regardless of the money spent.

I understand this report was not open for public bidding. I pay taxes, and I would like to know why the study was not open to public bidding?

I am not going into the details of why I believe the Dixon Report is so flawed because I plan on being at the meeting to state my opinion publicly. I am writing this should something come up that prevents me from attending.

The comments I will make has to do with safety:

Beachwood Canyon does not have the proper infrastructure to accommodate the influx of tourists that come to see the Hollywood Sign and hikers that prefer to access Griffith Park via the Hollyridge Trail, Deronda and Mulholland. The streets are too narrow and difficult to navigate, resulting in constant, everyday near misses of pedestrians and cars. It is only a matter of time until someone is killed.

This is an exponential problem that will only get worse if the City continues to perceive Beachwood Canyon as safe area for tourists and hikers to access the Hollywood Sign and Griffith Park.

Thank you,

Yvonne L Westbrook
2815 N. Beachwood Dr
Hollywood, CA 90068

Yvonne Westbrook, MFT

This email and/or attachments contains information which may be confidential and/or legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained herein. Unauthorized disclosure and/or use of information contained in this email may result in civil and criminal liability.



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

Council file # 18-0057

1 message

Tinker Lindsay <tinker@tinkerlindsay.com>

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 7:33 PM

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Cc: info@hollywoodland.org, Laura Davis <laura@lauradavisproductions.com>

To Whom It May Concern,

Due to the extremely late notice by Councilman Ryu's office, we are unable to attend tomorrow's City Council meeting regarding the Dixon Study.

We vehemently object to the decision to further consider sending shuttle buses up Beachwood Drive and creating an upper Holly Ridge entrance into Griffith Park. It is an unworkable solution that is dangerous to the public, a fire hazard, with no consideration for the safety of either tourists or locals. There is no infrastructure here to support the flood of visitors. None. Three weeks ago a van coming down Beachwood crossed our sidewalk and ran into a tree on our property and thank goodness it did, because otherwise it might have run down the usual crowd of pedestrians making their way up our narrow street looking for the sign. We are a deadly accident or raging fire from a tossed cigarette waiting to happen.

Please, please find a better way to deal with this issue of rampant tourism created by your own encouragement and endangering a residential community with no way to handle it. If you recreate an entrance into the park at the top of Beachwood, you will double the problem, not solve it, adding MORE pedestrians as well as MORE traffic to your shuttle buses. It can only result in endangering the residents as well as the tourists you are hoping to serve.

Sincerely yours,

Tinker Lindsay and Cameron Keys
Residents since 1980

Sent from my iPhone



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

Council file #18-0057

1 message

Tony Castanares <tonycastanares@gmail.com>

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 6:45 PM

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Cc: sarah.dusseault@lacity.org, Catherine Landers <catherine.landern@lacity.org>, councilmember.ryu@lacity.com

To the members of the Arts, Entertainment, Parks and River Committee:

Growing up in the 1940s and 1950s, I was privileged to be able to walk into Griffith Park from where I lived. And in 1981, when I was in the market for a home, I was careful to be sure that I would be able to do so again, and I bought my current home on Hollyridge Drive with access to the Hollyridge Trail, now closed to me. Access to the Park is extremely important to me, and I know that the same is true of a great many of my neighbors—a strong majority, I believe, though perhaps not possessed of the most strident voices.

To avoid repetition, and thereby save you time, let me say that I have read the recent submissions to you by my neighbors Ben Sheffner and Brian Lane, and that I join in them fully and wholeheartedly.

Thank you.



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

Comments on City Report regarding Hollywood Sign Strategies COUNCIL FILE 18-0057

1 message

Jane Goichman <goichphoto@earthlink.net>

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 5:38 PM

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Cc: shannon.prior@lacity.org, sarah.dusseault@lacity.org, david.ryu@lacity.org

Dear Councilmembers O'Farrell, Price and Ryu:

I have lived in Lake Hollywood Estates since 1979 and on occasion in years past I served on the Board and as President of the Lake Hollywood Homeowners Association. I have worked closely with the board in recent years although choosing recently not to serve on the board. My comments will be limited to those sections of the city report relating to the Lake Hollywood area or Mulholland.

Briefly summarizing:

1. It is gratifying that at long last the city has included funds in its budget to deal with tourism issues associated with the Hollywood sign. Thumbs up to Councilman Ryu and his staff for working on this. I am hoping but a bit dubious that the increased enforcement beginning on July 1 will help significantly to mitigate the terrible traffic issues in our area. Your council committee should hold a roundtable around mid-January to hear from the community and the city officials about the results of increased enforcement so that city council members and the CAO can evaluate during the preparation of the budget for the next fiscal year whether modifications should be made based experience on the ground.

2. Instructions to the city resulting from the report under consideration should call for speedy turn-around. A sense of urgency is needed, because the problem has escalated tremendously every few months. We now get traffic in the Lake Hollywood area on non-holiday and non-vacation season weekends that is akin to what holiday traffic was like 12-18 months ago. There are traffic jams on Mulholland and on Canyon Lake Drive. In these situations, emergency vehicles cannot reach our community when needed. Moreover, despite many No Smoking signs, many visitors smoke at the Vista, on Canyon Lake Drive and around our neighborhood. Recent fires in Benedict Canyon and near the Skirball certainly reinforce our awareness of fire hazards in the hills. The mass of tourists visiting the Lake Hollywood area greatly increases our local fire danger.

3. City leaders need to prioritize the quality of life of city residents, whom they represent, over the visitor experience, and hence need to rethink simply accepting masses of tourists in inappropriate spots. While the city cannot "control" visitors, it can think about how and implement policies to manage visitors, including rethinking permitting or encouraging ever increasing numbers of visitors to our area.

Detailed comments:

1. Strategy 1.2 Traffic Calming:

Note: We are happy the city installed traffic humps on Tahoe Drive several months ago. Thank you.

2. Strategy 1.3 Walkability:

There was little or no recognition in the Dixon report and none in the city agency report to the committee about the increasing pedestrian issue on LedgeWood, Heather and Durant (the streets leading up from Beachwood Café area to the Lake Hollywood vista). This is an increasing issue. During the past few months, I run into ever more young adults in groups walking up and down these narrow, curvy streets to get to the vista. At the most basic level, they don't seem to recognize that when you walk on a city street (there are no sidewalks here at all), you need to walk on the side facing traffic. But more significantly, this is extremely dangerous, because these streets are just wide enough for 2 cars to pass. When there are pedestrians walking and paying no attention, they sometimes block a driver's view. It becomes even more risky when there is a car parked on the street. Is walking on these streets legal? If so, what recommendations can city experts or outside consultant make about how to manage or possibly outlaw this with new ordinance? If a shuttle were run from Franklin and from Beachwood market/café area, then there would be no reason why these visitors would need to walk up to the vista. This problem needs to be addressed.

Signs, aimed more at cars than pedestrians, on Mulholland, and perhaps other spots are confusing and do not seem related to a master plan. The city reacts to input from the community, but to manage the car and pedestrian traffic (see below suggestion for vastly decreasing car traffic), city departments need to make sure all signs are coordinated and are part of a well thought-out master plan. One example is as you drive east on Mulholland and reach the intersection with Durant, there is a large sign saying something about no access to the Hollywood sign. It is unclear what the purpose of the sign is and what it is trying to accomplish. Signs about no car access to the Hollywood sign should be at all entrances to the hills area (e.g. at Barham/Lake Hollywood; Franklin and Beachwood). The city needs to figure out a way of creating single large signs containing the major points about Hollywood hills trail access/car access, etc.) on a single sign at various entrances to the area. Currently there are too many signs, making the entire experience completely confusing.

The recommendation for a survey of signs should be done within a couple of months. It should also include recommendation for master plan for large signs and fewer signs.

3. Strategy 3.1 DASH OR shuttle to/from highly congested areas:

There is no mention of shuttles to the Vista/ Lake Hollywood Park. Many neighbors disagree with me, believing that somehow we will put the genie back into the bottle. But, the reality is that some of the best and closest photo opportunities for the Hollywood sign are here. Those shots are available with essentially no walking involved and without the visitors taking the time and effort to park their car, get on public transport and then finally take a photograph from a place further away from the sign. We should not encourage tourists to come to the vista but should acknowledge that they are coming and will continue to do so.

In order to "manage" the situation, the city needs to stop most of the cars that now come to the area by implementing a 3-pronged approach: a. institute permitted parking throughout the Lake Hollywood Estates area; b. Red curb all of Canyon Lake Drive (perhaps create some permit parking so that locals from the neighborhoods surrounding Lake Hollywood Park can park and use it); c. provide electric shuttles to the park or vista area. This will also require ongoing traffic enforcement (but at a much lower level than the upcoming enforcement effort) once the city begins a comprehensive social media campaign advising that private cars cannot park in this area and will be ticketed. It might also require an additional fire safety watch person. If current ordinances interfere with such a plan, then city attorney and city council/mayor should determine what changes are needed and make them. This proposal acknowledges this is a public area and a

viewing area close to the sign but should result in a massive decrease in traffic and traffic jams and their concomitant public safety hazards. It requires little if any initial infrastructure construction and so could be implemented with relatively few costs. Since the city is already planning to increase shuttle service, this plan would simply be another element of that shuttle service. It can readily be modified or ended if after 12-18 months it has not had a major impact.

Of course, we do not want shuttles bringing people up here unless the plan to stop parking in our area is implemented. We certainly don't want additional tourists.

4. Strategy 3.1 Ridesharing zones:

This should be undertaken in conjunction with 3-pronged proposal discussed above—to move private cars with Hollywood sign tourists out of this area. Also note, some visitors seem to have difficulty connecting with ride share once they are finished with their photographs, because reception on mobile phones is poor in the Lake Hollywood park area. I live near the end of Arrowhead and recently a young man from France was standing in front of my house trying to figure out how he could continue to walk down to Hollywood Blvd., because his phone indicated he could proceed forward. Obviously he ran into cul-de-sac with houses, and I had to advise him how to proceed back to the park and onwards or try to get ride share car to pick him up.

5. Strategy 4.1 Planting on Mulholland:

I strongly encourage this planting. One major ongoing problem is cars that stop or even literally park on the narrow, curvy Mulholland when visitors look out and first see "the sign". Although there are signs and red curbs, all outlawing stopping or parking, visitors don't care. Even when you ask them to move, they ignore the request/the law, creating extremely dangerous traffic situations. Our hope is that planting the area and blocking the view will resolve this element of the problem.

The city should push to get this implemented quickly. We have already been discussing this for more than a year. Let's try to move forward without yet another round of studies. The one issue not mentioned in the city report and perhaps not yet resolved is whether any "path" will be retained. What now exists is an informal, rather dangerous path along Mulholland. In years past when only locals used it, they were well aware of traffic and paid adequate attention. Since then, the thousands of tourists who walk on the "path" also spill over onto Mulholland, further complicating the driving situation on a very narrow street, and the car traffic has vastly increased.

6. Strategy 4.4 WAZE etc.

The city needs to move forward on this with more urgency. City council should direct someone in an appropriate department to coordinate this recommendation, starting in the very near future, and this committee should direct city staff to report to the committee at least quarterly.

7. Strategy 6.3 Time Limited Parking

It is completely unclear why Recreation and Parks wants time limited parking. Unlike parking meters, limited time parking provides no money to city, (and I don't favor parking meters, because as noted above, we should outlaw all parking in the area). To be meaningful, time limits would require heavy, expensive enforcement that would not address the essential traffic problem. The city should not pursue time limited parking.

What parking lot is the city talking about near Lake Hollywood Park, and where would it place a parking lot? Again, this does not solve the basic problem that the routes to this area and the geography of this area simply cannot handle the mass of car traffic. The city needs to move the mass of visitors into shuttles if they want to visit Lake Hollywood park and simply outlaw parking in this area. Creating a parking lot again is another way of "accepting" the cars as inevitable, but with good management, enforcement, and social media advertisement, presumably

visitors would stop wasting their time driving up here in private cars if they cannot accomplish their photography goals because they cannot park their car.

8. Strategy 7.1: Enhance Trail Sign program throughout Griffith Park:

It is fine to improve the trail sign program as long as there is a full recognition that the mass of visitors who now come to the Lake Hollywood area have no interest in hiking for well over a mile to get a vista of the sign in another section of the park which is further away and generally with a less direct view of the sign than they have from the vista. For the visitors who want both a hike and a vista, the trail sign proposal sounds good.

9. Strategy 7.7: Social Media and Marketing outreach:

This should be a high priority. I have recently been advised that the Department of Conventions and Tourism is rather independent and perhaps does not directly link into city council or mayoral oversight. Your committee should explore the relationship and, if necessary, enact an ordinance that provides direct oversight by city council and the mayor. Strategies for managing tourism must be coordinated with marketing. We have signs in the Bradley Terminal of the airport highlighting close-up views of the Hollywood sign. One of our Lake Hollywood residents who regularly travels to China on business reports that buses in Shanghai have the Hollywood sign wrapped around them. Is there any reason to wonder why thousands and thousands of tourists come to our neighborhood for the close-up shot of the sign? Advertise the great beaches, the great museums, etc., not the Hollywood sign! And coordinate the message. To do this—the city needs to have some sort of direct reporting relationship with the Department of Conventions and Tourism.

I appreciate that the city's tourism sites do not include Lake Hollywood and the vista as a place to view the sign. BUT many social media sites highlight this area. And in fact the number of tourists coming to this area has exploded during the past 9 months despite what is shown on LA city based web sites. This reinforces why rethinking whether private cars can park in this area is appropriate. The city cannot control social media. So it has to create and implement strategies that deal with these realities.

10. Strategy 7.8: Restrooms

Our neighborhood opposes restrooms in the park. If restrooms were to be built, they need to be frequently maintained and completely locked up every night when Lake Hollywood Park closes.

These are difficult issues to tackle, but the city must do so. Your committee should include swift turn-around times in your directions to city departments. And your committee should think about how to effectively manage with the "3-pronged approach" the tourism glut in the Lake Hollywood area. Let's see the city actually try to deal with the realities rather than putting band aids on a very difficult situation.

One final thing for your committee or an appropriate group of your colleagues to consider: get back control of the Hollywood sign from the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce. I know that there is a complex background to this situation, which resulted in California Attorney General giving control over the sign to the Chamber. We have an Attorney General who comes from this area; it is inappropriate for a business organization to have control over a sign that sits on city property and so heavily impacts city neighborhoods that bear the burden but none of the benefit of the sign. The sign also has heavy cost impacts on the city. The city should explore how it can modify that situation.

Best regards,

Jane Goichman



Virus-free. www.avast.com



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

file number 18-0057

1 message

Kevin Murphy <kevin@reefermadness.org>

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 4:09 PM

To: "Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org" <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

My name is Kevin Murphy and I live at [3527 Wonder View Dr.](#) I am writing regarding the Dixon study of my neighborhood. I would strongly advocate that Option B of Strategy 2.3 be implemented to install a pedestrian access gate on Lake Hollywood Drive and relocate the Wonder View trailhead. There are many reasons for this, all of which have been well-documented, but the most important reason (for me) is that sooner or later, a hiker is going to be badly injured. Many hikers don't understand that this is not a footpath. They walk four abreast wearing headphones and have no idea cars are coming. It's an extremely dangerous situation and I think it's well worth the extra effort to figure out how to fix the situation so hikers can enjoy Griffith Park without putting themselves in danger and putting homeowners and their guests at liability risk. Thank you for your kind attention.

Kevin Murphy

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

public record #18-0057.

1 message

Doron Ofir <doronofircasting@me.com>
To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Sun, Jun 17, 2018 at 3:30 PM

Dear Shannon Prior, Councilmember Ryu, CD4 representation, Mayor Garcetti and Honorable Congressman Schiff,

I demand this be included in the public record item #18-0057.

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 devastating 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
President & Founder
Doron Ofir Casting LLC / Popular Productions Inc.
6207 Santa Monica Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90038
[323-871-2588](tel:323-871-2588) office direct
[310-779-6112](tel:310-779-6112) mobile
DoronOfirCasting@me.com
Twitter - [@doronofircast](https://twitter.com/doronofircast)
Facebook - Doron Ofir Casting
Website - doronofircasting.com

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.

Sent telepathically.