

## Griffith Park Advisory Board

Minutes – September 24, 2020, 6:30 PM

1. Roll Call: All present.
2. Approval of Minutes: Minutes approved.
3. Special Guests: Catherine Landers of CD4 updated the Board on bridge housing. The housing unit opened at the end of July and currently has 68 residents, with a capacity of 100. Six people have found permanent housing through bridge housing. Trailers across the street will be phased out gradually and residents will be moved into bridge housing or other permanent housing.
4. General Public Comment:
  - Marian of Friends of Griffith Park notified the Board that P22 day will be virtual on October 24. Those interested can go to FOGP website to register.
5. Information Reports and Presentations:
  - Chief Losorelli presented proposal for motorcycles to patrol Griffith Park.
    - o Chief Losorelli proposed a pilot program with two motorcycles to assist with events due to traffic congestion and possible rescue on trails. If the program is successful, the Rangers may purchase two additional dual-purpose motorcycles. The motorcycles are quiet, equipped with a silencer and clearly identified. Chief Losorelli answered questions from the Board. Chief Losorelli defined success in the program as whether response times during events went down and if the community likes it. They will only be used at large events. Electric bikes currently are not practical because of the price and charging restrictions. Bikes would only go on trails in a rescue emergency.
      - o **Motion made** to send letter of support to Parks Commission in favor of Chief Losorelli's presentation.
      - o **Motion amended** to add request for Chief Losorelli to come back prior to twelve-month pilot program and report back on issues of concern and work with the Board's ad hoc committee to address those issues.
      - o Public Comment: Emmy of Sierra Club expressed concern about use of bikes on trails, especially because to balance a bike they must be ridden with some speed. Another community member expressed concern over the fact that the bikes were not electric. Kristina

O'Neil of Lake Hollywood Homeowners Association wished to see letter of support because of traffic in Lake Hollywood area.

- **Motion passed.**

- LA Compost: Proposal for compost facility presentation by Michael Martinez.

- LA Compost seeks letter of support for composting facility within the Park. The facility would serve all LA County. It would have a 20-foot access road and allow for substantial amounts of organic matter to be composted. The facility would have hours of operation in which it is open to the public and was funded by a \$50,000 grant from UCLA.

- Member Phillips questioned about possible rodent problems created by composting. Mr. Martinez responded that covering, layering, and heat from the pile usually deters rodents. Hours of operation will prevent people from dumping organic matter that is not properly processed.

- Co-Chairperson Howe questioned the appropriateness of the location in a sensitive wildlife ecosystem.

- Chairperson Deutsch questioned the smell. Mr. Martinez responded that when composting is done correctly, it smells like a park after a rain.

- Member Crammes questioned environmental impact of travelling to compost. Mr. Martinez responded that all composted material would remain within 5 miles of site, and that composting itself offsets the transportation emissions. Mr. Martinez estimates that the composting will offset the impact of approximately 1,000 cars.

- Member Irani questioned about education at the site. Mr. Martinez responded that LA Compost has soil scientists interested in holding workshops.

- **Motion made** to propose letter of support for project as presented.

- Public Comment:

- Member of the public expressed support, but also concern about location.

There is another compost site, and this could draw attention away from that site. Acting Superintendent Smith responded that the other compost site is run by Sanitation Department and has too much heavy equipment to safely place LA Compost there.

- Emmy of Sierra Club supported the idea but was concerned about location, a more peripheral location would be better than grading and encroaching this area of the Park.

- Board Comment:
  - Member Howe expressed concern about this location becoming crowded and impacting wildlife.
- **Motion passed 8-2.**
- Consensus: Updates on Aerial Transit System Feasibility Study.
- Andrea Conant presented the feasibility study along with project manager Arya Rohani of Stantec about four possible routes for ATS.
- Questions from the Board in pre-written format:
  - Can you elaborate on steps left in the process and will you identify route at the end of the study? Response is that Consensus expects one route to move forward as the most feasible. A no-alignment option was not considered. Stantec noted that the City was possibly interested in an alignment that could connect, in the future, with the Observatory or Greek Theater.
  - What level of analysis has your team done on feasibility of transit hub at the station? Response is that this was not in the scope, but it was considered, and some routes might lend themselves more as a future transit hub.
  - Can you elaborate on traffic reduction? Response is that they are still evaluating this, but routes 1-3 will see no measurable difference between them in terms of traffic reduction.
  - Will the anticipated users be LA users or tourists, existing or new park users? Response is that a cellphone study was conducted of anonymized visitors of the Park, what area they are coming from, and how long they stay, which will be included in broader report.
  - What is the estimated number of additional Park visitors? Response is they do not yet know, but each year traffic in and around the park increases.
  - How does a ride to the Hollywood sign address traffic within the Park? Response is that traffic in and around the Park can be rerouted to a single appropriate location where they can see the Hollywood sign. By mitigating traffic in periphery of the Park, traffic within the Park will be mitigated as well.
  - Can you speak to renderings made by FOGP? Response is no, not by looking at them.

- What has been the general response to this presentation? Response is that many have concerns, such as hikers, equestrians, etc. Others like the idea and do not care about the different routes.

- What is the anticipated cost, and how realistic is that cost in the current climate? Response is that they were directed by the City to complete the study, and they estimate it will cost within the \$50M-\$70M range.

- How might the ATS change the overall character of the Park based on comments received so far? Response is that there is fear of commercializing the Park and added infrastructure could change the look of the Park.

- What is the anticipated timeframe for construction and what kind of access roads? Response is they do not know because the City has not requested that level of detail yet. The estimate would be 2-4 years.

- What is the ticket price? Response is that the ATS could be financially feasible at \$5 per ticket. The WB fare could be \$20 per ticket. These are rough estimates. There is no anticipated revenue yet, the financials are still in draft form.

- Can riders leave the viewing platform? Response is no, they cannot.

- Would Beachwood Canyon have access to the Park in the viewing platform area? Response is they do not know.

- How would this project reflect the values in the Vision Plan? Response is they want to find the right balance between addressing traffic issues and minimizing impact on the Park, which is consistent with Dixon Report.

- Have you heard an explanation for addressing the ATS as opposed to the other remedial measures in the Dixon Report? Response is that the City is working on implementing several recommendations in the Dixon Report.

- How visible will the ATS be from south of the park and in surrounding neighborhoods? Response is they are working closely on alignment, height, spacing, sag, and more to ensure the best visible profile possible. The ATS will be visible from the south side of the Park depending on location.

- What are the hours of operation? Response is that detail will be more concrete later, but at present they assume daylight hours.

- **Motion made** to send letter of nonsupport to the Parks Commission based on the presentation given by Stantec and Consensus.

- Public Comment:

- Emmy of Sierra Club opposes the proposed system and notes over 3,000 people have signed petition opposing it for environmental reasons and that it will change the nature of the park.

- Kristina O’Neil of Lake Hollywood Homeowners Association notes that this is a ride that will not mitigate traffic. It will still be more expensive than a free ticket to drive through the neighborhoods. She would prefer a visitor’s center.

- Member of the public expressed that most of their friends are against route 1 because it will gut Martinez equestrian area.

- A resident of Los Feliz noted that imagining a tram in the park during their hikes would dampen the experience.

- A Griffith park supporter noted this was just an amusement ride that will destroy the park.

- Another member of the public expressed that this would eliminate horses from the Park.

- Marian of FOGP noted it is time to stop this project now.

- Gerry of FOGP is strongly opposed and noted FOGP submitted a letter to the mayor and councilmembers of their opposition.

- Alex Phillips noted that his research led him to conclude that the cost of the ATS could be \$100M to \$200M.

- **Motion passes 7-3.**

6. Superintendent Reports:

- GPAB moving forward – Acting Superintendent Smith is still conducting interviews and hope to have new board by mid-October.

- Blighted restrooms at Fern Dell and Pettigrew are slated for removal. The old restroom building at Pettigrew has been boarded up for 25+ years, and another restroom by Fern Dell is also blighted. A vendor gave a quote to condemn and demolish the building. At the Fern Dell location, they will place picnic tables. At the Pettigrew location they will plat trees.

7. Next Meeting: The next meeting was scheduled for October 22, 2020 at 6:30 pm on Zoom.

8. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn passes at 9:35 pm.