



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

Council File 18-0057 - NO WAY STOP!

1 message

linda.erdmann@powereng.com <linda.erdmann@powereng.com>
To: "Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org" <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>
Cc: "info@Hollywoodland.org" <info@hollywoodland.org>

Mon, Sep 24, 2018 at 8:47 AM

Dear City Council,

I'm a resident of Beachwood Canyon, one of the many neighborhoods affected by the Dixon Study. This study has not adequately assessed the concerns of the residents in the neighborhoods that are accessed by tourists to see the Hollywood sign. **The proposed strategies in the Dixon Study are subject to CEQA and a full Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is warranted since there is substantial evidence that the Dixon proposals will have a significant effect on the environment.** Reasonable alternatives to the Dixon study proposals must be developed that address the concerns of neighborhood residents. The Dixon Study is biased towards increasing tourist access to the sign in residential neighborhoods vs. formal entrances to Griffith Park. Neighborhood access is not sustainable and will result in continued degradation of these neighborhoods and potential devastation by fire started by a tourist's careless cigarette. Enforcement of no smoking in the canyons does not exist and an increase in tourism can only mean fire and danger to residents and visitors alike. I strongly agree with the HHA and say "NO WAY STOP!"

Sincerely,

Linda Erdmann

[3301 Deronda Drive](#)



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

Council file number 18-0057

1 message

Lucinda Phillips <pavementpictures1@gmail.com>
To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Mon, Sep 24, 2018 at 9:36 AM

Dear Councilmembers and Committee
Regarding the Dixon Study Report - one thing of the utmost importance is a designated off-site Hollywood Sign Visitors Center. A center that can be for both viewing the sign to take photos etc and for purchasing merchandise. A money making venture and at the same time giving the Tourist and visitor a better experience. There have been discussions at Hollywood Sign meetings regarding various sites in Hollywood that could be used. This would alleviate a huge problem in the neighborhoods and Griffith Park. We cannot wait for years to fix this problem - it has to be tackled head on now.
best regards
Lucinda Phillips
Resident of Griffith Park neighborhood
Griffith Park Advisory Board Member
Friends of Griffith Park Board Member



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

Council File #18-0057

1 message

Emmy Goldknopf <egoldknopf@gmail.com>

Mon, Sep 24, 2018 at 1:50 PM

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org, eric.villanueva@lacity.org

Cc: Barbara Hensleigh <barbarajhensleigh@gmail.com>, Carol Henning <carolhen@sbcglobal.net>, Catherine Landers <catherine.landiers@lacity.org>

Dear Mr. Villanueva, Clerk for the Arts, Entertainment, Parks, and River Committee,

Attached please find a resolution approved by the Angeles Chapter of the Sierra Club regarding Council File #18-0057, which is on the agenda for Wednesday's meeting.

The Angeles Chapter of the Sierra Club, which has almost 50,000 members in Los Angeles and Orange Counties, opposes aerial trams into or within Griffith Park such as those proposed by Warner Bros. and discussed in the Dixon Report. Three entities within the Chapter -- the Central Group (which includes a portion of the Park and Hollywood, the City of Los Angeles and other areas), the Verdugo Hills Group (which includes areas north and northeast of the Park), and the Griffith Park Section -- all passed resolutions opposing aerial trams into or within the Park. They brought their concerns to the Chapter's Conservation Committee, which also voted to oppose the trams. Afterwards, the Angeles Chapter unanimously adopted the attached resolution opposing the trams.

Thank you,

Emmy Goldknopf, Vice-Chair,
Griffith Park Section, Sierra Club Angeles Chapter

egoldknopf@gmail.com

(213) 804-0967 (cell)

cc. Barbara Hensleigh (Chair, Central Group, Sierra Club Angeles Chapter)

Carol Henning (Verdugo Hills Group, Sierra Club Angeles Chapter)

Catherine Landers (Deputy Director for Special Projects, Councilmember Ryu's office)

Resolution_on_Aerial Trams_Final.pdf
46K

Resolution On Proposed Griffith Park Aerial Tram/Skyway

The Angeles Chapter Conservation Committee recommends that the Angeles Chapter Executive Committee adopt a resolution to oppose the recent proposal by Warner Bros. Studio to build an aerial “skyway” to take riders from its property in Burbank to the top of Mt. Lee in Griffith Park, behind the Hollywood Sign, and to also oppose other proposed aerial trams into or within the Park.

Background:

In 1896, Colonel Griffith donated the Park to the citizens of Los Angeles as “a place of recreation and rest for the masses.” He envisioned the Park as an oasis for residents and visitors to reconnect with nature. Today the Park is used by a diverse set of Angelenos for hiking, bicycling, picnicking, and more. The Park is also the largest natural wilderness within the City of Los Angeles parks department, containing a diverse ecosystem that houses a substantial number of native plant and animal species who rely on it to survive, including the world famous urban mountain lion, “P-22”. The Park is designated a Significant Ecological Area by the County of Los Angeles General Plan and a wildlife corridor linking the Santa Monica Mountains to the Verdugo Mountain range. It is considered one of 34 biodiversity hotspots for conservation worldwide by Conservation International. As such, the Park requires special consideration whenever its flora and fauna are threatened.

Previous proposals for aerial trams in the Park have been criticized by environmentalists and others. In 2005, a draft of a Griffith Park Master Plan including two proposed aerial trams was widely criticized for how it would despoil and commercialize the Park. The Griffith Park Working Group, created in response to that plan, ultimately asserted that the Park should maintain its Urban Wilderness Identity. However, the 2018 Dixon Report (“Comprehensive Strategies Report: Improving Access, Safety, and Mobility Around Griffith Park & the Hollywood Sign”), commissioned by Councilmember Ryu’s office and focusing on ways to alleviate problems associated with people trying to visit or view the Hollywood Sign, mentions the possibility of an aerial tram from one of several locations in the north or northeast parts of the Park (the Headworks Reservoir, the LA Zoo, and the Wilson and Harding Golf Course) to a Hollywood Sign viewing platform somewhere in the park. In a June 2018 written evaluation of the Dixon Report strategies, Recreation and Parks General Manager Mike Shull and City Council Legislative Analyst Sharon Tso rated the aerial tram strategy as feasible, seemed to think it would help alleviate traffic in neighborhoods south of the park, and even appear to propose building an aerial tram in a location not mentioned in the Dixon Report.

In early July 2018, Warner Bros. Studio proposed spending \$100 million to build an aerial “skyway” to take ticket holders from its studio property in Burbank to Mt. Lee, in Griffith Park, upon which rests the world famous Hollywood sign. This aerial tram would be built through Griffith Park and require a visitors center to be built atop Mt. Lee, where currently hikers, cyclists, and horseback riders can sit, rest, and contemplate the view of Los Angeles below. Warner Bros. proposes splitting the ticket fees with the City of Los Angeles. One of the arguments made by Warner Bros. in favor of the tram is that it would reduce congestion in the Hollywood caused by tourists attempting to see and photograph the Hollywood Sign. Warner Bros. Studio cites the Dixon Report as support for its proposal.

The Central Group of the Chapter voted unanimously in favor of a very similar resolution (5/0). The Verdugo Hills Group voted 8/0 to support a very similar resolution with one member absent. The Griffith Park Section voted unanimously in favor of the resolution (6/0).

Arguments For:

Surrounded by a bustling urban area, Griffith Park provides an oasis for an increasingly stressed ecosystem. An aerial tramway would carry an increased number of visitors into the Park, requiring a large amount of new infrastructure to support them and the tram itself, all dramatically increasing pressure on this critical wildlife habitat. This influx of visitors—including ones with little experience in a wilderness area—would likely result in litter, accidents, and increased fire risk in the Park. If the goal is to alleviate the burden of traffic on area neighborhoods, that burden shouldn't be shifted into the Park and onto the wildlife that depend on it.

With regard to the Warner Bros.' proposed skyway specifically, there is little proof that it would alleviate traffic congestion in Hollywood or the damage that visitors inflict on residential neighborhoods south of Griffith Park. Warner Bros. proposes an approach to the Hollywood Sign from the Burbank (north) side of the Park to Mt. Lee that would deliver park guests to an area just above the back of the Sign. This would not offer the many visitors the frontal view of the Sign they want for their photos. As such, visitors would still clog up the residential areas to the south of Griffith Park in order to get a shot of the famous sign.

There are, in fact, a number of options that would actually address the congestion in the neighborhoods south of the park, while giving visitors the photo shot they want. Some are mentioned in the Dixon Report. One promising strategy mentioned is having electric shuttles take visitors from a Metro station through the currently shuttered Beachwood Gate, giving visitors access to the shortest hiking route to the Sign. Other simple strategies in the Report include extending DASH shuttle service to Sign-related trailheads, increasing traffic and parking efficiency, and collaborating with Google and Waze to communicate more accurate information. In addition, a Hollywood Sign Visitors' Center and viewing platform could be created in Hollywood, perhaps atop a commercial building. All of these alternatives would clearly help meet neighborhood concerns while preserving the natural environment of the park.

Finally, there is an intrinsic environmental justice element associated with the monetization of the public Griffith Park by a private entity. Currently, the Park is free and accessible to all Angelenos. Converting a free, open, and wild section of the Park into an attraction only available to those with the means to purchase tickets, chips away at the communal abundance of the Park, intended for all of us to enjoy, at no charge.

Arguments Against: Griffith Park is already commercialized with a zoo, museum, and golf course. P-22 is an aberration, and is not in need of protection. Since a portion of the ticket price will go to the City, the tram will add to city coffers. Conceivably, a tram might alleviate some of the tourist traffic on the south side of Mt. Lee.



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

Council file number 18-0057

1 message

Christopher Maikish <cmaikish@gmail.com>
To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Mon, Sep 24, 2018 at 2:21 PM

To whom it may concern:

I'm a resident of Beachwood Canyon, living on Hollyridge Drive very close to the controversial Beachwood Gate trailhead. First, I'd like to establish that despite the clear need for a more comprehensive approach to the traffic issues at that location, my household is very much in favor of improved access at park trailheads. These entry points must remain open to our public, residents and tourists alike.

The proposed bulb-out on Beachwood Drive, however, does not seem like an intelligent course of action. While I favor "traffic calming" solutions to reduce speed and prevent pedestrian injuries/fatalities, creating an official tourist photo area will only serve to further swamp that area and create an actual bottleneck. Pretty soon travel blogs and hotel concierges will be communicating with tourists that "there's parking available" at an official viewing spot.

I agree that many solutions must be implemented and communicated to better distribute the traffic to/around the sign and park. But this is one area in which legitimizing that spot (instead of dis-incentivizing visitors from going there and redirecting them) will impact this residential area in a very real, very obnoxious manner. I'd caution strongly against implementing this unless planners have ample evidence that the solution won't increase traffic to that spot.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best,
Christopher Maikish
CD-4 Resident



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

Council File number 18-0057

1 message

'Clarissa Troop' via Clerk Arts Committee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Mon, Sep 24, 2018 at 3:10 PM

Reply-To: Clarissa Troop <clarissatroop1@me.com>

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Hello,

I live at the corner of Mulholland Hwy and Durand.

The area in front of me has become a drop off point for all ride services and a place for everyone to turn around. Our cars get hit, there is constant noise from the frustration of drivers with other drivers who just sit in the middle of the road because they don't know where they are going AND there it is the start of the winding road to the top of the dog park.

Because there is no constant policing in either the area in front of me or the winding road there is also constant breaking of the rules, people stop and get out of their cars, leaving them wherever they choose and don't care about others because they are just looking for a few minutes to take their picture and they have a pretty safe bet of doing that without getting a ticket.

It is also dangerous. Too many cars and so many pedestrians do not make for safety.

Also, we had a huge medical emergency end of April when our daughter had a brain aneurysm and had to be rushed to hospital and nearly died. We were "lucky" that this happened after 9pm at night.

Should an emergency such as this happen during daylight hours there would be quite a few extra minutes needed to get through all the cars and people.

PLEASE, add a tax so that we can have some help up here - and not help that is piece meal. REAL help.

Clarissa Troop
6230 Mulholland Hwy
LA, CA 90068

home: 323/462-5989
cell: 323/896-2866
skype: clarissatroop63



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

Council File No. 18-0057

1 message

Gubler, Leron <Leron@hollywoodchamber.net>

Mon, Sep 24, 2018 at 4:31 PM

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

Cc: Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Donelle Dadigan <donelle@dadigan.com>, Jeff Zarrinam <jeff@hollywoodhotel.net>, "Shahenian, Nicole" <Nicole@hollywoodchamber.net>, David Giron <david.giron@lacity.org>

Please see attached letter from the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce.



RSVP for our Business After Hours & Ribbon-cutting ceremony at Gwen



Leron Gubler

President & CEO

Hollywood Chamber of Commerce

6255 Sunset Blvd, Ste 150, Hollywood, Ca 90028

323-469-8311 x12

leron@hollywoodchamber.net

www.hollywoodchamber.net | www.walkoffame.com



 **Dixon Strategies letter.pdf**
1115K



September 24, 2018

The Honorable Mitch O'Farrell, Chair
Arts, Parks, and River Committee
Los Angeles City Council
200 North Spring Street, Room 405
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Council File No. 18-0057

Dear Councilmember O'Farrell:

On behalf of the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, I am writing to offer our opinion related to reports issued by the Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA) on June 15 and September 21, 2018 related to the feasibility of the Dixon Study recommendations regarding access to the Hollywood Sign.

We would first like to commend Councilmember Ryu and the City for your work on this study and follow-up analysis. We do not recall any time in the past 25 years when a comprehensive list of alternatives was assembled that might ease congestion related to access to the Sign. In general, we are in agreement with the thoughtful responses from the CLA in reviewing the feasibility of the various options. These are our additional thoughts:

1. Strategy 3.3 – Supplement the Griffith Park Circulation Plan with an Aerial Transit System. We concur with the recommendations from the CLA. However, subsequent to the release of the CLA recommendations, Warner Bros proposed an aerial tram from the backside of Mt. Lee along Forest Lawn Drive to the Hollywood Sign. There is at least one additional proposal in the works. We suggest that the CLA recommendations be amended to include a Request for Proposals (RFP) to be considered by the City.
2. Strategy 7.2 – Develop a Hollywood Sign Visitor Center. While a visitor center in Central Hollywood makes sense (at least in the short term), we do not believe that

Letter to Mitch O'Farrell

September 24, 2018

Page 2

Hollywood Blvd. is a viable site because of the cost of land or rent in that area. A better solution already exists at the Dept. of Transportation Parking Garage #702, located at 1625 N. Vine Street. This parking garage has 457 parking spaces as well as a 2,000-sq.ft. retail space at street level. This would be the logical location for such a visitor center. In the long term, however, we believe that it makes sense to also have a visitor's center located in close proximity to the aerial tram. This would be an added inducement for people to use the tram and would enhance the visitor experience in visiting the Sign. We note that the Warner Bros proposal includes an education center as part of their proposal.

3. Strategy 7.3 – Build a Hollywood Sign viewing platform. We agree that viewing platforms would be desirable, but point out that the view most tourists want is a head-on direct view of the Sign. This may be something to be included in the RFP for an aerial tram, to have the developer design a viewing platform to complement the tram and to direct guests to a specific viewing area.
4. Strategy 7.4 – Implement a Hollywood Sign Art Program. While we do not have an objection to an art program incorporating replicas of the Hollywood Sign at various locations throughout the City, we do not believe they would have a significant impact in reducing visits to the Sign. In our experience, people visiting the Sign want to see the real thing, not a replica.
5. Strategy 7.5 – Replicate the Sign on the other side of the mountain. We concur with the CLA recommendation to not pursue this alternative any further. We believe this option would create more confusion than solution and could actually add to traffic in the area.

We do not have issues with any of the other recommendations from the CLA. The Hollywood Chamber of Commerce looks forward to working with the City as you move forward with these recommendations.

Sincerely,



Leron Gubler
President & CEO

cc Donelle Dadigan, Hollywood Museum
Jeff Zarrinam, Hollywood Hotel



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

Arts, Entertainment, Parks and River Co. File #18-0057

1 message

Carol Henning <carolhen@sbcglobal.net>
To: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org
Cc: eric.villanueva@lacity.org, carolhen@sbcglobal.net

Mon, Sep 24, 2018 at 5:09 PM

Dear Councilmember O'Farrell:

It was nice meeting you at the Sierra Club Angeles Chapter Political Leadership Awards event on August 25. Congratulations on the award presented to you for your efforts to revitalize the L.A. River and to advance environmental justice. As you probably know, the Angeles Chapter has almost 50,000 members, many of whom live in the City of L.A.

The Angeles Chapter Executive Committee adopted a resolution in August of this year to oppose "the recent proposal by Warner Bros. Studio to build an aerial 'skyway' to take visitors from its property in Burbank to the top of Mt. Lee in Griffith Park, behind the Hollywood Sign, and to **also oppose other proposed aerial trams into or within the Park**"

The 2018 Dixon Report—"Comprehensive Strategies Report Improving Access, Safety and Mobility Around Griffith Park & the Hollywood Sign"—mentions the possibility of an aerial tram from one of several locations in the Park. The tram would transport visitors to a Hollywood Sign viewing platform somewhere in the Park. Three Angeles Chapter entities, the Central Group, the Verdugo Hills Group and the Griffith Park Section, wrote the original resolution opposing aerial trams into or within the Park. The reasons for their opposition are as follows: The combination of groups of visitors and the infrastructure required for them and for the aerial tram itself would add pressure to already stressed habitat and its wildlife. Adding crowds of humans—including ones with little experience of wilderness areas—would likely result in litter, accidents, noise and increased fire risk in the Park. If the goal is to alleviate the burden of traffic on nearby neighborhoods, that burden should not be shifted to the Park and its permanent plant and animal residents. There are other options mentioned in the Dixon Report that would address congestion in residential areas near the Park while preserving the natural environment of its hilly core. Why not a Hollywood Sign Visitors' Center established in Hollywood, perhaps atop a commercial building? Finally, there is an environmental justice issue associated with the monetization of a public resource, Griffith Park, especially by a private entity.

Currently the Park is free and accessible to all Angelenos. This was the wish of Col. Griffith when he donated the land to the citizens of Los Angeles in 1896 as a "place of recreation and rest for the masses...." Converting a free, open and wild section of the Park into an attraction only available to those with the means to purchase tickets, takes away a segment of the commons—one intended for all of us to enjoy free of charge.

The words President Theodore Roosevelt spoke on a ledge overlooking the Grand Canyon apply to Griffith Park's urban wilderness as well. He said: "Leave it as it is." **Please join with the Sierra Club Angeles Chapter in opposing any aerial tram into or within the Park.**

Sincerely,

Carol Henning

Los Angeles County Political Committee

Sierra Club Angeles Chapter Executive Committee

9/25/2018

City of Los Angeles Mail - Arts, Entertainment, Parks and River Co. File #18-0057

Griffith Park Section

Verdugo Hills Group