

## MINUTES

### THE GRIFFITH PARK ADVISORY BOARD DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS

March 8, 2018

The Griffith Park Advisory Board of the City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks, was called to order at 6:35 p.m. at the Griffith Park Visitor's Center, Los Angeles, CA 90027. **Present:** Chip Clements, Ron Deutsch, Sheila Irani, Chris Laib, Lucinda Phillips. **Absent:** Laura Howe, **Recreation and Parks:** Joe Salaices, Tracy James

**ITEM 1 ROLL CALL** Ron Deutsch, Griffith Park Advisory Board (GPAB) Chair, formally called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. There was one absentee, Laura Howe.

#### **ITEM 2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The GPAB minutes of Feb. 22, 2018, were approved.

#### **ITEM 3 COMMENTS FROM ANY CITY, COUNTY, STATE OR FEDERAL REPRESENTATIVES IN ATTENDANCE (5 Minutes each).**

Tom LaBonge (thanks to all for help in developing plan for western part of Griffith Park)

Park Superintendent Joe Salaices deferred comment until April GPAB meeting

Shannon Prior, deputy from office of Councilman David Ryu, introduced Julie Dixon of Dixon Unlimited to make presentation of "Comprehensive Strategies Report on Improving Access, Safety and Mobility around Griffith Park and the Hollywood Sign.

#### **ITEM 4 PRESENTATION BY JULIE DIXON** (available for viewing on the CD4 website).

#### **ITEM 5 PUBLIC COMMENTS ON DIXON RESOURCES PRESENTATION (2 Minutes each).**

Park Superintendent Joe Salaices thanked park staffers Adam, Brenda and Tracy for hard work in support of Strategies Report

Board Member/park staff questions for Julie Dixon:

Chip: asked whether individual strategies could be introduced on a pilot basis before making permanent

Tracy: asked about establishing a viewing site within walking distance of metro station in Hollywood

Lucinda: asked about why no sign-viewing platforms in Hollywood (Home Depot? Florentine Gardens?) were included in report

Ron: asked Julie to take us through process/timetable of making these strategies become policy

Ron: asked how quickly low-hanging fruit strategies might be implemented and was told 6 mos. Is possibility

#### **Public comment:**

Speaker 1: Questioned whether the Report was more about safety or more about promotion of tourism

Speaker 2: Beachwood resident talked about cars parked on Beachwood getting sideswiped and broken into...bringing in more tourists not the answer to congestion in Hollywoodland

Speaker 3: Glad to see the Wonderview traffic situation in the Report, prefers Option B to Option A

Speaker 4: Commented on differences between this version of report and previous one; favors electric shuttle up Beachwood to Hollyridge trailhead

Speaker 5: Speaker criticized report's purported goal of "improving the tourist experience"; increased access for tourists in Hollywoodland compromises safety, property values and quality of life; favors tourist center north of the park

Speaker 6: Pointed out that he's a park stakeholder but wasn't asked to participate in study. Pointed out that west trail offers great view of sign...easy hike.

Speaker 7: Neighborhood resident offended that study focuses on tourist experience more than resident experience. Supports moving tourism to other side of the hill and Visitor Center in Hollywood.

Speaker 8: Resident talked about directional signs being ignored; need for full-time enforcement in all areas; emphasized need for new visitors center and viewing platform in Hollywood

Speaker 9: Speaker says tourism should not be the focus...warned about ride-sharing being non-green and creating more problems than solutions; report needs more public input

Speaker 10: Speaker says nothing in report mitigates safety issues...signs do not help

Speaker 11: Resident says increasing tourism/traffic congestion is a disaster for local wildlife...that the report fails to address wildlife and advocates for more visitors

Speaker 12: Report's emphasis is on access not safety...we must take tourism out of neighborhoods...Mt. Hollywood Drive should be opened to tourism but opening was halted by special interests.

Speaker 13: Speaker is pro-access to park and says that hikers and ordinary park users were left out of study. No to aerial tram, against opening mountain roads.

Speaker 14: Speaker wants to keep Hollyridge trailhead closed; close all park entrances in Hollywoodland; enforce the law

Speaker 15: The bubble-out on Beachwood will do more damage than good; supports shuttles, aerial tram and a visitors center on Mt. Lee

Speaker 16: is opposed to shuttles up Beachwood; alarmed about smokers and suggests smoker-education agenda in local hotels; suggests turning the Scenic Vista into a traffic roundabout

Speaker 17: Speaker says Dixon study was poorly executed and did not meet objectives...this is all about neighborhood exploitation...about accommodating tourists and hikers but not residents; emphasized that there are no official park entry points in residential neighborhoods below the sign

Speaker 18: Does not like Dixon study...it's all about making money; no solutions offered

Speaker 19: Against all measures to bring more tourism into a neighborhood where there's no infrastructure for it. Tourists should be going to the north side of the park or to Canyon Dr. because it is an official entrance to the park and there is infrastructure. Report only focuses on tourists not residents. Access to park from Hollywoodland should be closed off.

Speaker 20: This is all about Griffith Park...let's not forget how the park is impacted by all this...moving problem to north side of the park not a good idea...can't keep moving the problem from neighborhood to neighborhood

Speaker 21: Vehicle traffic is the worst problem of all...one-way roads would penalize residents; Mulholland red zones need policing; Deronda needs to be closed to public access on high traffic days; dire need for vehicle mitigation

Speaker 22: Fire is the biggest concern...we are not in touch with millennials and how to deal with the way they get information

Speaker 23: Commends study and thinks it is proactive and long overdue

Speaker 24: Is concerned about smoking and never sees enforcement of anti-smoking laws; wants neighborhood gated; concerned about crowds and wildlife; asks why report caters to tourism

Speaker 25: Notes that report discusses "yesterday's tourism problem" but there is no effort made to forecast tourism volume over the next 10 years. Will these solutions still work when we get 10x the current volume of visitors?

Speaker 26: Hollywood sign is the problem...need max capacity review of traffic/city planning

Speaker 27: No amenities on Canyon drive lookout...no parking available. Fire concerns. Cannot support study

Speaker 28: thanks to GPAB for the presentation; does not support aerial tram

Speaker 29: Thanks to CD4 and Dixon for the study and creating means to solve problems; How are all the community ideas being documented and put out for review? Process will lead to solutions.

Speaker 30) The city has created nuisance at Scenic View; area's ecology being destroyed by city

**GPAB MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:35**