



## PACIFIC PALISADES COMMUNITY COUNCIL

---

March 7, 2022

Noah Fleishman, Deputy District Director, CD 11

Darryl Ford, Planning Superintendent, Dept. of Recreation and Parks (RAP)

Kristin Ly, PE, Civil Engineering Associate/Project Manager, Bureau of Engineering (BOE)

*Via email to each of the above*

Re: George Wolfberg Park (the Park) at Potrero Canyon (the Project)

Dear Mr. Fleishman, Mr. Ford and Ms. Ly:

The Pacific Palisades Community Council (PPCC) Executive Committee regrets that you have declined our invitation to attend a PPCC public board meeting for a “stand alone” presentation with respect to matters involving the Project.

In lieu of a presentation at a PPCC meeting, we respectfully request that you provide written answers to the following questions:

1. Will the south/PCH entrance to the canyon be closed at the Park’s opening? Will there be a sign in place stating "no coastal access," as indicated in the RAP-approved final landscape plans for the Project (the Final Plans)? For how long will the south/PCH entrance be closed? Will it ever be opened, and if so, under what circumstances?
2. Does the City of Los Angeles (the City, including RAP, BOE and/or CD 11) intend to seek permission or has the City sought permission from the California Coastal Commission (CCC) for this closure? Has the CCC indicated whether it will allow the entrance to be closed for any length of time?
3. What is the reason for the decision to close the south/PCH entrance? Is the closure tied to the status of the lateral trail from the south/PCH entrance to Temescal Canyon Blvd. (the Lateral Trail), and/or to the status of the PCH over-crossing/pedestrian bridge (the Bridge)?
4. What is the current status of the Lateral Trail? Is the City now proceeding to design and construct the Lateral Trail, or has this effort been abandoned? If the latter, what is the justification for doing so?
5. If the City is now working on a design for the Lateral Trail, when does the City expect the design to be completed? Will the design be submitted to the CCC for approval? Why hasn't the Lateral Trail design been completed and submitted to the CCC at an earlier time?
6. Has permission from Caltrans been secured for the City to use Caltrans property along PCH for the Lateral Trail? What is the status? What further steps, if any, need to occur with respect to Caltrans permission? Is the City now actively pursuing these steps? Has Caltrans indicated that it will grant permission and if so, when is permission expected to be granted?
7. If the City is now proceeding with the Lateral Trail, what is the timeline and estimated completion date? What is the estimated cost to complete the Lateral Trail? Is funding available to complete the Lateral Trail,

or are there any funding challenges? If so, what are any such challenges and how does the City propose to secure sufficient funding in order to complete the Lateral Trail?

8. Will the City hold off on opening the Park to the public until the Lateral Trail is completed? Or, will the City instead open the Park to public use while keeping the south/PCH entrance closed until the Lateral Trail is in place? Or, will the City wait to open the south/PCH entrance until the Bridge is in place? If the latter, what is the time estimate for completion of the Bridge?
9. Why did the City prepare the Final Plans after the City had prepared and submitted to the CCC prior landscape plans for the Project which the CCC approved in September 2016? Have the Final Plans been submitted to the CCC and has the CCC also approved the Final Plans? If not, does the City intend to submit the Final Plans to the CCC for approval?
10. Why was a pathway to/from Friends St. included in the Final Plans?
11. Since September 2016, what efforts has the City made to ascertain the level of public support for inclusion of a pathway/public entrance on Friends St. and/or for closure of the south/PCH entrance? What is the City's position on whether public support for these measures should be obtained and ascertained? Has the City reached any conclusion as to the current level of public support for these measures, and if so, what is the City's conclusion and the basis for that conclusion?
12. Regarding the EIR addendum for the Project's landscaping phase (EIR Addendum): Has the City followed up after concerns about the EIR Addendum were raised by residents, and has the City reached a conclusion as to whether statements in the EIR Addendum (about prior study in the 1985 EIR of a pathway/public entrance on Friends St.) are accurate or inaccurate? If so, what is the City's conclusion and the basis for that conclusion? Will any further action be taken with respect to these statements in the EIR Addendum?
13. Why does the EIR Addendum omit reference to proposed closure of the south/PCH entrance or any study of the impacts of a proposed closure of that entrance? Has the City reached a conclusion as to whether or not a study is needed of the impacts of a closure of that entrance, and if so, what is the City's conclusion and the basis for that conclusion? Will any further action be taken with respect to the EIR Addendum's omission of a reference to closure of the south/PCH entrance?

PPCC's Executive Committee respectfully requests answers to these questions in the interest of transparency. Thank you for your anticipated cooperation and prompt attention to this request.

We appreciate the City's work towards completion of the Park for its use by all.

Sincerely,

Executive Committee, Pacific Palisades Community Council

David Card, Chair  
David Kaplan, Vice-Chair  
Richard G. Cohen, Treasurer

Christina Spitz, Secretary  
John Padden, Organization Representative (P.R.I.D.E.)  
Joanna Spak, Elected Representative (Area 1)