

Questions from PPCC Elected Reps regarding the Pedestrian Bridge Project – Via email July 13, 2026

BOE Responses in red (7-28-26).

1. Regarding environmental review of the project:

- What agency or entity prepared the Preliminary Environmental Analysis Report (PEAR)?
The City and Consultant team (Jacobs)
- Do you intend to engage in further environmental review of the Pedestrian Bridge project, beyond the PEAR?

Yes, preparation of environmental technical reports and final environmental documents for CEQA and NEPA.

- What would trigger the need to undertake further review of the project, e.g., an MND, EIR or other CEQA or NEPA documents?

If the lead CEQA agency (City) determines there is potential for significant impact, they would prepare an EIR. If an EIR is required, the lead agency would file a notice of preparation (NOP) with the State Clearinghouse and County Clerk. The City would notify everyone on its project mailing list and hold a public scoping meeting.

If the lead NEPA agency (Caltrans) decides that an Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impact (EA/FONSI) or Environmental Impact Statement/Record of Decision (EIS/ROD) is required instead of a Categorical Exclusion (CE) then the City would notify the project mailing list when the NEPA document is available. There is no formal requirement for Caltrans to notify anyone until the environmental document is completed and they file a notice of availability (NOA).

- Who would receive notice of the preparation of any such environmental documents? The notice of preparation (NOP) would be filed with the State Clearinghouse and County Clerk. Copies would go to state agencies and every federal agency involved in approving or funding the project.
- Would residents and community organizations be permitted to comment on draft environmental documents for the bridge project before they are finalized? The CEQA document will be circulated for public comment.
- Who/what agency would make the final determinations for such documents? The City would be the lead agency under CEQA.
Caltrans would be the lead agency under NEPA.
- Will you commit to providing all pertinent environmental documents to PPCC and the community in a timely manner and in advance of any final determinations? Access to

pertinent environmental documents will be made available to the public consistent with applicable regulatory requirements, as appropriate.

2. Regarding the PEAR's conclusions as to the project's impact on "community character":

- What was the basis for the PEAR's conclusions that the bridge project "would not present the potential to evoke any measurable impact on the character and cohesion of the community" and "would not degrade community character"; that "community impacts [of the bridge project] would not be substantial"; and that a "community impact assessment [of the project] would not be required"?

Community impacts will be studied and evaluated pursuant to the requirements of NEPA and CEQA and discussed as applicable within the environmental document. The discussion within the PEAR was evaluating if there were substantial impacts anticipated from the project that the public would benefit from a more detailed analysis within a stand-alone Community Impact Assessment Technical Study. The proposed project would connect the Beach to an existing at grade trail located along PCH. It is assumed that when we open the bridge, it would provide a new access/entrance. The bridge would provide direct and safe access for pedestrians and cyclists to cross PCH between the beach and the park and the future planned coastal trail along PCH. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in changes to the neighborhood unity, social interactions, local identity, require residential or business relocations, influence growth patterns, or result in inconsistent land uses (i.e. Community Character and Cohesion). As described within the PEAR it was determined that the project would not result in any substantial change to Community Character and Cohesion and a Community Impact Assessment Technical Study is not required.

- When were these conclusions reached? If reached before the Palisades Fire on January 7, 2025, do they remain your conclusions post-Fire, and if so, on what basis? The PEAR was approved in January 2025. During the forthcoming Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) phase, the technical environmental studies will be completed, and the appropriate environmental determination will be made based on the results of those studies.

The purpose and need and project objectives for the project have not changed post fire. The reasons that a Community Impact Assessment Technical Study was not required have not changed as discussed above.

3. Regarding the PEAR's conclusions as to community support for the project:

- What was the basis for the PEAR's conclusions that "the public appears to generally support the project," and that the project is "not anticipated to result in public controversy"?

On October 12, 2023, the PPCC voted 13 in favor, 3 opposed, and 3 abstentions to allow the contractor hired by BOE to conduct meaningful outreach in order to garner the community's feedback through the process of the predesign phase of the project.

A meeting was held in 2023 at CD 11's office. More than half of the people that commented were in favor of the project. The primary concerns expressed were safety and security. Community members expressed concern about the unhoused population accessing the community and also the potential for fires in the park.

A letter dated December 3, 2023, was sent to Councilwoman Park's office from past Pacific Palisades Citizens of the Year and provided their support of the project.

A letter dated March 28, 2024, from the Potrero Advisory Committee was sent to Councilwoman Park's office indicating their support of the project, as well as feedback on items to incorporate in the design.

A Public Meeting was held on March 14, 2024, with approximately 94 attendees. Public sentiment based on feedback during the Public Meeting toward the project expressed both enthusiasm for the bridge and apprehension primarily related to issues of public safety, crime prevention, and the unhoused public. Those in favor expressed interest in greater connectivity, safe access to the beach, and potential aesthetics of the bridge's future design. With the overall population of Los Angeles City Council District 11 (CD 11) of approximately 284,600, at the time the PEAR was prepared, less than 1% of the CD11 population has shown interest in or commented on the project.

Within the PEAR it indicates that the Project is not anticipated to result in public controversy; however, the City will continue to engage and involve the public and keep them informed through extensive outreach, including meetings, mailings, surveys, and other means.

- When were these conclusions reached? If reached before the Palisades Fire on January 7, 2025, do they remain your conclusions post-Fire, and if so, on what basis?

The conclusions were based on feedback from the Public Meeting on March 14, 2024, and support for the project during a previous meeting the City held in December of 2023. The City held the 1st postfire community meeting on July 16, 2026, to update the community and hear public feedback. The City will continue to engage and solicit feedback from the public through extensive outreach, including meetings, mailings, surveys, and other means.

- What efforts have you made to determine if the community continues to support the project, considering the Palisades' devastation and the fact that key infrastructure and safety improvements are needed for the recovery which remain unfunded or underfunded?

The City presented to PPCC on October 2025 and held the 1st postfire community meeting on July 16, 2026 to update the community and hear public feedback. The City will continue to engage and solicit feedback from the public through extensive outreach, including meetings, mailings, surveys, and other means.

- What outreach with the community, if any, have you engaged in since the last community meeting about the bridge project in October 2025?

The City held the following meetings for community engagement:

1. Scoping Meeting (December 2023)
2. Community Survey (February – March 2024)
3. Pacific Palisades Community Council Presentation (March 2024)
4. Community Meeting No. 1 (March 2024)
5. Pacific Palisades Community Council Presentation (October 2025)
6. Community Meeting No. 2 (July 2026)

Following the Palisades Fire, the City temporarily paused project activities. The project is now moving forward into the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) phase. As part of this phase, two additional community meetings will be held to provide updates and gather public input.

- Have you spoken individually with any community members or groups about the project, and if so, with whom, when and what was the outcome?

Yes, the Project Team coordinated and conducted two briefings with the Pacific Palisades Community Council (PPCC), providing project overview, addressing general questions, and inviting members to participate in the first two community meetings. The first briefing was conducted in March 2024 and last in October 2025.

To extend the reach of project messaging prior to the first public meeting (held in March 2024) and the second public meeting (held on July 2026), the City directly engaged with the following community members who were known to be actively engaged within the community.

- Maryam Zar, Pacific Palisades Community Council (PPCC)
 - Anya McCann, Potrero Advisory Committee (PAC) and daughter of George Wolfberg
 - David Card, Palisades Forestry Committee (PFC) and Potrero Advisory Committee
- If it becomes evident during further outreach that the public no longer supports the project, would the only outcome be “increased cost/schedule for the PA/ED phase,” as noted in the PEAR? Or, would you support a community-initiated request to redirect the balance

remaining from the \$11 million in funding from the State (currently restricted to use for the bridge) to critical post-Fire infrastructure or other recovery needs in Pacific Palisades?

The City is administering the State Earmark Funds in accordance with the funding agreement with Caltrans and all applicable requirements. Decisions regarding the reallocation or redirection of any unexpended State Earmark Funds are not within the City's authority and would be subject to the terms of the funding agreement and any applicable State processes and approvals.

- If the community does not support going forward with the bridge, do you know whether the balance of the \$11 million would have to be returned to the State's General Fund (instead of being redirected to other Palisades needs)?

The City does not have the authority to determine the disposition of any unexpended State Earmark Funds. Any remaining balance would be returned to Caltrans and subject to the terms of the funding agreement and applicable State laws, policies, and approval processes.

5. Regarding the pedestrian trail and a Coastal Development Permit for the bridge.

- Why has information about the City's development of the pedestrian trail – required to provide coastal access under the existing Coastal Development Permit (CDP) for Potrero Canyon – not been mentioned in the notices about the bridge project and/or the PEAR?

The pedestrian lateral trail is a separate project being led by the Bureau of Engineering's Geotechnical Division. The trail is currently in the feasibility phase and would undergo its own environmental documentation. Because it is a separate project, it has not been included in the bridge project notices or the Project Environmental Assessment Report (PEAR). The Bridge Improvement Division will continue to coordinate with the Geotechnical Division as both projects progress but cannot speak on behalf of the trail project or its specific details.

- At the community meeting on 7/16/26, will you address the fact that there is an alternate route for coastal access that is required and is now under development? The bridge community meeting will mention there is separate pedestrian lateral trail being led by the Bureau of Engineering's Geotechnical Division. Bridge Improvement Division will focus primarily on the bridge project.
- Will you be applying to the Coastal Commission for a new CDP or an amendment to the existing CDP to allow the bridge to go forward? If so, when will that occur, and will the community receive advance notice of the application? What is your understanding as to the need to apply for a new CDP or CDP amendment for the bridge?

Yes, a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) or amendment is anticipated to be required for the bridge project. The CDP application process typically occurs during the design phase,

following completion of the environmental document and prior to construction. The City will provide information regarding the permit process and opportunities for public involvement consistent with applicable requirements and agency procedures.

6. Regarding community concerns about public safety and security.

- Have you taken into account changed conditions and concerns about increased theft and other crimes, as well as evidence of illegal fires in canyon and blu areas, occurring since the 2025 Fire? Did you know that on July 10, 2026, a fire destroyed a residential home under construction after the Fire (suspected due to copper wire theft/not yet confirmed)?

Potential safety and security features, such as controlled access measures, security cameras, lighting, visibility enhancements, and other measures to support public safety, will be evaluated as appropriate during the next design phase of the project.

The proposed project will incorporate fire-resistant materials and engineering practices to reduce vulnerability to both wildfires and manmade fires. This includes the use of non-combustible construction materials, reduced vegetation surrounding the project footprint, improved pedestrian access, lighting and visibility measures designed to discourage unsafe activity, and compliance with California fire safety standards.

- Are you aware that City officials have informed the community that due to lack of funding, Park Rangers cannot be assigned to patrol Potrero Canyon; that private security cannot be retained to patrol the park; and that increased police presence in the Canyon or elsewhere in the Palisades is not feasible?

Public safety staffing and enforcement decisions, including Park Ranger services, private security, and police deployment, are managed by the appropriate City departments and are not within the scope or authority of the Bureau of Engineering (BOE). Questions regarding these services should be directed to the responsible departments.

The BOE bridge project team will continue to evaluate project-specific safety features and coordinate with relevant City departments throughout the project process.

- What is the current plan, if any, to provide adequate security going forward, including if/when the bridge is completed? Are funds available to provide security for the Canyon and if so, from what source?

The project is studying incorporating safety and security features, such as pathway striping, lighting, protective railings and bollards, locking gates, and signage providing informational, educational, and wayfinding information. Potential safety and security features, including considerations such as locking gates, security cameras, lighting, and other measures to enhance public safety on the bridge, will be evaluated and incorporated as appropriate during the next design phase of the project.

The proposed project does not include patrolling on the proposed bridge or the adjacent existing park or beach. The use of security patrol would be under the discretion of the affected local agencies and their police and sheriff's departments.

- Are you aware that Potrero Canyon gates and locking mechanisms have had numerous problems since the park opening and before the Fire, e.g., no programmable remote option, gates being left open/not latching properly, requests for RAP staff to check gates to make sure they were closed and locked at sunset every night (to our knowledge such monitoring did not regularly occur) – as reported on PPCC's website?

BOE does not maintain the Park gates and locks. We recommend reaching out to City Department of Recreation and Parks.

- Is there a plan for gates to be installed at entrance points from and to the beach and the pedestrian bridge, and if so, will they have locks with programmable remote options?
Gates and locks are potential safety measures and will be evaluated in the next phase of the project.
- Will RAP or other staff be required to inspect all gates at the pedestrian bridge every night before park closure to ensure they are latched, locked and secured shut? How can residents be assured that this will in fact occur nightly?

The City will coordinate with the appropriate agencies and departments, including the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP), Caltrans, and Los Angeles County, during the next design phase to develop the necessary Maintenance, Use, and Operations agreements.

- Is there a plan to install more secure locks or gates, or higher fencing, or to implement any other safety measures, to deter persons from entering the park overnight via the proposed pedestrian bridge? If so, please describe any such plan and whether funding has been identified and will be available.
Gates and locks are potential safety measures and evaluated in the next phase of the project.
- Will the bridge have gates with locks at each end (i.e., at the beach parking lot entrance and at the entrance closest to Potrero Canyon)? Have you discussed with County Beaches & Harbors its ability to have nightly staff inspections of bridge gates located in the beach parking lot area, to ensure they are properly latched and locked? Gates and locks are potential safety measures and evaluated in the next phase of the project.

7. Regarding funding and cost estimates to complete the bridge project.

- Do you have a revised estimate of the cost to complete the project? Has your prior cost estimate (between \$13 - \$18 million, depending on inflation, as provided at the community

meeting in October 2025) increased or changed? If so, what is the current cost estimate and what is it based on?

During the Project Initiation Document Phase, the estimated construction cost range was identified as \$8 million to \$15 million. As the project advances through the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) phase, the cost estimate will be refined and updated based on the progression of preliminary engineering, updated project requirements, additional technical analysis, and applicable construction cost escalation.

- What has been paid to date for the services of consultants or other vendors with respect to the bridge project? Please detail the nature and amount of any such payments.

The consultant services for the development of Project Initiation Document and Preliminary Environmental Analysis Report have been paid to date.

- What is the current balance of the \$11 million in funding for the bridge?

The remaining State Earmark funding is anticipated to be sufficient to support completion of the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED), Right-of-Way, and Design phases of the project. Additional funding would be needed to fully fund construction.

- Have any other funding sources been identified or secured to cover the estimated cost to complete the project, beyond the original \$11 million? Please describe any efforts to secure additional funding for the bridge.

The project currently only has the \$11 million State Earmark Funds. The City is proactively pursuing additional funding opportunities, including competitive grant programs, to help address the anticipated construction funding needs.

Additional Questions from PPCC Elected Reps regarding the Pedestrian Bridge Project (that were not previously answered above)— Via email July 20, 2026 Requested clarification on later trail project and bridge project:

Bureau of Engineering, Bridge Improvement Division, is leading the pedestrian bridge project. The project is in the Project Approval and Environmental Document Phase (Predesign).

Coastal Development Permit (CDP) 5-91-286 Special Condition No. 28 (imposed under amendment 11) for the George Wolfberg Park required a study of pedestrian access crossing at Pacific Coast Highway at the mouth of the Potrero Canyon to the beach.

The feasibility study was completed in August 2016 to meet the CDP requirement. The pedestrian bridge was determined as the most feasible alternative. With community, City Council Office, and State elected official support, Senator Ben Allen's Office was able to secure an \$11M state earmark for this project in 2021. The City of Los Angeles and Caltrans entered into a Fund Transfer Agreement in June 2022. The state earmark funds are allocated specifically for the project

development (predesign, outreach, design, environmental review, permits, and construction) in accordance with terms specified in the funding agreement.

Bureau of Engineering, Geotechnical Engineering Division (GED), is leading the lateral trail project. The project is in the Feasibility Phase and is required per the Coastal Development Permit (CDP) 5-91-286 for the George Wolfberg Park. Funding for the lateral trail is separate from the bridge project. Questions regarding the lateral trail shall be directed to the Council Office for coordination with GED.