

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/22/2024 10:49 AM

**Council File No:** 23-0722

**Comments for Public Posting:** November 22, 2024 TO: Los Angeles City Council FROM:: Emily Gabel Luddy, FASLA RE: SIGNIFICANT ISSUES REGARDING OCTOBER 22, 2024 MEMO FROM GENERAL MANAGER RUBIO-CORNEJO RESPONDING TO INSTRUCTIONS IN CF23-0772, LA RIVER BIKEPATH PHASE IV The City Council adopted a motion February 2024, for a well-intended project, instructing LA/DOT, BSS AND BOE to report back to Council within 6&9 months responding to the Council instructions. In an October 22, 2024 Memo to the City Council, LA/DOT responded to the Motion's instructions. Neither BSS nor BOE have responded, an oversight given the cross jurisdictional responsibilities within the City of Los Angeles itself. On a directly related matter, my partner and I are designated a Consulting Party on a Section 106 compliance, under the Federal NEPA pursuant to a study called the " Los Angeles Phase IV Bike Path Project located in Griffith Park." Because federal money is involved, it requires NEPA clearance (its Project Description contains notable inaccuracies). This project appears to be a separate Caltrans/ESA consultant project. This separate study may be what is referred to as a "Special Study," however, it is not possible to determine because the DOT Memo to City Council is vague. Because of the City's own Phase IV's cross-jurisdictional and ownership complexities, the obvious constraints of the physical geography itself, and the ballooning costs the Phase IV project in CF23-0722 make it even less desirable then when it officially launched in 2019. Costs have risen to \$9 million for less than one mile. And it will remain incomplete for years. There is a less costly alternative that will provide a "continuous segment with an outlet at Forest Lawn Drive" to the current proposal and we hope you will agree. Because Council's clear direction was a "continuous segment with an outlet at Forest Lawn Drive". LA/DOT's inadequate and vague response deserves discussion, not a "Receive and File." It is neither equitable to all recreational users nor is it safe. LA/DOT proposes a "dead end" of indeterminant years, while "...people walking and biking will need to turn around." The "dead end" will last at least 10 years given a long term gap closure plan that will involve multiple jurisdictions, Army Corps, LA County Flood Control, Caltrans, other cities and departments; and the need to fund, redesign and

construct the Forest lawn interchange. There are no other outlets in the area. This is unacceptable. Without the continuous segment, 100% of the equestrian stakeholders will face City-introduced safety conflicts. A proposal for signs and safety warnings are hard to believe given that the current end of the existing bike path has no such signs, is not maintained and suffers from cuts in the fences. In the Memo LA/DOT will not advocate for a sound wall to protect equestrians from the trash and noise of the CA-134 freeway. No one expects DOT to construct it. However, please note, if multi-millions are being invested in a less-than-one-mile path, then additional funding for a protective sound wall must be included in the project — whether funded by DOT, BOE, BSS or other infrastructure funding. We know that bike infrastructure won't pay for a sound wall, but there is no equity in putting one user group at greater safety risk. Our stakeholders are extremely knowledgeable about the intricacies of the area and we encourage greater coordination and transparency. We do not oppose the ultimate bikepath, but as described in LA/DOT's Memo: with no interim solution, pitting one group against another while bringing satisfaction to neither, rising costs, significant project delays, expanding scope, major freeway interchange reconstruction, etc. then work on Phase IV should be closed until the entire scheme is finally and responsibly designed. We recommend that your Council Committees open further discussion about the most cost effective means to reprogram the grant funding. If there is no short-term solution to maximize safety and enjoyment of all users, the best course is to pursue a readily doable alternative to phase IV that is continuous, in shade and provides a grand experience until the long term gap project is funded, designed and ready to bid. Sincerely, Emily Gabel Luddy, FASLA Consulting Party for Mariposa Bridge

November 22, 2024

TO: Los Angeles City Council  
FROM: Emily Gabel Luddy, FASLA

**RE: SIGNIFICANT ISSUES REGARDING OCTOBER 22, 2024 MEMO FROM  
GENERAL MANAGER RUBIO-CORNEJO RESPONDING TO INSTRUCTIONS IN  
CF23-0772, LA RIVER BIKEPATH PHASE IV**

The City Council adopted a motion February 2024, for a well-intended project, instructing LA/DOT, BSS AND BOE to report back to Council within 6&9 months responding to the Council instructions. In an October 22, 2024 Memo to the City Council, LA/DOT responded to the Motions instructions. Neither BSS nor BOE have responded, an oversight given the cross jurisdictional responsibilities within the City of Los Angeles itself.

On a directly related matter, my partner and I are designated a Consulting Party on a Section 106 compliance, under the Federal NEPA pursuant to a study called the “ Los Angeles Phase IV Bike Path Project located in Griffith Park.” Because federal money is involved, it requires NEPA clearance (its Project Description contains notable inaccuracies). This project appears to be a separate Caltrans/ESA consultant project. This separate study may be what is referred to as a “Special Study,” however, it is not possible to determine because the DOT Memo to City Council is vague.

Because of the City’s own Phase IV’s cross-jurisdictional and ownership complexities, the obvious constraints of the physical geography itself, and the ballooning costs the Phase IV project in CF23-0722 make it even less desirable then when it officially launched in 2019. Costs have risen to \$9 million for **less than one mile**. And it will remain incomplete for years.

There is a less costly alternative that will provide a “continuous segment with an outlet at Forest Lawn Drive” to the current proposal and we hope you will agree.

Because Council’s clear direction was a “continuous segment with an outlet at Forest Lawn Drive”. LA/DOT’s inadequate and vague response deserves discussion, not a “Receive and File.” It is neither equitable to all recreational users nor is it safe.

LA/DOT proposes a “dead end” of **indeterminant years**, while “...people walking and biking will need to turn around.” The “dead end” will last at least 10 years given a long term gap closure plan that will involve multiple jurisdictions, Army Corps, LA County Flood Control, Caltrans, other cities and departments; and the need to fund, redesign and construct the Forest lawn interchange. There are no other outlets in the area. This is unacceptable. Without the continuous segment, 100% of the equestrian stakeholders will face City-introduced safety conflicts.

A proposal for signs and safety warnings are hard to believe given that the current end of the existing bike path has no such signs, is not maintained and suffers from cuts in the fences.

In the Memo LA/DOT will not **advocate** for a sound wall to protect equestrians from the trash and noise of the CA-134 freeway. No one expects DOT to construct it. However, please note, if multi-millions are being invested in a less-than-one-mile path, then additional funding for a protective sound wall must be included in the project — whether funded by DOT, BOE, BSS or other infrastructure funding. We know that bike infrastructure won't pay for a sound wall, but there is no equity in putting one user group at greater safety risk.

Our stakeholders are extremely knowledgeable about the intricacies of the area and we encourage greater coordination and transparency.

We do not oppose the ultimate bikepath, but as described in LA/DOT's Memo: with no interim solution, pitting one group against another while bringing satisfaction to neither, rising costs, significant project delays, expanding scope, major freeway interchange reconstruction, etc. then work Phase IV should be closed until the entire scheme is finally and responsibly designed.

We recommend that your Council Committees open further discussion about the most cost effective means to reprogram the grant funding. If there is no short-term solution to maximize safety and enjoyment of all users, the best course is to pursue a readily doable alternative to phase IV that is continuous, in shade and provides a grand experience until the long term gap project is funded, designed and ready to bid.

Sincerely,

Emily Gabel Luddy, FASLA  
Consulting Party for  
Mariposa Bridge

