

Communication from Public

Name: Sabrina Silver

Date Submitted: 02/15/2024 04:50 PM

Council File No: 23-0722

Comments for Public Posting: ULART studied portions of the LA Riverway West of the 134 Forest Lawn Drive Exit. Was a feasibility study conducted regarding the Phase IV section East of the Forest Lawn Drive exit to just West of the Riverside Drive Bridge/Zoo Drive? The western portion of this narrow sliver of land, bordered on the North by the concrete walls of the LA River and the South by the 134 Freeway easement fence, has been used for 50 years as an equestrian easement. From the Mariposa Bridge, this trail links to the only two equestrian access points to the interior of Griffith Park, tunnels 6 and 7. The Mariposa Street Bridge does not allow bicycles to be ridden or carried over its span and cyclists are not permitted to ride the dirt trails in Griffith Park. Equestrians have already lost an access route to Griffith Park due to the bicycle path extension under the Riverside Drive Bridge. Prior to that project, there was an incline on both sides of the river which equestrians could use to cross. Nothing has been built in replacement. Horses are living animals and have evolved to instinctively respond to perceived dangers. Fast moving bicycles approaching a horse from the front or the back is likely to cause a fear reaction in the horse, called a spook, which can injure horse, rider, or others. Common courtesy between cyclists, joggers, and equestrians has been ... uncommon. For safety, a buffer of about 5 feet should exist between horse and bike users, and the bike path should undulate or curve to slow the speed of cyclists. Having the horse and bike paths cross at the same elevation poses hazards, especially if it is well used. A horse trail/bike path crossing, well trafficked by both user groups, sets up a dangerous situation likely to result in accidents and injuries. Is the LA Riverway envisioned as transit? It is being built with funding for transit projects. Transit and recreational stakeholders have different, often conflicting, priorities. It is of concern to mix recreational and transit use. As proposed, Phase IV pits conflicting stakeholder groups vying for a narrow and tangled pathway. The forest lawn underpass is west of tunnel 6. That means that the horse and bike paths must cross if the bike path is to continue to Forest Lawn Drive. The Westbound Forest Lawn exit slopes down and curves under the freeway. From the equestrian center and nearby trails, it's common to hear car crashes (and ambulance responses) in this location – one car had to be pulled out of the river after having

crashed into it headfirst. A Riverside Drive Bridge / Zoo Drive to Forest Lawn Drive route would be safer. There is little gain and much expense to squeeze this project into this short and narrow geography. A less costly, less conflicted, far better, and shaded solution would be to use the Riverside Drive Bridge to route to a protected bike path along Forest Lawn Drive. Community members and participants in the LA Riverway Phase IV discussion have been awaiting reports from DOT and BOE to review. Please consider carefully the costs and benefits of the routes, including stakeholder conflicts and safety risks that can be avoided. Respectfully, Sabrina Silver

Communication from Public

Name: Emily Gabel Luddy, FASLA

Date Submitted: 02/15/2024 05:14 PM

Council File No: 23-0722

Comments for Public Posting: I attended the late spring 2023 initial community meeting, hosted by LA/DOT, BOE/Street Services and CD4 at the Friendship Auditorium, Griffith Park. Since then, no feedback has been provided to the original attendees. There have been no subsequent meetings, no updates. In July 2023, CD4 offered Council Motion 23-0722 that required badly needed follow up from several departments to the public questions and concerns initially raised. There was no follow up within the time frames specified in that motion. Instead, now there is a revised motion. The revised motion recommended by E&E Committee for CF23-0722-- before the Council on Friday, February 16, 2024 -- not only changes the original terms but introduces an old project set aside over 10 years ago. Notwithstanding, votes to move the revised motion along, it is critical Council take note of the following facts: 1) The community stakeholders are unaware of these changes. 2) The new-old design is dangerous and unsustainable. It proposes a 10-foot wide horse trail and a 12-foot wide bicycle path to be separated by a fence. The width of the tiny sliver of land between the Caltrans right-of-way and the vertical wall of the LA River is too narrow to design and construct safe parallel trail/path. There is no room for a buffer between the users. Even if Caltrans somehow provides added land to widen the sliver, the horse trail will become even closer to the travel lanes of the freeway, with only a chainlink fence between it and cars, noise, and the detritus that is typically ejected off of a freeway. 3) Further compromising safety is the “fall of the land” along this sliver. The topography slopes from the Caltrans right of way (ROW) downwards to the LA River’s edge. This will require extensive grading and retaining walls. It will likely require removal of all shade trees. It will result in a horse trail elevated above the bike path. LA/DOT and Street Services possess little knowledge of horse behavior and the animal’s visual acuity: this prey animal has a 270 degree visual range; it can see behind as well as to the side and front. Its eyes focus independently and together. 4) There is an equestrian easement recorded over this section of the LA River-adjacent path for Phase IV. It has been in place for more than 50 years and provides safe access to the interior of Griffith Park for LA, Burbank and Glendale equestrians. 5) LA County Flood Control has an easement for flood control purposes, but the underlying fee

is owned by the LA Recreation and Parks. And the Recreation and Parks Department was granted the equestrian easement by LA County Food Control District. This easement, known as the River Trail, appears in Parks' maps as a horse trail. The circumstances remain unchanged. 6) "Connecting" the bike path at the on- and off-ramps at Forest Lawn Drive will be dangerous. The multiple ramps experience significant automobile traffic, frequent back ups onto the freeway itself and sudden stops. Commuters, visitors to the two cemeteries and truck/commuter to and from Warner Bros Studios comprise a unique set of circumstances for this dangerous intersection. The off-ramps are down hill. And there are records of autos going straight into the LA River at this intersection. 7) The superior, shaded and non-conflicting alternative will be Zoo Drive. Enhanced with a Class 1 separated bike path, Zoo Drive lends itself to construction within an ample level right-of-way, in the shade, and will remain open year round. The Zoo Drive Alternative comes at significantly lower cost. The only time a horseback rider will cross the alternative route for the bike path will be at the Live Streamers (start of Rattlesnake Trail) intersection which is level and affords long sight distances for safety.

Communication from Public

Name: Faith K.

Date Submitted: 02/15/2024 05:37 PM

Council File No: 23-0722

Comments for Public Posting: 1) The south side of the LA River between Riverside Bridge and the Forest Lawn on & off ramps is an Equestrian Trail, and has been so for more than 50 years. 2) The cost and construction of a Bike Trail To Nowhere will, by its sudden end, encourage the UNSAFE intermingling of bicycles and horses on the same trail, as cyclists look for a way out. 3) The cost and delay of an unnecessary bridge or changes to the already dangerous Forest Lawn exits to carry cyclists out to Forest Lawn on the south side of the 134 seems like a waste of public funds - it would be so expensive and take a long time to get that portion built. 4) Moving the bicycle trail to the interior of Griffith Park, down Forest Lawn Drive and then Zoo Drive is safer and more practical. Please strongly consider this option. 5) A separate bicycle trail inside the grass could be constructed to eliminate the risk of 'dooring' - the opening of a car door in the path of a cyclist. 6) The Forest Lawn route is cooler and more 'park-like'. 7) The fence beside the LA River is very low and dangerous for both cyclists and equestrians. It's an inadequate barrier next to a 25' sheer drop onto concrete. 8) The width of the available area as it nears the Forest Lawn off-ramps is too narrow to accommodate cyclists and horses, even with the existing trees destroyed. 9) It's only a mile long, expensive to build, and at its end will create even more dangerous conditions for equestrians as cyclists fly by in very tight quarters. 10) There is no law enforcement on the bicycle trail and that section of the horse trail. Unsafe behavior by cyclists towards horses already exists. Different jurisdictions claim that responsibility belongs to another... 11) We went to a meeting with DOT at Friendship Auditorium, and have not heard back with updates. Please ask them to consider public input carefully.