

# CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



## HOLLYWOOD HILLS WEST NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL OFFICERS

PRESIDENT  
ANASTASIA MANN

VICE-PRESIDENT  
STUART ROSS

SECOND VICE PRESIDENT  
JANE CROCKETT

SECRETARY  
DARNELL TYLER

TREASURER  
MATT SHICHTMAN

## HOLLYWOOD HILLS WEST NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

7095 Hollywood Blvd., Suite #1004  
Hollywood, CA 90028

Phone: (310) 854-6000  
[www.HHWNC.org](http://www.HHWNC.org)

## HOLLYWOOD HILLS WEST NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

### JOINT COMMITTEE\* MEETING: MUHOLLAND DRIVE SPEEDBUMPS & HOLLYWOOD BOWL NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC

### MEETING MINUTES from Feb 27 meeting

Minutes compiled by Kyrstin Munson, Transportation Chair

#### \*Committees Represented:

1. Transportation
2. Community
3. Area 2 (Cahuenga Pass/Universal City)
4. Area 3 (Yucca Corridor/Whitley Heights/Cahuenga East)
5. Area 4 (Hollywood Heights/Hollywood Blvd)
6. Area 5 (Outpost/Cahuenga West)
7. Area 6 (Nichols Canyon/Runyon Canyon/Wattles Park)

A map of the areas is located here: <https://www.hhwnc.org/find-your-area/>

#### I. Call to order and Welcome, Introductions.

##### a. Introductions by

- i. Jeff Straebler, [area2chair@hhwnc.org](mailto:area2chair@hhwnc.org)
- ii. Brian Dyer, [area3chair@hhwnc.org](mailto:area3chair@hhwnc.org)
- iii. Lisa Scott [area4chair@hhwnc.org](mailto:area4chair@hhwnc.org)
- iv. Charles Coker, [area5chair@hhwnc.org](mailto:area5chair@hhwnc.org)
- v. Mary Yarber, [area6chair@hhwnc.org](mailto:area6chair@hhwnc.org)
- vi. Chris Wintrobe, [communitychair@hhwnc.org](mailto:communitychair@hhwnc.org)
- vii. John Bwarie, [john@stratiscope.com](mailto:john@stratiscope.com)
- viii. Mehmet Berker, [mehmet.berker@lacity.org](mailto:mehmet.berker@lacity.org)
- ix. Joshua Silva- Infrastructure

#### II. Approval of May 9 meeting minutes, motion and vote.

- a. *Minutes were not available from May 9 meeting. This is tabled.*

### III. Discussion and Possible Action Items

#### A. Mulholland Drive – Speed Humps Prioritization Feedback UPDATE re: locations: Mehmet Berker, CD4

Set of 7 speed humps have been recommended and approved by DOT, but currently only enough funding for the top 3 sets of speed humps. See attached speed hump map & initial prioritization based on feedback so far.

**NOTE: Mehmet Berker, CD4, Office of Councilmember Raman is now Sr. Deputy for Transportation, Infrastructure and Public Space. ([Mehmet.Berker@lacity.org](mailto:Mehmet.Berker@lacity.org))**

- i. *We reviewed process so far, where we are in the process & asked LADOT for “speed mitigation” recommendations. Below: Q = questions from committee members. A = answers from Mehmet.*
  - i. *Q: what is the timeline?*
    - 1. *A: Couple months -this fiscal year*
  - ii. *Q: How does this impact evacuation vehicles? How does this impact evacuation rate? Has LAFD looked at this? Do we know how much speed humps slow down evacuation? Do we have an evacuation plan?*
    - 1. *A: There are speed table designs that are easier for fire- that may be what they recommend in the end.*
  - iii. *Comments were shared by the public:*
    - a. *Comment 1- AGAINST: not a proponent of the speedhumps. Concern of darkness & safety. This is daily transit and will inconvenience thousands of people. No comments for people walking on a bike.*
    - b. *Comment 2- AGAINST: homes near Multiview, it’s a road people love and care about. Its well-intentioned & reason to take reasonable measures but destroys driving feel of street. Changing from country road. Favor as few as possible. Maybe trial pilot first before embarking on larger product.*
    - c. *Comment 3- In FAVOR: This is no longer country road, lots of speeding, wakes people up, 80%, cyclist won’t run, donuts on universal, evacuation plan concerns aren’t that high of concern because everyone is leaving at same time, do need speed mitigation & concern from neighbors.*
    - d. *Comment 4- AGAINST: too many speedhumps, use this a corridor a few times a day, wear and tare on the car, do a traffic study if this will help, concerned there isn’t enough community outreach for others to know, DOT signs are laying down bollards run over, lots of trash, more outreach needed, speed limits should be raised.*
    - e. *Comment 5- AGAINST: way too many speedhumps- excessive, can drive around corners safely, came about because speeders on Mulholland is speeders, will destroy, Nichols Canyon- not sure if this is representative.*
    - f. *Comment 6- IN FAVOR: was damaged property, for those who don’t say it’s a problem – it’s a problem, always sending feedback to police department and videos, recommend at least temporary solution, concerned of people getting hurt.*
    - g. *Comment 7 - IN FAVOR: live at 7 & 3, proponent of speedhump, put in hospital, lost a dog add before Macappa turn,*
  - iv. *Mehmet responds to few questions with Answers;*
    - i. *Nature of road:*
    - ii. *Number of speedhumps: 17 is too many- wouldn’t be able to implement,*
    - iii. *Next steps: ask DOT to recommend this is what we can do.*
  - v. *More questions and comments were shared from board & public (Q) with some answers (A) from Mehmet*

1. Q. Can you explore if wear and tear on vehicles if you go over speedhumps at right speed?
2. Q. During this timeline & agencies- what is the timeline and is there a plan for a larger push for communication?
  - a. Mehmet: They will share out every step of the way,
3. Q. Do we have # vehicles traveled? & overall safety projections? Is there a incremental safety for additional speedhumps vs. to show that many more is needed
4. Has anyone asked Coldwater residents if they are happy with their speedhumps?
  - a. A. No, but not necessarily.
5. Q. Why not in Beverly Hills photograph for speed?
6. Q. What are we going to do to increase community outreach. We are concerned not getting representation.
7. Q. When go over speedhumps at 10 mph, car is low- will reduce speed by 10 miles per hour. Will this be problematic for traffic flow.
8. Q. Data needs to be clean data- doesn't feel data is going to police report if someone dies, no website where you can see what happens,
9. Q: We suggests we want comprehensive traffic study needed. Concerned once bollards go in, they never come out.

**B. Milner and Camrose Hollywood Bowl Closure during Peak Nights Discussion:** Transportation Chair shared results from survey, accepting public comments, and addition feedback on results.

- i. John from Stratiscope presents update:
  - i. DOT doesn't have authorization for – for soft closure, can't write tickets
  - ii. Increase traffic officers
  - iii. Increase Park-n- ride options
  - iv. Added website for community
  - v. Preselling parking to dissuade last minute decisions
  - vi. Can't have partial closure with resident parking passes

- ii. *Transportation Chair shares survey results from Survey posted on HHWNC and emailed to HHWNC members.*

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE SURVEY RESULTS FOR MILNER AND CAMROSE HOLLYWOOD BOWL CLOSURE- Feb 2023					
What is your preference for closures?					
What is your neighborhood?		No Change- continue to close Milner & Camrose on peak Bowl traffic event nights	Reduce Frequency of Closures- reduce frequency of closures at Milner & Camrose	Remove All Closures- remove Milner & Camrose closure on peak Bowl traffic event nights	Total
Camrose Side	Hollywood Heights	49	3	5	57
	Other	2		5	7
	Outpost Estates	64	6	3	73
Milner Side	Whitley Heights	6	1	6	13
Total		121	10	19	151
<p>These results indicate <u>there is conclusive evidence that neighbors on the Camrose side want no change &amp; continued closures on peak Bowl traffic event nights</u>, with 115 neighbors in favor of closures, 9 neighbors requesting reduced frequency of closures, and 13 neighbors requesting removal of closures with total of 137 respondents.</p> <p>These results also indicate <u>there is NO conclusive evidence for preference for closures from neighbors on the Milner side</u>. This is a near split decision with minimal neighborhood inputs from 13 residents.</p>					

- iii. *Committee and community feedback on the presentation and survey results. Questions= Q from committee members, and A= some answers from John*
- i. *Q/A: Is there every a barricade without staff?*
    1. *A. Always event staff*
  - ii. *Q: Why does this decision for Milner & Camrose need to be considered at the same time when they are 2 separate sides of the street? Neighbors are concerned the survey pits neighborhoods against each other & we believe neighborhoods should be given independent choices?*
    1. *A: According to engineers: reasons the decision for Milner & Camrose closure is combined is:*
      - a. *Safety access to area- if we limit access to one area, traffic will flow to the other area where there is most access*
      - b. *Historically they did first start with Camrose side; but it pushed all the rideshare drop off to Milnerside. In order to prevent everything pushing into Milner, close both side*
  - iii. *Q. These 2 neighborhoods have very different considerations and we request further evaluation to separate these closures be reviewed independently. Ask traffic engineers to present why one can't be closed without the other & advise of the current objective. We Need objective data, and current data.*
  - iv. *Q: Concern that the traffic study may have pre-dated Lyft drop to not be valid any longer.*
  - v. *Community Feedback:*

1. Comment 1- Yes agree with closures: Originally was opposed to hard street closures. Think they work because its eliminated traffic, Traffic officer blocks entire street & its too narrow to pull in on Hillcrest & Camrose for how you turn from Hillcrest on to Camrose
2. Comment 2: Lives in Whitley Heights. This only happened on lease events. Early closures were done without input. Recommend to separate Hollywood Heights & Whitley Heights. Everyone used to have placards.
3. Comment 4: Hollywood Heights – Yes agree with closures. Sawhorse transition from Hillcrest & Milner, La Presa offers were often absent. Question- new street sign at Sycamore no right turn at 3-7- but with hard closures- you need to be able to turn right on hard closure night.
4. Comment 5- YES Closures: lived for over 35 years, traffic is due to lease events, for Phil. Appreciate hard closures

vi. *Closing comments from HHWNC committee members*

1. *Brian- Area 3- This not just on leased events anymore. LA Phil is trying to draw bigger events. What are the next milestones for these decisions?*
2. *Charlie-This burden is currently on the neighborhood when it should not be.*
3. *Transportation Chair- I recommend we next evaluate the need for another survey on the Milner/ Area 3 side as the results are not conclusive. We will evaluate next steps.*

**C. Proposed Partial Street Closure Legislation Feedback-**presentation by Chris Wintrode, Committee Chair.

The California Office of Legislative Counsel has finished drafting the state legislation change to allow for partial street closures during big venue events (like Hollywood Bowl) and Senator Portantino's office has forwarded the legislation change for support.

**NOTE:** The Senator has advised that this proposed legislation will most likely be presented in the 2024 package.

**Motion:** The Transportation Committee of the Hollywood Hills West NC supports the proposed legislation change for partial street closures as written: "THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS: SECTION 1. Section 21101.5 is added to the Vehicle Code, to read: 21101.5. Notwithstanding Section 21101.6, a local authority may, by ordinance or resolution, adopt rules and regulations to temporarily limit vehicular traffic in certain neighborhood streets during large events to residents and owners of property abutting those streets and their guests, if all the following conditions are met: (a) There are 10,000 or more people in attendance at the event. (b) The street closed is within a five-mile radius of the event venue. (c) There is signage that clearly designates the traffic restriction.

i. *Presentation by Chris Wintrode on the legislation and update. Outlines language for motion discussion.*

i. *Feedback from Committee members:*

1. *Charles- thank you*
2. *Brian- huge thank you for all the progress you made so far on traffic mitigation, coordinating north and south end of Franklin, we need to find a way to*

*communicate all these small wins out- somethings that are pushing forward and want to celebrate*

*ii. Feedback from Public:*

1. Comment 1: didn't see "except for resident," 5 mile radius is too big & how far other theatres away. 1 mile is better
  - a. May update language to say "residents or property"
2. Comment 2: how else do we send our feedback to Senator Portafino?
  - a. Need to get more grass roots neighborhood feedback from our neighbors. Then, we need to outreach to other neighbors-
3. Comment3: look at radius for 1 mile for distance
4. Comment 4: Good thank you

**IV. Comments from the public on non-agenda items within the Committee's subject matter jurisdiction.**

*a. NONE*

**VI. Committee Business**

**A. Comment on Committee Member's own activities/ brief announcements.**

**B. Introduce new issues for consideration by the Committee(s) at its next meeting/request that the item be placed on the next meeting's agenda.**

**C. Ask Committee Chairpersons to research issues and report back to the Board at a future time.**

**VII. Decision on next meeting date(s)**

**VIII. Adjournment**

# Mulholland Speed Mitigation

CD4 | HHWNC | UNCNA | LAFD 97 & 76



**NITHYA  
RAMAN**

| Los Angeles  
★ City Councilmember  
| 4th District

## The Need

- Racing and speeding on Mulholland
- Crashes into homes and other unsafe incidents
- Enforcement can only do so much, need for 24/7 infrastructure help

## The Process So Far

- HHWNC initiated effort in 2021 to identify stretches of Mulholland in most need of speed mitigation
- CD4 encumbered \$90,000 of Neighborhood Services funds (Federal) to allocate to speed mitigation in CD4
- CD4 reached out to Upper Nichols Canyon Neighborhood Association and LAFD Station Captains at Stations 97 and 76 for comments

## Where We Are

- LADOT has finished a preliminary review of submitted stretches and identified [seven “Sets”](#) of humps for which they can conduct final engineering, design and construction
  - Humps have to be in sets of at least two
  - Contextual issues like grade and curves can affect placement
- We are checking back in to propose a priority ranking before moving forward with final design for the sets we expect we can pay for at this time



## CD4 Draft Priority Ranking

- Set 3 - Universal City Overlook
  - *Recommended by HHWNC, UNCNA*
- Set 4 and Set 6 - Hairpin turns with recent crashes
  - *Recommended by UNCNA*
- Set 1 - Dona Pegita
  - *Recommended by LAFD Station 97 and neighboring residents*
- Set 7 - Mulholland/Macapa curve
  - *Recommended by HHWNC, UNCNA*
- Set 2 and Set 5 - Lower priority locations at this time

## Past-received Comments and Considerations

- Reasons why some areas are without sets
- Possibility to add a hump to an existing set
- Possibility to supplement funds with Neighborhood Council, private, or other funds

## **Comments and Considerations Received (2/15/2023 HHWNC)**

- Try to coordinate work with DWP work?
- Can you add a hump east of 7456 Mulholland hairpin turn to Set 6?
- Design so people driving can't/won't swerve to sides to avoid humps; can design accommodate people biking
- Design for emergency vehicles

## **Next Steps**

- Consideration of comments at HHWNC meetings in February (and March, if desired)
- Direction to LADOT to pursue final design and construction for sets we can accomplish in budget
- Noticing for construction and construction



