

**Timeline: GW Park at Potrero Canyon**  
**Coastal/Beach Access – Bridge & Lateral Trail**<sup>1</sup>

**1964 - 2004**

*Thumbnail: Initial history; work on the canyon; California Coastal Commission (CCC), City of Los Angeles (City) and Pacific Palisades Community Council (PPCC) involvement.*

1964: City purchased Potrero Canyon “to provide coastal access to and from Palisades Park” [the Recreation Center] (as explained in 2004 by former CD 11 Councilmember Cindy Miscikowski and in related City Council committee reports in Council File 04-1587).<sup>2</sup>

1983: PPCC “heard a report from [former] Councilman Braude about Potrero Canyon. A partial fill of the project is proposed to stabilize it . . . A representative of the Recreation and Parks Dept. showed renderings of the proposed fill, which would become a passive use park and walkway to the beach” (see PPCC Historic Summary, Appendix A).

1985: Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the park restoration project was certified, stating that the project was intended to provide a “pedestrian accessway between the Palisades Recreation Center and the Will Rogers Beach State Park,” and “will serve as a pedestrian link from the Palisades Recreation Area to the Will Rogers Beach State Park.” A *bridge over PCH* is referenced twice in the EIR: 1) that a bridge was required to be built by the then-concessionaire of the Sunspot Motel,<sup>3</sup> and 2) that such a bridge would “eliminate traffic dangers to pedestrians when crossing to the beach area facilities” (see Appendix A).<sup>4</sup>

1985-91: Work began but the park project was stalled due to issues with fill and funding. CCC issued a series of Coastal Development Permits (CDPs) which eventually expired.

1991: CCC issued the controlling CDP for the project (CDP #5-91-286; the 1991 CDP, subsequently further amended). Required under the 1991 CDP: a trail link from the Rec. Center and the canyon mouth/south end, “with entrances [to] be established at the Pacific Coast Highway end and the Palisades recreation area end so that in its final form the park will provide coastal access.” The 1991 CDP explains: “Due to the 200 foot high bluffs that exist throughout much of the adjacent areas in the Pacific Palisades, little foot or bicycle access is available from inland portions of the Palisades to the coastline, this park, as designed and approved, would provide that access.” There is no reference to a bridge over PCH in the 1991 CDP (*first CDP reference to a bridge did not occur until 2011*; see below and Appendix A).

1993: CCC issued the second amendment to the 1991 CDP, providing for one “fire lane/access trail 12 ft. wide through the facility from Pacific Coast Highway to the Pacific Palisades Recreation Center” (CDP 5-91-286-A2). As explained, this trail satisfied the 1991 CDP’s requirement of a trail link from the Rec. Ctr. to PCH, and in turn was “consistent with the requirements of the Coastal Act with regard to public access” (no changes in this

---

<sup>1</sup> This timeline focuses primarily on coastal access topics and is based on currently available sources and information (including online documents, reports, CDPs, recordings, meeting minutes, emails and responses to Public Record Act/PRA requests).

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix A on p. 7, following, for links to this file and to other documents referenced in this timeline.

<sup>3</sup> The Sunspot was an old facility dating from the 1930s, located below the mouth of the canyon (eventually taken over by City). Public records show that City required a \$200,000 down-payment for the bridge as a condition of granting the concession, to allow patrons to safely access the beach parking lot. This never took place; the original concessionaire could not make the required down-payment, the bridge requirement was dropped in a “sweetheart” deal with a subsequent concessionaire, the property was then abandoned and later essentially buried in a landslide. In 1996, CCC permitted City to demolish /remove debris from the Sunspot location, with no reference to a bridge in the relevant CDP (see Appendix A). In 2008, this author researched and prepared a summary of earlier events related to this issue; a copy is available for those interested.

<sup>4</sup> **Of historical interest:** the EIR also recounts that the original Palisades community plan in 1922 called for a “bridge over Potrero Canyon as an extension of what is Bowdoin Street, and a branch of the Pacific Electric railway line through the canyon connecting the coast with the town center; neither ever materialized (Young 1983: 71).”

requirement for 30+ years; no reference to a bridge in Amendment #2; see Appendix A).

1993-2004: Work on the project (stabilization and fill) was sporadic, and eventually stalled due to lack of funds.

May 13, 2004: City Recreation & Parks Dept. (RAP) officials gave a presentation on the project's status at a PPCC meeting. Regarding a possible bridge: "It was reported that a walk bridge over PCH has been proposed. The cost was estimated at \$1.9 million 13 years ago" (see Appendix A).<sup>5</sup>

May 27, 2004: PPCC unanimously passed a motion to jump-start the project (motion by a former PPCC Chair, N. Kulla, originally initiated by then-CM Miscikowski; the PPCC Chair presiding was G. Wolfberg (now the park namesake). Among other things, the motion called for a process to allow funding from the sale of rim lots, for "input from the community" on eventual park design, for construction of a "walk bridge from the mouth of Potrero Canyon over PCH to beach parking" and for an "EIR of the project upon abutting neighborhoods" (see Appendix A).

August 2004: CM Miscikowski followed up with a motion in City Council (CF 04-1587) to form a Potrero Canyon Trust Fund, to seek amended CDPs to allow funding from the sale of rim lots, and to create a citizen's advisory committee to facilitate community input on park design; motion adopted in City Council committees in fall 2004, with the Mayor's concurrence (note: formal City Council vote occurred in 2007; see Appendix A).

## **2005 - 2008**

*Thumbnail: Work of the Potrero Canyon Community Advisory Committee (PCCAC).*

2005-2008: CM Miscikowski appointed the Brown-Acted PCCAC in late 2004 / early 2005. Work began, with monthly meetings over the course of roughly three years, led by G. Wolfberg as the appointed PCCAC Chair (no further meetings were held after PCCAC completed its work in January 2008; see below).

PCCAC meetings featured extensive and often contentious public debate on all aspects of the project, including issues of park and coastal access. Various alternatives for access to the beach from the canyon mouth were discussed, including a trail to Temescal Canyon Rd., a tunnel underneath PCH, a signal/crosswalk at the canyon mouth, and a pedestrian bridge or PCH overcrossing (with some of these concepts determined to be infeasible or unsafe and most PCCAC members supporting a pedestrian bridge). The community's position on a bridge was mixed: many residents were opposed (or supported alternatives to a bridge), while others were supportive.<sup>6</sup>

January 2008: PCCAC issued its final report (drafted by G. Wolfberg), entitled "Potrero Canyon Trails: City of Los Angeles Public Greenspace and Pathways Connecting Palisades Village to the Beach," with recommendations on park development and design (2008 Report; see Appendix A). The 2008 Report proposed several park entrances to connect "Palisades Village to the Beach," at the north ("top") and south ("bottom") ends of the canyon, along with two separate accessways to extend from the bottom entrance: (1) a *pedestrian bridge* or other vertical PCH overcrossing to the Will Rogers State Beach parking lot (the PCCAC's "highest priority" for public safety, with the report also expressing non-opposition to a feasibility study); and (2) a trail to run along the inland side of PCH to the Temescal Canyon Rd./PCH intersection, by which pedestrians could also safely access the beach (*the "Lateral Trail"*). The report further called for environmental review (reiterating the 2004 PPCC call for an EIR).

## **2008 - 2021**

*Thumbnail: Issuance of successive CDP amendments providing for lot sales and funding; canyon grading;*

---

<sup>5</sup> State funding of \$11 million was later obtained based on a 2021 cost estimate (likely to increase); see below and Appendix A.

<sup>6</sup> Hundreds of residents from both rims of the canyon signed *paper* petitions stating opposition to a bridge. Sixty-two people responded to a PCCAC "Workshop Questionnaire," with more in favor of a Lateral Trail (27) or a signal crossing (7) than those favoring the bridge (22); 6 others had no opinion. This author (a former PCCAC member) noted that many persons with opinions one way or the other may not have responded either because their positions had already been made known via the petitions or in statements at meetings, or they weren't aware of the Questionnaire. A Caltrans representative also indicated support for a PCH over-crossing during meetings. Then-CCC District Director P. Emerson explained that although CCC "generally favors coastal access," a bridge would require a CDP amendment (per meeting notes, documented by this author).

*development of park landscaping plans; commencement of landscaping.*

January 2011: CCC issued the eighth CDP amendment (#5-91-286-A8), for the first time referencing a *potential pedestrian bridge* in connection with one of the park's grading phases/projects – the “Unit 4 - PCH Slope” project. As explained in the amended CDP: although Unit 4 had previously been graded, then-recent geotechnical studies indicated that the slope is “potentially unstable;” that a possible bridge may be constructed in the Unit 4 area; that “additional geotechnical studies are recommended to address this area;” and that “a reduced stability may have consequences affecting the overall safety of park users utilizing any future bridge over PCH.” A map of the grading units, including Unit 4, was attached to the CDP; the map shows that Unit 4 is located adjacent and to the west of the canyon mouth and includes a portion of the Via de las Olas bluff area, where there have been multiple landslides and erosion is ongoing (see below and Appendix A). Amendment #8 did not reference a Lateral Trail.

July 2012: CCC issued the ninth CDP amendment (#5-91-286-A9), which acknowledged that: (1) City had *removed* the Unit 4 project area from the overall park project's scope; and (2) CCC did *not approve* either the Unit 4 project or a bridge over PCH. Amendment #9 also did not reference a Lateral Trail (see Appendix A).

September 2013: PPCC board meeting held, at which N. Kulla (then-CD 11 Sr. Counsel) reported on the park's status and explained: “There will be a nice pedestrian path to Temescal Canyon access points [*i.e.*, the Lateral Trail] and Coastal Commission requirements will be satisfied” (see Appendix A).

October 2014: CCC issued the eleventh CDP amendment (#5-91-286-A11), *for the first time referencing the Lateral Trail* and requiring the trail to be included in biannual progress reports (Condition 25); requiring a feasibility study as to alternatives for beach access crossing at PCH and a *further CDP (or amendment) for any PCH overcrossing* (but no further CDP required for the Lateral Trail) (Condition 28); and requiring submission of final plans and working drawings showing “trail connections to PCH and to Palisades Recreation Center.” Amendment #11 also included the same language with respect to the “Unit 4 - PCH Slope” project as in prior amendments, including the recommendation for additional geotechnical studies of the Unit 4 area (see Appendix A).

2014 - 2015: City Bureau of Engineering (BOE) submitted progress reports to CCC in 2014 and 2015, but inexplicably submitted no further reports for the next 7 years, until directed by CCC to do so in 2022 (after finding that City had violated the CDP by failing to submit progress reports since 2016; see below and Appendix A).

August 2016: *DRAFT Feasibility Study* of alternatives to crossing PCH prepared, which for reasons unknown was never finalized and was not submitted to CCC at the time (later submitted in 2023; see below and Appendix A).

October 27, 2016: BOE (per then-project manager R. Hancock) updated PPCC on park development and plans. Attendees were told that park plans “were essentially complete; we have Coastal approval.”<sup>7</sup> Discussion included a potential future bridge, a trail to Temescal Canyon and related security issues (see Appendix A).<sup>8</sup>

2016 - 2021: City and Caltrans officials engaged in periodic unresolved discussions over an “encroachment permit” or other process to allow use Caltrans land below Via de las Olas for the Lateral Trail (per various

---

<sup>7</sup> This was an apparent reference to CCC's approval of prior landscaping plans in September 2016, shortly before BOE's presentation to PPCC. For reasons unknown / unexplained, the 2016 CCC-approved plans were *supplanted* by plans subsequently developed by BOE and RAP and completed in 2020 (see below). The 2016 plans (in contrast with the 2020 plans) showed an open PCH/south end connecting to a Lateral Trail running to Temescal Canyon (as required by the 2014 CDP).

<sup>8</sup> BOE statements in 2016 as to a bridge / security: “A pedestrian bridge to be built over PCH is the second phase. . . The plan is to build a bridge which would have ‘Trilogy’ locks on the gates which would open at sunrise and close at sunset. The bridge is a requirement of the 1985 EIR” [*incorrect: a bridge is not required by the EIR (see above); the current park gate locks do not automatically operate at sunrise/sunset each day; gate locking has been a frequent problem since the park opened*]. As to other security: “The park rangers will move people on” [*incorrect: the park has no rangers and City has insufficient resources to deploy rangers at the park, per recent unequivocal RAP statements*]. As to the bridge and trail: “We think we have an additional \$6 million to build the pedestrian bridge. RAP is trying to fund a plan that would take a trail from the park to Temescal . . . must first obtain a permit from Caltrans” [*see footnote 5 above re bridge funding; at this writing partial funding has been allocated for the trail but the Caltrans permit status is uncertain*]; see below and Appendix A.

announcements over the years, as reported in news posts and at PPCC and PCH Task Force meetings).

January 22, 2019: As was widely-reported, a “groundbreaking” for the final phases of park construction was held. In connection with the groundbreaking, a conceptual map of the park was posted on several social media platforms and on the CD 11 website (with an open PCH/south end connecting to a Lateral Trail in the direction of Temescal Canyon Rd.). The same map had been shown by BOE to PPCC in 2016 and was also posted on the RAP and PPCC websites (see Appendix A).

October 2020: New landscaping plans and specifications for the park project were completed (the 2020 Plans), effectively supplanting the prior CCC-approved plans and inexplicably depicting a *closed PCH/south end* with *no Lateral Trail* and signage stating “*no coastal access*” – unlike the prior 2016 plans and the widely-distributed conceptual map; despite ongoing discussions about use of the Caltrans land for a Lateral Trail; and contrary to the express CDP conditions (see Appendix A).<sup>9</sup>

January 21, 2021: RAP Commissioners approved the 2020 Plans; for reasons unknown, City did not apply for a CDP amendment or submit the new plans for CCC approval. (Later, CCC directed City to apply for a CDP amendment and to submit final revised plans for CCC approval in 2022; see below and Appendix A.)

April 2021: PPCC’s then-Executive Committee learned that City might request federal “earmark” funds for a bridge; motion for PPCC to support such a request *withdrawn* after City decided not to apply for federal funds.

May - July 2021: RAP Commissioners awarded the park project landscaping contract, and landscaping work began per the 2020 Plans (without CCC approval).

July 2021: Sen. Ben Allen announced at a PPCC meeting that he had “worked closely” with then-PPCC Chair D. Card (also a former PCCAC Vice-Chair) and then-RAP Commissioner J. Halper to achieve the state legislature’s approval of *\$11 million in funding* to build the pedestrian bridge (see Appendix A; the funds were later transferred to a BOE account in 2022).

## **2022 - 2024**

*Thumbnail: Park landscaping continued, with temporary halt on certain construction until CCC approval obtained; park opening; bluff area instability concerns; Lateral Trail progress; bridge consulting phase begins.*

March 2022: Series of PPCC letters sent to numerous City officials and agencies, requesting answers to numerous specific questions about the status of the Lateral Trail, CCC approval and other aspects of the development (see Appendix A / one of several letters of inquiry). No responses were received.

March - April 2022: PPCC expressed support for the Lateral Trail and for federal funding of the trail in letters to City officials and to the community’s then-U.S. Congressman Ted Lieu, via his representative (see Appendix A).

April 2022: Upon learning that park landscaping was underway without CCC plan approval, CCC directed City to halt unapproved construction, to apply for an amended CDP and to submit revised final plans for approval. CCC staff also separately made clear to BOE that construction of the Lateral Trail is required, that City must proceed to secure permission from Caltrans and that CCC would assist in this endeavor (see Appendix A).

July 14, 2022: CCC approved City’s application and issued the most recent CDP amendment (#5-91-286-A13), which contained substantially the same Conditions 25 and 28 as well as language from previous CDP amendments with respect to coastal access, the “Unit 4 - PCH Slope,” the Lateral Trail and the pedestrian bridge (final park plans required to be submitted for approval by the Executive Director; Lateral Trail required to be constructed; new signs stating “Future Coastal Access” to be installed; pedestrian bridge not approved and a new CDP or CDP

---

<sup>9</sup> BOE did not update PPCC on the 2020 Plans (as it had in 2016). The 2020 Plans were not made available publicly until a link was provided by prior CD 11 staff at the request of this author in 2022. The PPCC board was not informed about how the plans had changed from 2016 to 2020 or that CCC had not approved the 2020 Plans. Questions eventually arose which led to PPCC’s then-Executive Committee, in March 2022, seeking answers from City officials about several aspects of park development, including the Lateral Trail status and CCC’s approval of landscaping plans (see below and Exhibit A).



amendment required in the future for a bridge; biannual progress reports required; further geotechnical studies of the Unit 4 project area recommended; feasibility study of alternatives for vertical crossing over PCH also required; see Appendix A).

August 2022: Federal funding (\$1.15 million) for Lateral Trail construction approved by the U.S. House of Representatives, per Congressman Lieu's earmark request (approved by full Congress December 2022; see below).

October 10, 2022: Final revised landscaping plans submitted to CCC and approved by CCC's Executive Director (effective as of July 14). Plans show: "future coastal access" signage (as required by the amended CDP, to replace "no coastal access" signs in prior unapproved 2020 Plans); perimeter fencing around the mouth of the canyon with a gate for future pedestrian access (to eventually connect with the future Lateral Trail; see Appendix A).

December 1, 2022: PPCC hosted a community meeting in advance of the park opening, where City officials provided information, answered questions, and addressed concerns about various park aspects (see Appendix A).

December 10, 2022: Landscaping was substantially completed, and the park opened to the public.

December 2022: Federal budget with partial funding for the Lateral Trail (\$1.15 million) approved by Congress. PPCC was advised that the trail cost estimate was now closer to \$4.3 million and that BOE had made a City budget request for the amount necessary to complete the trail (*but see* a different cost estimate in the November 2023 BOE Progress Report, below and in Appendix A; reason for the differences unknown).

December 2022 - May 2023: The feasibility study of alternatives for vertical PCH crossing (required under CDP Condition 28) had not been submitted by BOE; CCC staff and this author engaged in extended efforts (via email and PRA request) to ascertain the study's status. It became apparent that BOE had never finalized or submitted the study. (Eventually, in June 2023, BOE submitted the prior 2016 DRAFT feasibility study to CCC; see below.)

February 2023: PPCC President M. Zar formed the "Potrero Canyon Oversight Committee" (PCOC) as an ad hoc committee of the PPCC board, to monitor park conditions and progress. A PCOC email for public comments was established and a PPCC website tab was created, with ongoing posts on park conditions/developments (this author is a PCOC member and participates in posting relevant entries on the Potrero webpages; see Appendix A).

March 13, 2023: PPCC letter sent to Mayor Karen Bass and current CD 11 CM Traci Park, supporting BOE's budget request for the then-estimated shortfall of \$2.25 million needed to complete the Lateral Trail (see Appendix A and differing cost estimate in the November 2023 BOE Progress Report, below).

April - May 2023: Following multiple earlier landslides, a large slide occurred in the bluff area adjacent and to the west of the canyon mouth, below Via de las Olas, toppling large trees and breaking concrete barriers; a massive amount of landslide debris still covers what is commonly known as the "Potrero Canyon Access Road" below the bluff – the Unit 4 area where the Lateral Trail and potentially the bridge would be located (see below and BOE Geotechnical Engineering Division (GED) Field Investigation (FI) Summary in Appendix A).

June 2023: 2016 DRAFT Feasibility Study submitted by BOE to CCC and accepted by CCC as compliant with CDP Condition 28 (see Appendix A).<sup>10</sup>

August 2023: BOE GED conducted a field investigation of the slide area below Via de las Olas ("Location: Via de las Olas @ Friends St.," *i.e.*, within the "Unit 4 - PCH Slope" boundaries) and later prepared its FI Summary in November 2023. Among other things, GED determined that the bluff area forms an "eroding cliff" with a "history of constant erosion and landslides;" that a large metal buttress structure on the bluff is damaged and "ever-deteriorating;" that GED has made a "replacement bulkhead funding request;" but that "unfortunately, a solution, funding and timeline for any follow-up mitigation is not available at this time" (see below and Appendix A).

---

<sup>10</sup> This author notes that the 2016 *draft* study fails to address: 1) the fact that the Lateral Trail is required under the CDP; 2) the potentially dangerous geologic conditions in the relevant bluff area (Unit 4) and the recommendations for additional geotechnical studies; 3) current cost estimates; and 4) any other pertinent conditions that may have arisen since 2016 (or were present in 2016 but had not yet been included in the draft that was never finalized).

October 12 / 13, 2023: PPCC passed a motion by majority vote to support moving forward with the consulting and outreach phase of the bridge project; PPCC letter sent to Sen. Allen & CM Park (see Appendix A).

October 13, 2023: City Board of Public Works (BPW) authorized issuance of a Task Order Solicitation (TOS) to Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. (Jacobs) in connection with a \$2.2 million contract for consulting services for the pre-design “Project Approval and Environmental Document Phase” of the Potrero/PCH “pedestrian/bicycle bridge project” (see Appendix A).

November 14, 2023: GED FI Summary prepared, based on its August field investigation (see Appendix A).

November 22, 2023: Potrero Canyon Progress Report submitted by BOE (most recent to date). The report states (contrary to earlier estimates) that the cost estimate for the Lateral Trail is \$1.258 million (with “federal earmark funding in the amount of \$1.15 million” in process of being transferred to City; see Appendix A).

December 5, 2023: A well-attended, online community meeting was held, hosted by CD 11, regarding coastal access and the bridge consulting phase process (recording exists but is not currently available to the public).<sup>11</sup> Promptly following the meeting, the required Notice to Proceed was issued to Jacobs (per CD 11), officially initiating the bridge consulting phase.

December 15, 2023: GED submitted written responses to questions about the FI Summary (see Appendix A).

January 2024: Current status of the Lateral Trail (any construction plans and/or permission for use of Caltrans land) is uncertain. The bridge consulting phase, led by Jacobs, is expected to proceed with required work and community outreach. **Still to be determined** (potential environmental considerations or measures during the consulting phase):

1. Nature and extent of *geotechnical and other studies* to be undertaken regarding safety and feasibility.
2. Whether and when the identified “*Unit 4 - PCH Slope*” *area conditions* will be investigated further.
3. Whether a *plan for remediation of geotechnical hazards* – and actual remediation – will be required before moving forward with the project.
4. Who will conduct such studies (Jacobs or one of its sub-contractors? BOE or another City agency? Caltrans or another state agency? An independent entity with no stake in the outcome?).
5. Whether *CEQA requirements*, including preparation of a full EIR,<sup>12</sup> will be met and/or undertaken.
6. Whether relevant *Coastal Act environmental provisions* will be considered (e.g., Coastal Act Sections 30200, 30210, 30214, 30240, 30250, 30251, 30253).
7. Whether *CCC approval*, via a new or amended CDP, will be sought, and if so, at what point in the process and by which entity (City/BOE? State/Caltrans?).

January 8, 2024  
Prepared by Christina Spitz,  
PPCC At-Large Representative &  
past PPCC Chair & Secretary

## Appendix A (links to documents referenced in Timeline):

CF 04-1587: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=04-1587>

PPCC Historic Summary: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/PPCC-Summery-Of-Activities-1972-1985.pdf> (p. 30)

1985 EIR: <https://www.laparks.org/sites/default/files/pdf/commissioner/2021/jan21/21-016.pdf> (pp. 88, 96, 128)

1991 CDP 5-91-286: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/5-91-286City-of-Los-Angeles.pdf>

---

<sup>11</sup> Among other things, officials informed attendees on December 5 that (1) a series of community outreach meetings would be held during the consulting phase; (2) further studies would be undertaken to ensure safety and feasibility; and (3) Lateral Trail progress was continuing behind the scenes (although visible work had not yet occurred). Attendees’ comments during Q&A were split roughly equally among those opposed to the bridge, those in support and those with concerns or questions (as described in reporting on 12/14/23 in the *Palisadian-Post*).

<sup>12</sup> An EIR (as called for by PPCC in 2004 and by PCCAC in 2008) has never been conducted regarding impacts of a proposed pedestrian bridge over PCH in connection with this park project.

1993 CDP 5-91-286-A2: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/5-91-286-A2City-of-Angeles.pdf>

1996 CDP 5-91-286-A3: <https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/1996/10/Th9a-10-1996.pdf>

2004 May PPCC meeting minutes/motion: <https://pacpalicc.org/index.php/minutes-from-2004/> (scroll down to 5/13/04, item 4.3, and 5/27/04, item 4.1)

2008 PCCAC Report: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/PCCAC-Final-Report-2008.pdf>

2008 CDP 5-91-286-A6: <https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2008/6/W10a-6-2008.pdf>

2011 CDP 5-91-286-A8: <https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2011/1/Th19a-1-2011.pdf> (Unit 4 Map – Ex. 7)

2013 PPCC meeting minutes: <https://pacpalicc.org/index.php/minutes-from-2013/> (scroll down to 9/12/13, item 7.2.1)

2014 CDP 5-91-286-A11: <https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2014/10/W19a-10-2014.pdf>

2016 Conceptual Map: [https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/potrero\\_plan\\_board\\_reduced\\_3\\_.pdf](https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/potrero_plan_board_reduced_3_.pdf)

2016 BOE Presentation to PPCC: <https://pacpalicc.org/index.php/ppcc-minutes-2016-10-27/> (scroll down to item 10.4)

2016 DRAFT Feasibility Study:  
<https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/DRAFT-2016-Potrero-Canyon-Pedestrian-Crossing-Feasibility-Study-Technical-Memorandum.pdf>

2020 Park Plans: [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ZNV38\\_oSonjIlrLExnK2dPtxzCsIQ5Lc/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ZNV38_oSonjIlrLExnK2dPtxzCsIQ5Lc/view) (link to download)

2021 Sen. Allen Presentation to PPCC: <https://pacpalicc.org/index.php/ppcc-minutes-2021-07-08/> (scroll down to item 11.1)

2022 PPCC Letter w/Questions: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/PPCC-EC-Potrero-Questions-1.pdf>

2022 PPCC Support for Lateral Trail: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/PPCC-Letter-Lat-Trail-Fed-Funding.pdf>

2022 CCC Letter to BOE: [https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/LettertoCity\\_4.22.22.pdf](https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/LettertoCity_4.22.22.pdf)

2022 CDP 5-91-286-A13: <https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2022/7/Th17a/Th17a-7-2022-report.pdf>

2022 Final CCC-Approved Park Plans: [https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Plans\\_Stamped-10.26.2022-1.pdf](https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Plans_Stamped-10.26.2022-1.pdf)

2022 City Acceptance Bridge Funding: [https://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2022/22-0713\\_misc\\_06-14-22.pdf](https://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2022/22-0713_misc_06-14-22.pdf)

2022 PPCC Community Meeting Recording: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fWla7FFrEBk>

2022 PPCC Community Meeting Q&A: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Complete-Responses-Questions-to-speakers.pdf>

2023 PPCC / PCOC Potrero webpage: <https://pacpalicc.org/index.php/potrero-canyon/>

2023 PPCC Trail Funding Support Letter: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/In-support-of-City-Funding-for-LT.pdf>

2023 BPW Bridge Consultant TOS Approval: <https://dpwlacity.primegov.com/Portal/Meeting?meetingTemplateId=6106>

2023 PPCC Support for Consultant to Proceed: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Potrero-Advance-letter-1.pdf>

2023 BOE November 22 Progress Report:  
<https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/2023-Nov-Progress-Report-for-Coastal-Commission-11-22-23.pdf>

2023 BOE GED FI Summary: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/FI-23-222-Via-de-Las-Olas-2-1.pdf>

2023 BOE GED Responses to Questions re the FI Summary:  
[https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Via-de-las-Olas\\_responses-to-Chris-Spitz-questions.pdf](https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Via-de-las-Olas_responses-to-Chris-Spitz-questions.pdf)

***Map of Grading Units/Unit 4 Slope, following on p. 8***

Map of Potrero Grading Units/Unit 4 Slope Area

Map of Potrero Grading Units, showing Unit 4 Area (Ex. 7 to 2011 CDP Amendment #8 / link on p. 7 above) – Orientation: PCH at top of map image / Unit 4 to the right/west of Unit 3 (“Friends St. Slope”/ canyon mouth area):

